

since 2019 it has been made clear that the government does not work toward the best interest of the citizens of this country.

the blame for this is threefold;

i) the government pushes an agenda that does not reflect the will of the people. members of government are likely self serving in their agenda - be that for financial or political gain.

ii) the media is complicit in promoting ONLY the agenda desired by the government. it does not provide a wide range of views that the people can then use to make educated, discerning decisions for themselves.

iii) the Australian people have a share of the blame for dispensing with their own responsibility for making informed decisions. this comes from two sources; a) laziness (which is self-inflicted), and b) a consolidated media front which the public SHOULD be able to trust (which is not their fault) but which instead pushes nothing but government propaganda.

i will briefly unpack a number of issues that demonstrate this. there are plenty of articles online that do so with more detail and possibly eloquence than i will - i will not be presenting sources which are by majority online. and herein we return to the issue - if people and/or independent news sources are not allowed to express their opinions online then the result is nothing less than the suppression of free speech and the suppression of independent thought and opinions. i will add to this that the opinions provided by the government are NOT always correct. they are not always moral. and they do not reflect the desires and opinions of the population.

covid - in general

-----  
the government clearly pushes a firm opinion and agenda regarding covid. their information was NOT always correct. the excuse that 'we did the best with the information we had' is not acceptable. nor is the excuse that it was 'high pressure times and immediate decisions were vital to public safety'.

while the 'pandemic' was going on there WERE other opinions and alternatives available. these were available to the public precisely because we have a right to express ourselves freely, and without government monitoring or censorship or editing.

these were available to the population despite the media pushing (ad nauseum) the "singular point of truth" approach.

these were ignored despite people with objections being demonized and punished for not agreeing with the "approved truth."

anyone claiming to be a single source of truth should (in my opinion) be treated as either, a) a liar, and/or b) manipulative and self-serving.

that the government considers it good to have their own approved truth as the only truth is clearly disturbing in a country that says that it promotes freedom and democracy. the last few years have strongly suggested that the government does NOT stand for these things that once made Australia a fair and decent country where a person could be proud of their citizenship and heritage.

on many cases the government's response to covid in hindsight was wrong. that is my opinion and the opinion of many others. you, the government, have no right saying whether i can or can't agree with you.

## "Vaccines"

-----

the government's policy was one of enforcing compliance.  
the vaccines forced upon the population were NOT tested.  
they did not suppress the spread of the disease.  
they did stop infection or reinfection.  
there were not "safe" and they DID cause many injuries to people who did not need to be injured.  
they were not required for the majority of the population, especially the young.  
there were alternate treatments that could have been effective in treating the disease.

i will not focus on the source of the virus, but it is clear that even if it was intentionally released on the population that cover ups were made. suggestions that it was 'leaked from a lab' are known believed to be highly likely, though at the time people expressing these views were regarded as 'conspiracy theorists'. even though it was the most logical theory.

many of us felt instinctively that the vaccine that followed was detrimental based solely on logic - ie what we are being told does not make sense.  
and as time has passed, there have been many studies done proving the above points to be the case.  
even without those studies done, the idea that the government had some inside information that credible scientist did not regarding how the process of approving medical procedures are developed is ludicrous.

fortunately for the 'real truth' there were informed, serious people presenting information all the while the pandemic was happening to those willing to research beyond state propaganda. by real truth i mean that there are more facets and nuance to reality than what the government and media were insisting was true. the government and media play hard and fast with the concept of truth. and by this i mean that they lie (including by omission).

of course now that studies and information proving the governments position to be erroneous are coming out there is NO coverage of this on the state approved media. in fact there are still advertisements telling people to continue taking a potentially harmful treatment.

## injuries

-----

despite the fact that they were untested, the government pushed, to a criminal level, vaccine enforcement.

people who suffered likely related or triggered injuries were told to have the next booster anyway.

people were having complication such as heart episodes, shingles, etc.  
BECAUSE their systems were compromised by an untested drug that they were effectively not allowed to say no to.

the idea that a reasonably healthy person just happened to have a heart episode after an experimental drug was administered... coincidence is NOT an acceptable conclusion in this case. it is not logical, it is not reasonable. especially when many people have had the same detrimental experience.

doctors were told to push the treatment regardless of their own opinion about the treatment, which, it is not unreasonable to assume, would be more informed than that of a politician. this has led to a profound loss of credibility for doctors.

the proposed changes of this bill would no doubt be used to stop people talking about injuries they received. they would stop doctors expressing their concerns. both of these groups have a right to express their opinions - they WERE injured regardless of your desire to shut them up - they ARE more knowledgeable despite your desire to suppress their expertise.

the government should be investigated and probably prosecuted for their malicious stance during these events. they should not be genially dismissed as "they did the best they could" and they should definitely NOT be granted MORE power to dispose of inconvenient facts that go against what they want to be believed.

mandates and lockdowns

-----  
the government's imprisonment of the entire population was simply a criminal act.

it has been demonstrated that the government considered such steps to be "for the general masses" but need not apply to themselves. why? because they knew it was pointless.  
yet they inflicted it on the population regardless.

additionally a "lockdowns end in x days" approach demonstrates that the processes was pointless. lockdowns should be abolished as soon as the decision was made that they were stopping. what benefit did 3, 5, 12 extra days make? there is no logic to it.

an argument that "it would have been so much worse if we hadn't xyz." does not hold water. it is conjecture.

appeals that 'modeling showed xyz' is at best a weak argument. models have been proven to be almost worthless time and again. not that the public in general is presented with these the follow up information.

i believe that the government finds people having access to more information scary. perhaps the government should credit the people with some level of common sense and autonomy. this is the reason for this new, authoritarian proposal.

the demonization of people refusing to get an untested 'treatment' is equally criminal.

any suggestion that the government did not enforce mandates is a lie. the federal government palmed off responsibility to the states. the states palmed off responsibility to the employer, all the while making it perfectly clear that to not comply was to be a pariah and liable to punishment. there was no choice given, despite what politicians and bureaucratic mouth pieces choose to utter.

the government and media did nothing but push this propaganda the entire time. there was NO alternate information other than criticism or dissention to alternative opinions no matter how logical or reasonable those argument might have been.

the government should ABSOLUTELY NOT have the right to suppress opinions that do not agree with the government stance.

examples;

i) outdoors. the idea that keeping everyone in an enclosed space was the safest and best way to stop the disease spreading is non-sense. it is not sense. trains, planes and enclosed office spaces are particularly filthy breeding grounds for 'germs'. yet this was the government's response - stay in a low-airflow environment. the alternative was - be outside more, where the germs can float off into the sky harmlessly (and the sun helps kill viruses by the way). but to even have that kind of thought was 'rebellious'.

ii) vit d, ivermectin, etc. the government/media's promotion of people seeking alter treatment options as crackpots looking for veterinary medicine is obscene. i don't even want to delve into that one. you know what you did.

iii) nsw premier gladys b stated that people who did not have the vaccine were 'less than human'. this from a person who is now known (if not proven in court) to be of far less than superlative moral character. an insult from here is almost a compliment. however this was the information propagated to the general public in order to promote revulsion of people with alternate (and possibly far more considered) views.

iv) most people i know only had the vaccine because they need i.e. medical treatment and would not be allowed to have it if they were not vaccinated (unreasonable), needed to work to make a living and could not do so because their employers blackmailed them into do it (unreasonable), were convinced that the government knew what they were doing though a one-sided media campaign (also unreasonable).

protests

-----

large protests WERE held to oppose mandates, though it is only through online sources that anyone would ever know about it.

these large gathering were ignored ENTIRELY by mainstream media, no doubt whatsoever at the request of the government.

the media and government should have acknowledge that there was an alternate opinion. and not presented objectors as 'crazies', 'fringe' or 'granny killers'.

the government should NOT have the ability to supress the opinions of the population. especially when that is a large portion of the population.

that such protests, where they were even acknowledged, were posited as 'violent protests' was also government misinformation (to use your own term).

i) most of the violence that was RECORDED ON CAMERA was instigated BY THE POLICE. yet none of this was covered by the media, at the governments bequest.

it is only available if you go looking for it. and it is APPAULING. people should not respect what the police did, regardless of their orders coming from on high.

ii) 'guy who punched a horse' that clip as shown on the main stream media was taken out of context and used as propaganda. the horse was swinging around wildly within a densely populated piece of ground. which in my own opinion shows the cop using the horse as a weapon.

iii) the guy who was tackled to the ground murderously in the train station.

iv) the union workers who were tracked down and beaten by many police officers as they were leaving a protest site.

v) the elderly woman pepper sprayed.

the list goes on. again, i don't need to provide sources. you, the government, know exactly what i'm referring to.

it is vital that the government and their agencies are held to account for these appalling acts of violence, suppression and hatred of the population. clearly the media is not up to the task of doing this objectively, therefore it is up to the growing uptake of online providers to present that is REALLY happening. because you won't. and you're right to be thoroughly ashamed of the behaviour over the past 5 years. you will rightly go down in history as despicable.

media

-----

the main stream media should be held to account for their actions during this time. they should not be praised for lies, or the omission of truth. they should be seen as colluders and demonized for subverting truth.

if you want to crack down on misinformation start with the media.

let's now skip through a few other topics just to acknowledge that this more far reaching than just covid related matters.

"the voice"

-----

the government wants to divide the country by promoting a racist policy. we all mostly agreed back in the day that south african apartheid was bad, yet this government WANTS to divide people by race.

one might well ask why the government wants "everyone else" to dislike aboriginal people.

the majority of people would not support such a decision if they knew what it actually meant - that "yes" is a vote for institutional racism.

the government has not, and most likely will not state what changes would actually be made. indicating that whatever it has planned is NOT what people would vote for.

and all the while a media blitz for their side ONLY continues, funded by people who don't want what they're selling. how about using that money to benefit the population instead.

how about making accountable all the committees, organizations, think-tanks and departments who have allegedly failed to come up with a better situation for the people in question for DECADE after DECADE? groups that syphon millions if not billions of tax dollars from the tax payer year after year, all for aboriginals to still remain in sometimes horrific situations.

by the way there was plenty of good independent reporting about the situation from central australia and about the aboriginal situation, that was entirely ignored by the main stream media. in fact the main stream media presented lies instead, promoting those areas and populations as racist and supremacist, which appeared to be the opposite of the truth.

the population won't get an opposing option unless they ignore main stream media and look online for other, reasoned opinions and independent reporting. people reporting facts.

why should the government be granted power to suppress opinions that do not align with their own machiavellian schemes? if the people are no longer free to have their own opinion and belief then please abolish the pretence that we are in a free country, do the right thing and state that this is a soviet-style dictatorship.

ukraine

-----

that a war is being fought there is not good. most reasonable people would agree that no war is better than war.

however the presentation of zelensky and the ukraine government is blameless or perfect is insulting.

the situation there is complex. yet the media here does nothing but promote putin as the anti-christ and leave it at that.

how about the shelling of civilians BY ukrainian troops? how about the destruction of infrastructure BY ukrainian troops? how about the almost entire depopulation of the male ukrainian population and press-ganging of anyone capable of carrying a weapon?

there is no nuance to the reporting. no objectivity. in the light of such a one-sided opinion being presented why would people not look for alternate or at least more information?

the government have no right to disallow people from finding out more information about global events that very well could affect us.

climate change

-----

the government has really run the country into the ground with this one.

on one hand demonizing coal, on the other promoting wind and solar 'solutions' that are clearly not feasible.

if people had the actual information they would be appalled that anyone (those in government promoting this) even considered this, let alone flushed god knows how much tax money into a scheme that is never going to work.

doubling down on something wrong doesn't eventually make it right.

but of course the main stream media doesn't acknowledge any of that. why?  
because it's not in the government's interests.  
but what of the interests of the people?  
at the moment we HAVE to go to 'fringe' sources in order to find out what is  
actually going on.

and the government proposes shutting down even these outlier cases. no.

NO to government censorship. NO to government overreach. NO to  
suppressing government failures. NO to the voice (since i'm on a roll). No to  
this proposal. NO to biased propaganda.

the government is NOT always right. they need to be held accountable. people  
need to be able to hear and talk about the government, not simply suppressed  
because it is inconvenient to their election chances. for a country to be healthy  
people need to be able to talk freely.

discussion in and of itself is not hurtful, hateful or harmful, and a government  
who suggests that it is, for want of a better term, evil.