

Personal Unresolved Grievances, of a particular kind.

How do I explain the way that lies have wrapped themselves around me for at least the last twenty years of my life.

There is something very malicious about wanting to believe in your own aggression toward someone so much, that you lie with every breath about them. Every impression offered up is a misrepresentation, that any listener takes for granted as true.

There is no opportunity to explain, to anyone that believes these types of lies, the subtlety with which they have embedded themselves, unless they themselves think to question it, and determine what information they have for themselves.

I know what it is like, for it to become impossible to be around people, whose impression of you is so skewed, that there is no way to act around them, without your every action being inherently misconstrued, miscalculated, until ultimately rendering your actions inexplicable.

You are forced to live a lie, and you cannot do anything that doesn't add to that perception, in it's interpretation by them. Even if it is just formalities, and the person is decent, and thinks little of it. It is like being muzzled.

I wonder about the purpose of it. The viciousness of death by a thousand indignities, and it's culmination into a lie too great to ever allow it to persist. I wonder about the purpose of the need to be swaddled virtually out of sight, and by what instinct it might be necessary, with so many paths in life. How or why this has come about, I don't know, it is my life.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the power of what I have just described, not least of all, because the future poses a similar threat to our sensibilities, if the worst were to happen in regards to power, corruption, and something more calculable. I even wonder if the ability to speak freely is already far less than it appears. I wouldn't know. How would the average person, except for the fact that things are getting weird, and people are being kept down.

I have a few recent, and not so recent, examples of “grievances of a particular kind”.

IRD

This is what IRD did to me. They are clambering over themselves to destroy people's lives. Very simply, they wanted to be able to decide what businesses should be allowed to survive and trade. They did not like that, as a small business, and as someone with a part time job, that I could claim my tax back while growing my business, just like every other business.

There is no claim that isn't limited by the fact that it is your own hard work that you are claiming against. But IRD wants to presume against a business when a person also has a job, because they want money, more than they want to do what is right. It is a revenue scam.

They audited me. They used up my time and resources doing so. Every single claim they want to dispute is a matter of “discretion” on their part. Make no mistake, they are wrong on every count. They just want to be able to do whatever they want.

They moved to disallow my claims after the audit, without explanation. Their insistence was that my claims were wrong because they said so. I persisted, I complained, I was told that it had been explained, it had not.

No part of their own internal process admitted to any flaw on their part. It was not feasible to trade under the circumstances. For months and months. It had to go to a review. Just before which, I find out that their supposed “explanation” includes a repealed law that they either deliberately, blatantly omitted, or that they were obviously negligent. The hypocrisy.

They just wanted to save money by lying, this is not an exaggeration. Their “discretion” is to destroy whatever business or person they feel like. This is not an acceptable use of power.

Even though they know nothing about me personally, they think that they can judge my ambition as unlikely. Not something that a person can't claim, but more something that I specifically couldn't claim. Based on what? It is bizarre. It is a self-fulfilling prejudice.

They are 100% misinterpreting the intention of a law for subsequent GST registration and have probably gotten it wrong a lot, many times over. I doubt they have applied it evenly.

They want to ignore perfectly reasonable claims in favour of their right to discretion, on all points of contention, at unreasonable costs.

And, they want to make money off of fake penalties. Penalties for not acting as a reasonable person would. A standard that's purpose and original precedent is, certainly, to ensure that a person will not be penalised while going about their business, unless acting unreasonably.

This is about decisions that a reasonable person would make. I am a reasonable person. To rule against me in this regard is to set the standard for a reasonable person above my own ability to reason. This book is evidence of my reasoning. It is evidence that they are corrupt and out of control, to determine, to their own benefit, that I am not a reasonable person. I stand by my actions. They are using no real standard to determine this.

They want to take away people's right to simple and straightforward business practices. Even in so far as to claim that it is “unreasonable” behaviour not to exercise that right.

The process is years long, while making it unworkable to trade. They sent debt letters to two separate employers, while still in “the process”, and undetermined. Presumably no employer is impressed by this, or unaware of the intimidating threat IRD poses to their own business.

Because of their presumption against a business, even while being unable to trade or work, getting income support is also inaccessible while it poses a threat to the legitimacy of my business, and gives IRD an excuse that they would likely abuse to validify their argument.

I am brutalised by this process. It is an unrealistic amount of work, it is wrong how much of a mess they have made to my life, and wrong that they will not take it upon themselves to fix it. I have to worry about others not doing their job, and about not getting proper justice, even from those whose actual job and duty it is to determine fair and correct outcomes. I do not want to be harsh, only honest and serious about what needs to be done. (62)

DEMAND LETTER

This is a formal demand letter to the New Zealand Inland Revenue Department.

I, Heather K.O. Leeves, **DEMAND** the voluntary resolution, and remediation of, the dispute following the unacceptable, and, disgraceful, actions of IRD, and, namely, it's employees.

These terms are **NON-NEGOTIABLE**. I demand the following:

Every single individual involved in any decision making process involved in this case is reviewed and assessed as to their individual role and actions, and is held accountable for any individual failures in good, prudent judgement and responsibility. Including a duty of care, the duty of human decency, and the duty to uphold the integrity of the law and government. I demand retraining of all staff on these matters of responsibility, for clarity and solidarity.

IRD must define and adhere itself to the honorable definition of it's role to serve, as only the well-intentioned employees of the NZ people, serving only the interests of the individuals of this country in their capacity, carefully, and with no allowance for abuse or any undue harm.

I demand a system be put in place to completely eradicate the unlawful, predatory practice of IRD targeting and persecuting individuals for the purpose of financial gain. I demand that the freedoms of the individual be protected from the incompetencies of predation.

I demand every point of contention made by myself to be acknowledged as correct, fair, and reasonable, and to be treated and applied as such. Any inadequacies of IRD in their role will not be accepted, and must be rectified by them as their own responsibility and failure.

I demand an apology, and acknowledgement that it is unacceptable for IRD, a government department, to place onus on others to uphold the integrity of their administrative processes, and that rather IRD should hold itself to the highest standard of duty and competency, rather than rely on the powerlessness and inability of individuals to defend themselves, in what is clearly understood to be an unfair, inefficient, and harmful process.

There is no adequate compensation for how my life has been affected by this treatment and process. Money has little value alone, however, I demand an offer of financial compensation as a means of completely tidying up the devastation done to my life, where without financial input, it is specifically irreparable. This offer must be made with the full consideration of three years of harassment and financial immobilisation, as well as stress and harm. As well as with the understanding that no accountability is final unless complete, and my acceptance of any such offer would have every intention of being generous, where possible, but not as a means of shortchanging myself, or my life, nor as any indication of the acceptance of abuse.

I demand all fees and penalties, including late fees, that were applied during the period of the dispute to be reversed, as well as formal acknowledgement that this is an unacceptable practice during a formal process.

I demand formal letters, acknowledging the incorrect administration of debt collection, to be sent to former employers that were informed of this process, and of my persecution by IRD.

If these demands are not met, I can do nothing but persist in my absolute, unwavering, adherence, and resolve, to the peaceful, fair, and lawful, insistence of justice on this matter. In response to the soul-destroying, unequivocal abuse of power, and it's resultant outcomes.

How is it, that an organisation wants discretionary power over it's own actions, when wielding power against individuals, but apparently chooses to use none in terms of rectifying it's own mistakes, and taking responsibility, when that power has been misused and misplaced?

Signed,

Heather Kathryn Olivia Leeves

The NZ Police

There is something serendipitous, and at least some idea of good or bad timing, when trouble seeks you out. We don't know how all the currents of cause and effect, and possibility, play out, at different scales.

I don't know why this might happen, but I do believe that you should act when it is required of you to do so. NZ Police officers gave me a speeding ticket so problematic as to make it necessary to question the integrity of the internal systems within The NZ Police.

I was driving on State Highway 2, before the turn off to Otane, and I was specifically aware that I was unsure of the speed limit. It's a place that looks like you might have missed seeing an 80 speed sign at some point, like you've entered into a "highway town area".

I was driving slow, two police cars then passed me in the other direction, and I decided that I should probably speed up in case I was going too slow (there was no car behind me), but I was still uncertain and tentative about it. As I passed the Otane turnoff I saw a car parked on the side of the road, which I was immediately suspicious of as being an unmarked police car, as I often am of any car parked on the side of the road.

I looked into my mirror quickly after passing it, and saw the police lights in my mirror while it was still on the side of the road. I was worried that it was an 80km/h area and that I had got it wrong by speeding up. When I asked about the speed limit, the officer told me that it was a 100km/h limit area making me wonder how it was possible that I was going 111km/h, as it was very unlikely.

I followed up by emailing the NZ Police about their equipment. It was then that I was told that their official story was that they had not been parked on the side of the road, and, that the measurement of speed was dependent on the input of the speed of both vehicles, and, at the time of the ticket, the police car was supposedly going 85km/h.

That car was definitely parked on the side of the road. I wouldn't usually challenge a ticket, because it's hard to be sure, but I knew this was not correct, very certainly and particularly.

So, I challenged it in court. I was sent to the wrong location for the hearing, then I was given a new hearing date over the phone which was changed without informing me. When I raised this in court it was treated as irrelevant. Isn't that perverting the course of justice?

I had just so happened to email the day of, to get confirmation of the date, only to be told that it was scheduled for that very morning. I was 3 hours away. One hell of a coincidence.

Both police officers lied under oath. I tried to "lightly" address the question of police integrity on the stand, the judge said it was starting to sound political and moved to exclude it from the record. I think this is extremely strange. How is police integrity political?

What does that even mean? If being "political" simply means that individuals have different viewpoints and perspectives, based on their individual circumstances, much like having a skill that makes you an expert in one field of knowledge or understanding? (65)

What is wrong with anything being political, unless there is the “assumption” that you form group loyalties based on this, and can act on those interests instead of based on their merit?

Or, is being political a problem because of it's proximity to power and the incentive that this provides? It seems like an excuse to invalidate a valid argument.

Is labeling questioning police integrity as “political” about the question of motives? I am not sure that she realised at this point that it was relevant. I had no intention of being “political”.

This is really a question of duty and responsibility. How is it not absolutely important to point this out? Since when is this not a problem. Police officers can not lie in a court of law.

If I can't get to the point to begin with, and say that it is largely a question of my account of events verses their false testimony, then how can I address it, and address why I was there. I don't think real issues affecting real people are “about” politics. Other way around.

It is provable. I established this in court, I think it was ignored. Not only did I see the car parked on the side of the road, (so ruling “guilty” is glossing over the fact that this is ruling me a liar, or ignoring the fact that I am certain that I am not mistaken), it's also not plausible.

The “official” account is that I was seen visibly speeding, then the radar was turned on, they listened for the tone, then turned on the lights, all while coming from the opposite direction.

If reaction time is at least 2 seconds for each action, that is $2+2+2+2 = 8$ seconds reaction time before I would then begin to be able to react to the lights, and start braking to pull over.

A car travelling 111km/h will travel close to 250m in 8 seconds. The stopping distance of a car travelling that speed will take over 110m to stop, that is when slamming on the brakes.

That is over 350m, and, as I did not slam on my brakes, I pulled over normally, the amount of distance needed from the place I was “seen”, to where I stopped should be well past that.

There is little to no visibility past the Otane turnoff coming from the opposite direction, as there is a bend in the road past the turnoff. The turnoff is 350m approx (according to google maps) from where I had stopped, and the vehicle was photographed by police.

This means that the officers would have needed to observe my car speeding in the distance, well beyond the turnoff, at a minimum. Visibility is practically zero 150m past the turnoff.

Taking into account the difference between pulling over and slamming on the brakes, and, taking into account that the police officers would need to become aware of my car in such a way that allowed enough distance travelled to see my car moving, and determine it's speed, in order to corroborate their story of seeing my car speeding before deciding on any action.

Those two additional items would add time and travelling distance beyond that which their testimony allows for. I would say that it is almost impossible that it can be accounted for in less than 150m of road, well past the turnoff, and at extremely low to non-existent visibility.

There is also the fact that I saw them parked on the side of the road, and their story is not what actually happened. I already stopped in probably close to the shortest plausible amount of time when I saw the lights in my rear view mirror.

If it is a question of my word against both of theirs, and if it is an attack on my character, then this book also serves as evidence of my character.

There is also the fact that this particular set of circumstances occurred while the government had decided to audit me, and viciously attack my business, leaving me financially crippled and trying to deal with two separate occurrences of corruption with no money.

Another odd coincidence.

I have tried to appeal this, I have tried to email in time, but the court system is relying on my not knowing how, rather than making it simple. There is also the fact that in both cases I have already presented what should be enough evidence for a satisfactory outcome.

It means that I am forced to gather more evidence, do more work, prove a more compelling argument just in order to be able to appeal, and while these people can affect my resources.

Why should I have to worry that justice won't be done? When there is obviously something very wrong going on, why is it not enough?

And then it becomes a part of the excuse, it prevents justice being done. It leaves me in a position to do a ridiculous amount of work just in order to appeal, even when it is their job to determine correct outcomes from what should already be sufficient.

I have been threatened with arrest for not paying the fine. I could have an arrest warrant right now and not know it. They threatened me continually with threats of arrest by txt, even after I emailed them. They sent a letter for a court date just for not paying the fine, which I didn't receive, and was oblivious to, until after it had passed. That one they conveniently didn't txt.

I don't have any money. How can you criminalise someone for being poor? These people are the reason why I don't have any money. It is honestly disgusting. Will I be able to get a job once I am done with both of these cases, or do I have a record?

Does nobody care about police officers committing perjury? I do not think that making an example of people is good, or justice, and I don't intend to do that. But this is the truth. For whatever reason, they got caught doing it, and it is important. It isn't "just" a fake ticket.

I think it is a tough concept to think of how we act against crime. Why do we react to risky behaviour when something goes wrong, more strongly than when it doesn't. To some people this may seem incongruent, inconsistent, or unfair. Blame isn't the point, but decisions are.

There is justice, which is more so about doing right by a victim; basically if you take a risk on behalf of yourself and others, then you share in the consequences. That includes sharing in alleviating the burden of injustice placed on the victim. That is fair enough, I think, it is also natural accountability, even though we shouldn't want to spread the misery senselessly.

And, there is a known deterrent; when we don't want people being careless or irresponsible with excessive risk and harm. We want them to be aware, and to think, and make better decisions, understand, and learn, that there are real consequences, to know that risk is not just about avoiding very unlikely outcomes. That it is wrong to not take some care for the mitigating of risk, that we do have expectations for, and will follow up in the betrayal of.

Managing crime is supposed to be based on real harm. I actually don't think police officers should be forced to do revenue collecting. How about letting them do their real job.

The system we currently have is one where people accept that through chance, or some lack of grace, that they may get ticketed. An approximate deterrent. A “where there's smoke there's fire” or a “law of averages” type deterrent.

People have never agreed to be fined x amount for every time they speed or make an error while driving. To me, it is more about making sure that people are aware while driving and using their better judgement. And of course, having a presence on the road so that when there is actually dangerous and irresponsible driving, it is responded to.

I have gone over 110km/h before without getting a ticket, that does not mean I have it owing to me, or that it is the same difference to get a fake ticket. It is just corruption.

Parking tickets

Here is an alarming story about parking tickets in Palmerston North, (a city I like):

Not everyone is built for the “rock star lifestyle”, but I am, and I was working a night shift at the time and would often have to drive an hour between cities resulting in some awkward car naps and maybe a handful of instances of waiting out 3-7am in the city after work so I could do things the next morning.

This is the type of thing I would do if it was fun, but this wasn't particularly fun under the circumstances. Basically working non-stop under extreme pressure and financial abuse, rather than abandon my business.

I found myself hanging out at the park one day, because of a work shift, not something I had made a habit of. It might have been the second time that I parked there while I was doing an art project. My car was past it's wof, so I wasn't parking anywhere in town because I didn't want to get a ticket.

I felt reasonably unfettered at a city park of publicly owned land, with no parking meters, and I left the car for 15 minutes, long enough for a city employee to come out of nowhere, and have me catch him putting a \$200 ticket on my car.

For anyone that thinks that this is appropriate, while I care about your opinion, you are very wrong. Financially punishing people for being poor is disgusting. I understand when actions endanger other people, then actions can be considered irresponsible, however a lapsed wof is not an indication, or proof, of anything really except a lack of money, and I do trust my own judgement under the circumstances.

If it had been a traffic ticket in the course of driving, I would maybe be more sympathetic, as chance or fate would have it, but it's not, it's a systematic parking ticket. It's not the same.

The city also had no options, whatsoever, if you could not afford to pay, except for them to send it to the “court system”, and criminalise you for being poor? It is alarming to someone who has no idea what that means, and, actually, it does do that, it is an aggressive escalation. It is not normal. This is not about crime, it is bureaucracy, it is predatory revenue generation.

I would never want to act genuinely irresponsibly. Under normal circumstances, I would not choose to drive without a wof, and who would?

It is not reasonable, proportionate, or an effective deterrent. It is predatory, opportunistic behaviour by thieves and scumbags. Sorry, I am serious, I am very tired of the white collar criminals and abusers with their nonchalance about their own extremely abusive behaviour.

Even more concerning than this, is the question of how the guy came out of nowhere, in an unmetered area, without seemingly taking the time to stop and check the details of any other car in a very long line of cars before mine.

I want to know if the public is being intimately surveilled in public spaces. Because that would be 100% unacceptable.

It is also noteworthy that this spot in lovely Palmerston North is one of the few places in Palmerston North City with free parking, because of it being public land, and it is full by 8.30am in the morning on weekdays. I do wonder about the hypocrisy of city employees parking all day in the only free carparks in town.

I got a second \$200 fine for the same reason, four days later, for daring to use a bathroom. This was at the Intercity bus drop off area in the park, and I hope they are really annoyed that the city is fining it's customers. How is \$400 worth of fines for someone who can not afford the basic requirement of a wof, under extraordinary circumstances, helping?

No to criminalising people for the sake of revenue. This is not justice. It is very alarming to think that there are people who have absolutely no respect for the true purpose of the law, and have no problem with wielding it like a weapon. Life is actually for living, not control. Life without allowing freedom for some risky behaviour is a cruelty.

Trademe

Oh, how I despise Trademe. A while ago, the impoverished young person that I was, was trying to do a little enterprise, attempting to sell some art and previously CD's, but I was not in a position to post quickly and everything was a struggle.

Trademe wouldn't let you just say how long it would take because of their rules, and my reviews were making an attempt at a stereotype of a modern comment section.

With people quick to smell blood. Not terrible, I definitely wasn't cheating anybody, or trying to, but I was slower at posting than was ideal, and my methods were hard work. (69)

Trademe took it upon themselves to casually ban me for life on the official basis that I had two accounts. This is a presumption or projection problem, they didn't have a "real" reason.

The foreigners who bought Trademe came in, after my original account didn't even require a real name to begin with, and banned me from using a major, necessary, resource of modern life that they had a monopoly over. This had better not be a metaphor for what's to come.

Do you have any idea the impact that this has had on my life. How can a person buy second hand goods, rent a house, get flatmates, buy a car, sell anything?

It is so irresponsible. I am still mad as hell about it, so don't bother with the victim blaming.

Ironically, they did it mid-trade, and they stole my golden Nintendo 64, that I had already paid for, and never gave me back the money, just told me to reopen a bank account that was already closed.

You cannot behave like this. I didn't actually do anything wrong, and I am the one that was harmed. You can't ignore the social responsibility you have when you control the market, realistically. I would have created the competition myself, and still would, if given half a chance to, which would be doing them a favour. Monopolies aren't actually fun if you give a damn. I also lost sight of an item that I should have sent, the only time I didn't send something on there. I had to cancel a few sales. I should have sent some stamps to Eddie.

A lot of people are shitty in real life, I'm just "bad" at Trademe, "apparently". This is the epitome of "poor people problems", when money is the only thing that counts for a fake sense of decency.

There is a rumour going around, which I might have started, about how, hypothetically, if there really was a calculation being made for "worst possible outcomes", that it could be made to look as though you had as much opportunity as possible, right up to the point of it falling short; as measure how much you can have and still fail, but deceptively, insultingly so, like an unhittable target with a trick illusion. This is just an idea, of the power of a type of "bad will manifest". Regardless of that, I think it is always worth trying, and effort always counts for something.

Recall that bizarre saying about "the definition of insanity" being "doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results".

Does anyone else notice that it would actually be the opposite? That expecting nothing to ever change, would actually be a closer approximation of crazy thinking? Different results with every new action is already reality.

Banks

Need I really say more?

I hate it when they put an unarranged overdraft on your account but expect you not to use it, and if you do, they think they can hold it against you. Even, as if it is a test, or measure. (70)

Obviously, there is little risk to the banks that you are intending to leave them out of pocket. It is as if, incredulously, they think they are in the right, and that it is our behaviour that is the problem. That is out of touch with real logic.

Banks should not be able to willingly add an overdraft just to remove it without warning, and then reapply it over and over. Something really needs to be done.

I have a very serious issue with Kiwibank, where the pretty mild missing of a credit card payment resulted in them deliberately and unreasonably pushing my accounts to collections. I only used my Kiwibank credit cards by making a monthly payment, then using the credit I had paid off each month for basic transactions.

While on a small income, this is the common practice of biding your time and managing credit until your circumstances change. It wasn't a large amount of interest each month, but the payments themselves were significant to me at that point in time.

So, this was about a juggling act more than anything else, especially since Kiwibank wasn't my usual bank, and I would let the monthly payments lapse and catch up later. Unsuspecting that, in reality, it could cause any real problems except for the fake indignation of a banking system. Don't they make more money when you do this?

No harm to Kiwibank, the corporation, by the way.

At least, I really hope that no one is conflating money, credit worthiness, and compliance to financial systems, with morality, or right and wrong, because that is literally “insane”, false, enraging, and seemingly devoid of reality. I am certainly unaware of any reason to think so. Except, of course, when it involves your actions towards, and consideration of, other people. Have the aliens landed? Did a group of people form a pact, and forget to tell everyone else? Your construct is false. This could be a real worry if “systems” are vying to control society.

I did accidentally let my payments lapse for a third month, because I forgot, and to my shock and horror, they then insisted that they had the policy of blocking transactions for six months, but expecting payments to continue at the same rate.

This is effectively like deliberately increasing credit card payments three-fold to the point of unsustainability, and deliberately creating unavoidable and ruinous financial hardship on its customers. It is actually wildly vicious and vindictive, in terms of banks. There are supposed to be laws to protect against this exact type of behaviour. Hardship laws. Credit lender laws.

It seems to me that they did not mind at all, deliberately pushing the debt to collections. I told them very politely that it was not possible to spend all of my disposable income on these “new” untouchable payments for 6 months. They did not care. Offering no remedy, no hardship options. They also closed my actual, unrelated, bank transaction account.

This is extremely bad, and unequivocally unacceptable behaviour. I wouldn't even expect that of the Australian banks, or privately owned credit card companies, not even loan shark type finance are allowed to behave in this way. For good reason.

I complained to the Banking Ombudman, who did nothing that I know of, and didn't follow up on what is truly an egregious lapse of standards. Maybe it is because it is a NZ bank and there is a conflict of interest. So much for independent regulation, no wonder it's like this.

I used to think a bit about banks acting like that just because they can get away with it. If they only care if it were to backfire, and affect them, but otherwise treat vulnerable people badly, when it makes no difference to them. And, I thought about how important it is for the maybe even, only one time, that it does backfire, to really count. For what it's worth, I, personally, intend to hold it against them. Not unreasonably, of course.

Woolworths and Repco

I liked working for both Woolworths and Repco, they are pretty good employers, and I would still maybe like to work for them again, so I will keep it short and hope for the best. I think well enough of them to think that I could, but that may be misguided. So be it.

Woolworths short-changed me on my paid sick leave, and I have no real means of taking action about it. They just refused to pay it, and ignored the law.

I would not take sick leave unless I thought it was fair, and at a normal standard. I would be very uncomfortable faking a sick day, although I think people are allowed to use their own discretion for themselves, as to when they need to use it. That is different for everyone.

I think it is wrong to insist someone visit a doctor unless they are pushing the limit excessively. Going to the doctor is not a reasonable request for everyone equally.

I don't like our sick leave laws in general, because I think it becomes personal.

To me it is not acceptable to allow too much "observer based discretion" over the management of people's sick leave, because people get petty and small-minded over pinching pennies and making personal judgements. It can bring out the worst in people.

And, it rewards and incentivises the people who are willing to take more sick leave. Sick leave should be paid out if you don't use it, at least up to the accruing first 6 days per year.

Repco closes on Easter Sunday, legally, this being a closedown period under the Holidays Act 2003, for anyone contracted for Easter Sunday, without any official leave entitlement, so at least in their first year, should have been paid out their total accruing 8% earnings (holiday pay), or have been paid for the contracted hours, as per normal. It is not a closedown period without this stipulation, and is not for using up annual leave.

The Cola-Cola Company

I'm going to say, straight off the bat, that I adore Diet Coke as a drink. I don't personally know of any reason to hate on a big company, just because. I try to be very careful when it comes to things like health, (despite what anyone may think), the environment, social and personal responsibility etc. But I don't think that you should believe everything you hear.

Maybe it is my mistake because I haven't researched, but I don't know if I agree with any potential disputes, in terms of this; I haven't heard anything that concerns me in regards to ethical considerations, in which I try hard to keep a high standard of personal responsibility.

As I understand it, Diet Coke is a straightforward natural product, with natural flavourings, and an artificial sweetener; aspartame. I listen to my own body as best as I can, and I try to be sensitive and aware of how things affect me. As far as I can tell, I have no issues with it.

Hopefully I'm not wrong. I believe that it is better for things to be natural, but I'm willing to go out on a limb for something that I like, and I think that listening is the real key to health. So, while I was prepared to be a little vaguely horrified when doing some research into aspartame, after actually reading a bit about it, (combining natural amino acids), I still don't really know what the big deal is, except, of course, the need to be cautious with chemicals.

I wouldn't make as much of a habit of drinking the other variations of Coke, because I think I am sensitive to those, like the syrupy sweet regular, or no sugar varieties that seem similar, but are definitely different.

There is an example of another real issue here in regards to other people's judgement, and when they want to take a single action and use that as a measure and projection onto all of your actions. However, more to the point of why the Coca-Cola Company is on this list, is that they are illegally stiffing me on prizes that I won in their excellent Mycoke competition.

I have won many prizes from this competition, over more than a decade, and it is quite easy to win because, it seems, no one bothers to enter. What is wrong with people? Anyway, they have gone against their own terms and conditions, by disallowing several Prezzy Cards that I definitely won from them, although they still allowed other non "cash" prizes.

And I want to know why. What is going on here? They won't answer my emails, they know that I can prove it. I have screenshots of being told that I have reached the limit for winning that particular prize. There is no limit. They can put a limit into the terms and conditions if/when they want to, but did not. This is specifically problematic for me, as I need the money.

I am concerned that this could have anything to do with money, or even IRD, or the law around cash prizes. It is all very odd, actually, because it doesn't really make sense to me that they would be so invested in having their company fall into legal trouble, or disrepute.

Why would Coke even care if I win these prizes? I'm a good customer, it's kind of the point. Not just me either, a person related to me as well, who isn't a regular prize winner. If they wanted to, they can set prize limits, and have done so before. So, is it targeted in some way?

I think the situation warrants the speculation. It is bizarre. Do they just not care, can't be bothered, don't think that it will catch up with them? Or other? Because I think that it is very important that things like this have meaningful follow-through, even though I don't mean to be ungrateful for the competition itself. Does Prezzy Card keep a list? Why specifically cash prizes? Prezzy Card is a NZ Post product, NZ Post is run by the Government. I would have added NZ Post to this list of grievances, but I wasn't sure that the occasionally bad customer service added up to an unresolved personal grievance.

There was that time NZ Post closed the doors at 4.45pm before the Christmas post cutoff. When trying to post those hats late, Aaron. I did a glow-in-the-dark, underwater, Starwars, New Years Eve party, themed twin package. Low key. The hats were ruined. You would have hated it.

Or, the way they possibly run the company like a government department, where the bottom line comes at the expense of the people they serve. It's probably bad for the country for a business to squeeze profits through the creating of inefficiencies and some kind of waste for real people, in exchange. We can do better.

Moderation and other people's judgement.

This actually drives me crazy, and is a real problem. When other people think that they can judge your moderation based on how they would moderate the same thing. That is not how that works. People's needs and wants are not, and should not be, homogenised. If there is nothing wrong with good abundance, then how a person makes personal choices and preferences is none of your business, and is not yours to judge. This is my opinion.

I am sorry to say this, but it is exactly the types of things that people want to curtail, that are examples of this, like turning off lights, being careful with water usage, eating “too much”, that are exactly what you “should” be doing in response to this bad attitude.

Yes, if you are excessive across the board, then you probably have a problem. The point is that you get to choose what things suit you, that you want to use, for whatever reason. Life is not about “waste” it is about growth. There is a limit to how “excessive” a person can be.

What if someone doesn't want to spread themselves out evenly over every so-called “vice”, just to look like they are moderate in everything? Is that really less, or just hidden “excess”?

People judging your actions based on what it would mean to them, if they were to do the same thing, is bad judgement. Based on things they don't know, and, at the very least, they need to acknowledge their own lack of understanding of another individual's reasoning.

Some people don't want to measure out everything they do. Who doesn't understand the value of the freedom in that? What about how you spend your mental energy?

Who gets to define what is considered “waste”, or good use of a resource? There is plenty of value, it is really not about that, it is about specific value that we as individuals need, that you are in poverty without. Freedom is one of those. So is stability, security, safety, comfort, ease...

To be honest, the more freedom and variety of resources you have, the more efficient and refined your personal “quota” of usage could be, because you are getting quality, you need less to get your needs met. Often, like with food, less can be more.

A perfect snack will satisfy more than a bucket of something that still doesn't give you quite what you need. Although, I think there is “value” in gorging yourself silly. Would be nice wouldn't it, to have fun and freedom again? Carefree abandon, anyone?