Comment on Pearls and Irritations vaccines post 28 February 2021

<https://johnmenadue.com/vaccine-rollout-herd-immunity-highly-unlikely-with-astrazeneca-in-the-frame-part-2/>

Exchange petalbausten with DJT.

**DJT:**

There is one overwhelming consideration which is lesser considered by all who 'protest' restriction for whatever reason;

'What if I catch the bug, and infect a dear one, and they succumb to the bug, while I'm beefing about me freedumbs?'

I live alone, and have suffered no detrimental effects, mentally or physically, by being 'isolated' due to the bug.

Dya know John Martinkus? Journo, John, very involved for a long time in the region. Advocate for the Timorese, and the West Papuans.

To quote him recently;

"You know the East Timorese experienced 24 years under curfew from the Indonesians. Every night around six pm there was a great rush to get home before you would be shot by the Indonesians. I caught the last few years. A bit of perspective here Victorians."

Reality bites, Petal.

**Petalbausten** responded along the lines of:

On issue (a) what if I pass it on?

The easy answer is: we were all told at the outset of the pandemic

(i)if you did not want to catch Covid, avoid others

(ii) if you do not want to transmit Covid to some others, avoid them and their contacts.

The logic still holds. It is part of the rationale for a lockdown (and its mirror, border closure).

The other part is that public health resources are inadequate to trace and isolate those who may be infected – i.e a lockdown assumes everyone may be infected.

A lockdown is a broad measure to mitigate risk. In my field such measures are often accompanied by insufficient attention to risks faced by specific – highly at risk - individuals. The health analogy with such individuals would be nursing home residents who cannot mitigate their risk – they have no control over (i) or (ii). The policy issue is whether the attraction of lockdowns has led to overlooking specific risks – assuming those risks are covered by the broad policy.

On issue (b), repression of Timorese

The easy answer is: most Australians are fortunate to not have experiences such as in Timor or indeed many societies for millenia. That does not mean we should seek those experiences.

I expect those who suffered repression are not keen to have it inflicted on others. The reporting of it is to seek to overcome, and warn, about it.

The better answer is the ends does not (always) justify the means. Nuremburg, and detaining children of refugee applicants being examples.

In this case I pointed to 5 million people subject to home detention by State officials for no apparent public health fact. This involved either colossal errors of judgement or had purposes other than public health.

The issue is not about ‘freedumbs’ but of balance between human rights and social obligations. There is recognition of such rights in Vic and NZ, and of the balance, in law cases on Covid restrictions. In those cases, the restrictions had some overt public health purpose.

So, we may agree to disagree on the ability of officials to impose detention – a form of restriction – for ‘whatever purpose’.

The concern is not specific to Covid. The misuse of power by State officials is setting precedents for the Commonwealth, in which the Prime Minister now has (purported) power to (in effect) declare a national emergency and enforce measures with the military or militia. There is no Constitutional recognition of human rights.

I am warning the clamour in Australia for being bitten may turn that into a reality.

Best wishes