

13<sup>th</sup> September

Ms. Rebecca Maddern  
Channel 9  
Today Show (Weekend)

Dear Rebecca

As a viewer of the Today (weekend) Show I wish to express my concern for the undignified way in which you abuse the circumstance of your desk to perpetuate a bias that (I think) is vested in ignorance.

Permit me first to set the protocol by which I will address my concerns. I will not (in this communication):

- Identify, group, label and demean the good intent of a population of peaceful people
- Hold sacred that my view is more important than any other person's
- Hold with contempt a view that differs from my own
- Intimidate people to not exercise their God given freedoms

This correspondence refers to the segment (12<sup>th</sup> September) where you bring to focus a particular event in the week that was of interest to you. You chose the segment where Dep. Comm Luke Cornelius, referred to the protesters as those that attire themselves with tinfoil head gear and some ignorant other reference to a dog eating its own vomit.

**Fact (1); Bias reporting:** In all the footage I saw, I did not see one person wearing any such head attire.

This would suggest that you align yourself to the "Conspiracy Theory" narrative because I can think of no other reason that you would choose to mock people in this way. And in adopting this approach you are blind to the "Complicity Theory", which is the equal opposite view – but we never hear of this on your media platform.

In the future, when your children come from school distressed at the mistreatment they received from a 'bully' at school who referred to them in such a disrespectful way, (when all your child was trying to do was *be their best*), I would encourage you NOT to laugh at them, as you did this morning and NOT to align yourself with the idiocy of person that perpetrated the abuse.

I request that you do a count on the number of times that your channel has pushed the "Conspiracy Theory" narrative and contrast that to a "Complicity" or aligned theory. I think you know what the answer may look like.

(Sub-text)

In your other channel 9 news media stable there is a tendency to attenuate this bias in the form of anti-Trump sentiment. In doing this, you are simply enacting that narrative which bears the mark of the corporate agenda being sold to you, without mind for scrutiny or critical or balanced thought. This goes to the heart of the role of media and your (possible) complicity in it.

**Fact (2); Good intent:** The people attending the march, did so with good intent. It was peaceful and purposeful. Their intent could be stated as, *to express their concern for the future of our freedom* – a very worthy cause which will hopefully (because of their efforts) survive this C-19 episode by my lifetime, your lifetime and the lifetime of our children.

**Fact (3); Responsibility:** The very person in whom you are placing your trust to remedy this situation is the same person that created the architecture and provided the approval and response capability to the assignment of security guards to the hotels. He also failed to augment an appropriate Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and training to support the intent of the policy.

**Fact (4); Scenarios:** There are a number of scenarios that may come into play here:

- (a) Action: We do not silence the protestors
  - (i) And the protestors were wrong
    - Outcome: Our freedoms were safeguarded and C-19 was seen and responded to as a legitimate disease that required an intervention of the sort invoked by the Premier but we embraced our basic freedoms and celebrate a society that permitted us to freely express our concerns and ask those questions necessary to safeguard the future we seek
  - (ii) And the protestors were right
    - Outcome: These ‘tin hat wearing’ people protected your rights at a time that you were not even aware that your rights needed protecting.
- (b) Action: We silence the protestors
  - (i) And the protestors were wrong
    - Outcome: We have bestowed a level of power and authority with the government that provides a precedent that invites them to escalate any future matter of their choosing, to the exclusion of our individual and collective freedoms
  - (ii) And the protestors were right
    - Outcome: We have hereafter consigned ourselves to a future that we, our children and our children’s children do not want. We have surrendered our freedoms and become complicit in our own destruction – but there is no way or HOPE of navigating our way back to what we have today

You choose. Which of these scenarios do you wish for our children to live in? Because what we are seeing today is the wholesale loss of HOPE.

This same loss of hope is represented in the Queensland circumstance of not letting four children meet with their palliative father, by crossing the border from NSW to Queensland to see him for one last time. By default, I would understand that you too agree that the children should be denied access to their dying father. Because instead of using that valuable and sacred airtime to advocate for these children, you chose to reference and bring focus to the ignorant and disrespectful rantings of Dep. Comm Luke Cornelius.

In advancing the above scenarios, I acknowledge those family members, friends and valued, cherished and loved people have died. I do not in any way discount the heartfelt grief for families and the pain of those that have died (many of whom were aged and died alone by themselves and not in the accompaniment of their loved ones).

In saying this, we are unable to assign a numerical value to the differential between scenarios (a) and (b), so I cannot quantify what this may look like in terms of the human cost of any of the postulated scenarios. But it does raise the question as to where is the tipping point? How many lives should we surrender for our freedom?

As close to an answer that I can get, in World War I 60,000 young Australians lost their lives; In WWII it was 27,000 and in the Vietnam War it was 521. Cumulatively this represents a death toll of 87,521, plus those whose lives were irreparably impacted physically, psychologically and socially.

If we were to assign a further value to the average youthfulness of those that gave their lives versus the average age of those that have died from C-19, the measure would be even greater.

Just as a reminder as at the time of writing this the C-19 number of deaths was 797. Of course, this number is exacerbated by the governments' policy settings and response to aged care and the Ruby Princess. This would be the very same governments upon whom you now place a reliance upon for protection and good policy.

As an additional reminder for the other pandemics that evidenced a greater loss of life, no such interventions were invoked.

In any of these scenarios and if C-19 is historically known to be a hoax (refer to Fact 4), it is the freedom that these people defended that will permit for this to be known. The alternative scenario is unfathomable.

**Fact (5):** Is C-19 a hoax; Firstly, the initial estimates of morbidity, when C-19 first became a concern were 150,000 Australians would lose their life.

In saying this, I understand that at the beginning there was much unknown so it was a very prudent approach to be circumspect and conservative in the setting of those policies that would safeguard the wellbeing of our people.

Yet here we are, having on boarded all the data and knowledge that is now available to us and we still cannot get a unified and federated model on the policies and treatments.

This is what we know:

- On any given day in Australia there are on average 410-440 deaths attributed to all causes. At the current C-19 death rate and for all the despair, turmoil, disruption and economic hardship, we are yet to achieve 2 days average deaths.
- Asymptomatic people do not transmit the virus, yet we persist in marginalising and isolating this population of people and give no recognition to the fact that the probability of contracting and dying from C-19 is (how many points of a single percentage?)
- Children represent an infinitesimal risk of community spread, yet we have closed our schools
- CDC has declared (in USA) 94% of all C-19 deaths have a co-morbidity factor of 2.6, leaving 6% that have exclusive causality assigned to C-19, yet we persist with the assignment of a "pandemic" scale response, without articulating co-morbidity and other causal relationships, nor do we give statistical recognition to the unnecessary deaths attributed to the clusters associated with aged care and the Ruby Princess

- There is a monetary incentive for hospitals and practitioners to declare a death as C-19 related, which would skew the data in favour of C-19 related deaths
- The average age of people dying of C-19 is higher than our average (Australian) life span
- For equivalent periods, more people historically, have died from the flu
- We continue to invest in a belief that vaccines are the answer, yet despite the flu vaccines, deaths from flu (which exceed C-19) continue to rise, as does the incidence and correlation of other debilitating effects such as autism.
- The race for a C-19 vaccine goes on unabated, knowing the commercial rewards that are available and that we have truncated the approvals (human trials) process and provided indemnity to all big pharmaceuticals for any adverse clinical outcomes.
- The resultant cumulative impacts of suicide, social and economic marginalisation, deferred health treatments and other secondary and tertiary level impacts far outweigh any consequence of C-19
- The focus on reporting the number of cases is obscure and is correlated to the number of people that were tested which is no real measure of anything other than maybe the geographical origins of any potential cluster.
- The test is for Corona Virus, not COVID-19 so the reporting of positive test outcomes does not evidence the number of C-19 cases and there is a plethora of false positive results that are never corrected
- There is a significant body of scientific evidence that hydroxychloroquine, with some zinc and sunlight is a viable treatment for C-19, yet the full scale of the scientific evidence is denied access to mainstream media, despite thousands of clinicians attesting to 100% positive outcomes.

**FACT 6:** Legitimacy of lock down; It has been acknowledged that neither the Chief Medical Officer nor the Commissioner of Police authorised the imposition of a curfew.

Daniel Andrews has acted outside of his legislative and constitutional authority.

He continues to claim it falls under his responsibility but I have never seen him take responsibility for the process by which the curfew and the security guards abominations came into existence

**FACT 7:** Listen to the science; Doctors refute the science adopted by Daniel Andrews to inform his approach to curfew. I quote from the Age Newspaper on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2020:

*World leading scientists linked to the modeling Daniel Andrews has used to lock down Melbourne say the research has been misrepresented and have urged the Premier to rethink restrictions as his virus suppression targets are impossible to meet.*

The article goes on to say that there was no differentiation between policy to inform high risk populations and the general public.

**Fact (8):** You have a job; In your mocking of these people, that I believe have a legitimate right to express their concerns, you sit there in the comfort and knowledge of your weekly income to the exclusion of those (like I) that have had zero or significantly diminished income since this C-19 started.

Your smugness and surety of income is noted, as is your lack of empathy at the frustration and hardship that these people are suffering.

**Fact (9): Look at your employer;** Channel nine now falls into the global sphere of centralised media ownership.

The delivery of objective and informed news is beyond the realm and capability of any of the six owning entities (and their masters).

This elitist male dominated cohort seems to be at odds with the perception of channel nine as an informed, fair, diversified, egalitarian and socially progressive organisation.

With much complicity you take your weekly salary and mock those that dare to stand up to this institutionalised theft.

The above represents a body of evidence by which to suggest that these “tin hat wearing Conspiracy Theorists” have a legitimate right to ask the question as to the basis for the imposition of such draconian measures.

Your obfuscation of truth, or capacity to ignore and mock the rights of these people represents a breach of your fiduciary obligation to present a balanced and informed view.

My daughter was arrested last weekend, and I cannot share with you the joy that this provided to me as a father in knowing that I have given my children the gift of critical thought and the courage to express it. The extent that her beliefs align to mine is of no consequence.

When she was arrested, she was social distancing, wearing a mask and within 5kms of her residence. The arresting officer gave her an option that if she did not pick up the banner (calling for constitutional freedoms); she would not be arrested. She picked up the banner and was arrested. I would be interested in the interpretations of the law that justified or made a correlation between picking up a banner and protecting her and the broader community from C-19 (which of course is what this is all about; or is it?).

Further, regardless of the context, in the absence of that woman who was dragged from her car at Wallan, being on the Australia’s most wanted list, there is no reason that she should have been treated in that manner. Which by default you also agree that this is OK. (Her tin hat must have been out of view on the back seat).

But it is OK! This woman had the temerity to not share her name and/or have her phone wrongfully connected to the windscreen. They should bring back corporal punishment for these sort of crimes (which no doubt you will also agree with).

By the way, did you know that there are 28 senior politicians and people of eminence, including one ex-prime minister that enjoy the benefits of their crimes for pedophilia being sealed under a court order for 90 years. (Refer to Senator Bill Heffernan’s attempts to bring this into the public arena). Yet these tin hat wearing conspiracy theorists are seen as the problem.

In next week’s segment after investigating the validity of what I have put forward, why don’t you raise this (pedophilia) in your segment about the things you found to be interesting.

And in the absence of you having the courage, (because it may also expose you to zero income) why don’t you give a nod to the validity of people to say their piece in a peaceful statement that represents the things that matter to them, without the imposition of a Stassi like police responses.

One more thing.

- That deaths attributed to smoking and alcohol represent the greatest percentage of loss of life in Australia, yet the governments freely bank billions of dollars in revenue from these sources (without the blink of an eye). If the wellbeing of our population was the primary concern, then let us have policies and interventions that would deal with this.
- C-19 as a cause of death, when compared to alcohol and smoking, is as common as it would be to see Dep. Comm Luke Cornelius eat his own vomit.

I close this message out with the sharing of much love and a hope that maybe I have opened your eyes to an alternative and possibly legitimate view.

To the extent that I have assigned any wrongfulness, I would be pleased to learn of how I might better represent and/or as appropriate, change my views.

To the extent that you read and discard the key messages here, please do so on an informed basis.

To the extent that it may influence you to think critically and maybe a little differently, my job is done.

I do not wish for this correspondence to encroach upon your sense of wellbeing or your zest to be the best professional that you can be, and I wish you every happiness in your forward journey.

But for each and every one of us, let us all on board a little UNDERSTANDING and HUMANITY.

Your sincerely

CC: Tom Kelly Chief of Staff