

Inquiry into the Government's response to the Covid-19 pandemic

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Do you have any additional comments or suggestions?:

The attached was submitted for consideration to our public health officials. Whilst the link between the quarantine and outbreak is indisputable, the abject dismissal by most commentary as to the role of the BLM protests precludes a more nuanced understanding of some of the additional risks.

Opinion in the media has been based on that of one or two medical experts – yet, if we observe opinion between so-called experts as the pandemic has evolved, (for example with respect to utility of mask wearing) what this demonstrates is that expert opinion can be divided. This is an important consideration that must have a bearing on proceedings.

The impact of unquestioned and unsubstantiated opinion circulating as fact in the broader public discourse has the net result of a given line of enquiry being disregarded. This represents an erroneous perspective and carries with it potential for overlooking important additional sources of evidence.

With the security of the country at stake from an economic and public health perspective, every piece of information, understanding and evidence – no matter how seemingly inconsequential – is of crucial significance.

The problem with erroneous assumptions can best be illustrated by reference to one of our country's most more high-profile cases. As was well known at the time, the case against Lindy Chamberlain was watertight and a certainty. That is, until it wasn't.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]