

To whom it may concern, ACMA Board

Let me start with the following questions after finding out about the draft bill proposal.

1. Who is truly qualified to define what is or what is not harmful online misinformation and disinformation?
2. On what basis could the authority judges one way or another and whether their judgment is correct, or their judgement is also based upon misinformation or disinformation they believe in?
3. How do you develop a code of practice covering measures to combat misinformation and disinformation on digital platforms that is open, fair, just and accurate?
4. Why should Australians allow the ACMA to create and enforce an industry standard (a stronger form of regulation) instead of following the absolute standard given to mankind by the Holy Bible? The perfect standard is available; why should we seek biased and imperfect standard from ACMA or government appointed agents?

And I quoted from your given information made available to the public here below in blue while I responded in black:

Misinformation is online content that is false, misleading or deceptive, that is shared or created without an intent to deceive but can cause and contribute to serious harm.

According to this definition, everything that is spoken and written in circulation by print or by digital channels can be deemed misinformation e.g. The unproven or unverifiable claim of Aboriginal history in Australia: 50,000 to 100,000 years, often cited by Prime Minister and other influential public servants at federal, state and local governments etc. Should they all be criminalised and brought to justice for spreading misinformation, telling lies about the true history of Australia?

Disinformation is misinformation that is intentionally disseminated with the intent to deceive or cause serious harm.

According to this definition, everything that is spoken and written in circulation by print or by digital channels can also be deemed disinformation because anyone in charge of making the judgment of what was said or done can label it as evil at will. e.g., The Labor Minister claimed that the illegal boat people should not have sent back to their countries of origin despite breaking the law and defying the sovereignty of Australia, endangering lives of others, encouraging people smuggling trade, undermining Australian borders and security, and doing injustices of those waiting in the queue patiently for decades. Should they have been penalised and put in jail for doing such great injustice to Australia?

Rules made under the Bill may require digital platform services to have systems and processes in place to address misinformation or disinformation that meets a threshold of being likely to cause or contribute to serious harm.

Social Media is not meant to be serving as the government-censorship agent or the thought police, determining the standards of right and wrong, truth and falsehood, light and darkness and then censoring every piece of information coming to their sites on behalf of government in order to determine whether it should be shamed, banned or penalised.

Freedom of speech means that everyone, regardless of their background and upbringing, is free to express himself or herself, and to share their thoughts, ideas, beliefs and values without going against their conscience or being controlled or manipulated by higher authorities while taking responsibility for their own actions. You reap what you sow! Every person must be held accountable for their decisions for themselves as well as for other entities such as hospital, media, school, government, community organisation and business. There is no exemption for any person for the law is there to administer justice with equity and impartiality.

The code and standard-making powers will not apply to authorised electoral and referendum content and other types of content such as professional news and satire.

How hypocritical you are! Many so called authorised and professional contents are full of misinformation and disinformation, serving as government mouthpiece to spread lies, untruths,

narratives that suit their political agenda, and evils that promote injustices and moral depravity e.g. Gay Marriage, LGPTIQ agenda, Voice Referendum, Climate Change, Covid 19 Mandates, Vaccinations, Lockdowns, etc. Why then would you exempt yourselves from being judged while others are subject to your unjust, unfair and discriminatory practices?

Misinformation and disinformation spread via digital platform services is a major issue worldwide. The rapid spread of false, misleading and deceptive information online has resulted in a multitude of harms from disrupted public health responses to foreign interference in elections and the undermining of democratic institutions.

I accept that the phenomenon described is truthful but who is competent to be the judge after all? Most of the false, misleading and deceptive information online spread across the globe, based upon evidence available to date, has been done by local, state, federal, and international government bodies together with high-ranking officers and elites all around the globe more than anyone else. These are the ones who have the most resources and powers to disrupt policies, engage in foreign interferences and undermine democratic processes. The little people can nowhere come close to do such harm or damage to Australian society. Therefore, priorities should be set on Prime Minister, Cabinet Ministers, Mayors, Premiers, Governors, and all the high-ranking bureaucratic officers instead.

Serious harm is harm that affects a significant portion of the Australian population, economy or environment, or undermines the integrity of an Australian democratic process.

According to this definition, everything that is spoken and written in circulation by print or by digital channels can be deemed serious harm because it depends on from which angles and perspectives you take as harm or wickedness or badness or similar. No human judgment is perfect and without flaws and prejudices and biases; the lens you use to judge others may well be as evil as the object being judged.

For instance, hatred against a group of people living in Australia: LGPQTI when someone tells the truth that these people experience gender confusion and would not accept their God-given sex at birth, seeking to be someone else based upon their wrong perceptions and fluctuated feelings. They keep changing their genders or identities in every season. And you, being the judge, come along and declare it as a hate crime against them instead of commending the action as fact-telling so that the public will be well informed of the real underlying issue behind the problems facing this group of people in society, namely: gender confusion, wilful perversion against themselves and sex identity crisis. You the authorities use the law as a weapon to silent dissent and stifle free speech because you see it as a hate crime whereas others see it as truth-telling as a first step before the right answer to the problem can be found.

Type of harm	Example of serious harm
Hatred against a group in Australian society on the basis of ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or physical or mental disability	Misinformation about a group of Australians inciting other persons to commit hate crimes against that group
Disruption of public order or society in Australia	Misinformation that encouraged or caused people to vandalise critical communications infrastructure
Harm to the integrity of Australian democratic processes or of Commonwealth, State, Territory or local government institutions	Misinformation undermining the impartiality of an Australian electoral management body ahead of an election or a referendum
Harm to the health of Australians	Misinformation that caused people to ingest or inject bleach products to treat a viral infection
Harm to the Australian environment	Misinformation about water saving measures during a prolonged drought period in a major town or city
Economic or financial harm to Australians, the Australian economy or a sector of the Australian economy	Disinformation by a foreign actor targeting local producers in favour of imported goods

This is why your proposed bill amendments are full of flawed thinking and judgement, lacking truth-based discernment and deep understanding of what Australia really needs in this area. The harm and damage you are doing to social media, the general public and potentially the Asia-Pacific region should alert you to stop your

efforts immediately; you should instead allow freedom of speech, conscience, association and religion to run its course and reap its own fruit in due season.