

## **New ACMA powers to combat misinformation and disinformation**

To the Ministers involved with the ACMA bill,

My name is Peter Blatch and I am a citizen of [REDACTED]

I wish to raise a number of issues related to the proposed ACMA bill:

### **The Issue**

“Misinformation and disinformation pose a threat to the safety and wellness of Australians, as well as to our democracy, society and economy” \*

I feel another important sentence should be added to “**The issue**” ( above ) as follows:

\*, “Especially if the mis or disinformation comes from the federal or state governments or the corporate media ( professional news content )

What if the commonwealth, state governments or professional news content are the source of misinformation or disinformation as was evident during the covid-19 crisis? Who will be able to investigate and punish those responsible and to correct misinformation or disinformation? They appear to be unaccountable under the proposed “**excluded content for misinformation purposes**”, in “**2 Definitions**” on page 9 clause (e)?

In the same section regarding clause (a) **content produced in good faith for the purposes of entertainment, parody or satire**”: If I post on Facebook that “mRNA vaccines are dangerous, ineffective and have caused myocarditis”, I would have my post taken down and be threatened with cancellation of my account for **telling the truth**. Under this proposed ACMA bill I may also be attacked for telling the truth, unless perhaps I may be able to reconstruct serious content in such a way as to qualify for exemption under clause (a) which is laughable? We must be able to speak the truth, this is why the covid misinformation from government and professional news content ruined the lives of so many ordinary Australians.

**Harm** means the following:

Clause (a) **hate against a group in Australian society on the basis of ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, or physical or mental ability;**

What if I was to say “I don’t believe men should play in women’s sports” or “I only support traditional marriage”? Would that be considered harm? I certainly do not consider such things to be **harm**, however I can see the potential for ACMA to interfere in everyday peoples lives in the future?

Threats of violence or hate speech are adequately covered by existing law.

Clause (b) **disruption of public order or society in Australia;**

Does that mean for example, somebody proposes a peaceful protest, can that be considered disruption of public order or society? Or if someone proposes we only use cash this week and boycott those who refuse to accept cash, can that be seen as disruption of public order or society?

I hope not?

**Clause (c) harm to the integrity of Australian democratic processes or of commonwealth, state, Territory or local government institutions;**

If a whistle blower speaks out about government or institutional wrongdoing,

or,

If a person speaks out against politicians who deceive in order to manipulate for an agenda,

or,

If parents criticise the material that may be forced upon their kids at schools such as sex education or encouraging cross dressing to five year olds',

or,

Institutions such as the TGA did not do their job competently and put the entire Australian population at risk from dangerous experimental synthetic gene therapies. These were never tested to stop transmission of the virus and yet we were treated like lab rats and mandated and coerced to take these mRNA jabs. We should never be denied "the right to informed consent".

Would these types of content raise a flag under clause (c)?

I would expect a person who makes statements in good faith should not be censored or punished for such things as the above examples and I sincerely hope the government has genuine reasons under clause (c). However, when the political process has the potential to harm us, impact our freedom, sovereignty, quality of life or deny our right to bodily autonomy etc, then the citizens must have the right to communicate openly about these harms and injustices, **regardless** of the integrity of the democratic processes of governments or their institutions? In fact, I think it would be better if governments or their institutions that do lack integrity or transparency should be exposed. ( mismanagement of the covid crisis is a good example ) Hopefully this will make governments and their institutions **more accountable** to the citizens they are supposed to represent?

**Clause (d) harm to the health of Australians;**

There has been a lot of misinformation about mRNA vaccines and their dangerous side effects, lockdowns doing more harm than good etc, and later being acknowledged as **fact**. I hope telling the truth will not be flagged by ACMA?

Recently, the Department of Home Affairs censored more than 4000 posts related to COVID. People should not be labelled or categorised based on their beliefs? Home Affairs has no place policing covid given the amount of "misinformation that turned out to be true". Further, Home Affairs should not provide a conduit between the dictators in the Department of Health and social media platforms, and nor should ACMA have this power.

**Clause (e) harm to the Australian environment;**

If I don't agree with the Net Zero agenda can this be attacked as mis or disinformation, under the pretext of protecting us from climate change? I would hate to think that any government can win a debate by censoring us through ACMA or professional news content?

Clause (f) **economic or financial harm to Australians, the Australian economy or a sector of the Australian economy;**

Government has already created financial and economic harms to Australians through the covid crisis and yet we the people have no protection against this authoritarian style of mismanagement?

.....

Under the proposed ACMA bill, I have never felt so insecure.

Some of the clauses in this bill do not appear to be currently applicable to me, however, I am deeply disturbed by what I am familiar with. I don't believe an unelected and unaccountable department like ACMA can be the sole source of control over Mis or Disinformation. The Australian public is unjustifiably censored or gagged from telling the truth already by other platforms such as Facebook.

**"The Australian public must have a genuine and inalienable right to appeal whenever they are censored"**, not just by ACMA, but also by Facebook, any large corporate social media platforms or any entity capable of censorship.

This is called **"freedom of speech"**, and I wish to see freedom of speech returned immediately to the Australian people for future prosperity.

Yours Sincerely

Mr Peter Blatch

