

New ACMA Powers to Combat Misinformation and Disinformation Submission from Dr Rosemary Faire, [REDACTED]

Dear reader of my submission,

I have been asked for feedback on this proposed legislation. If this is merely a tick-box exercise by a government with totalitarian aspirations intent on censoring any dissenting voices about anything it is doing, then I am wasting my time, and you are wasting your time reading my submission (albeit you are getting paid).

I am giving you, the reader, and the government you represent/work for, the benefit of a doubt, in the hope that you are actually interested in what the Australian people think of this legislation.

So, in a nutshell: in my opinion, this legislation needs to be binned. Why would I think that? You may ask. Well, because I've just lived in this country through the last three years in which I have personally experienced a level of censorship I wouldn't have believed possible here.

Who am I? Born and educated to PhD level in Australia, science and psychology background, left-leaning Greens supporter and ABC watcher, I trusted there was such a thing here as investigative journalism and Media Watch, and ethical politicians, to protect me against government lies, propaganda and corruption by exposing moneyed interests so that politicians would be accountable and could be prosecuted for misdeeds.

Well, was I in for a shock! Despite my science background and my belief that ABC and The Greens would listen to viewer/supporter feedback (at least answering letters), stand up for human rights and expose wrong-doing, I have come to the realisation that I can no longer trust any of these institutions, not even my own doctors and specialists, who dutifully/cowardly succumbed to AHPRA to keep their jobs.

Dear reader, if you find this strange, then I must urge you to consider whether you yourself have succumbed to the bombardment in your favourite media by tropes which were lockstepped globally; whether you have chosen to believe the labels of "misinformation", "conspiracy theories", "antivaxxer" "right-wing fascist" or whatever else was thrown at anyone, including doctors and scientists in this country who dared to question "the Facts", "the Science" and those wonderful "fact-checkers"; and you may even have bought the altered Wikipedia descriptions of those who questioned the Acceptable Narrative.

Having got this far into my submission, perhaps in order to preserve your own "truth" you might have had to already label me as a nutter who has "fallen for" "misinformation". But I urge you to consider whether, after all, the real pandemic was a crisis in **epistemology (how do we know what we know, who do we trust?)** rather than epidemiology. Whom do you trust, dear reader? Pause... breathe...

On the other hand, you may be one of those public servants who had to play along with the Narrative to keep your own job. You may, like so many other Australians, have already woken up to the abuse we have suffered at the hands of captured regulators, captured "health experts", and politicians with an agenda so important that warnings of "collateral damage", in terms of injured and killed Australians, were not to be given any credibility.

(I wonder, as an aside, whether, as stated on your description, my submission will be published, or whether, ironically or farcically, my feedback will be censored as “misinformation”.)

Anyway, the point of telling this story is that what I learned over the “pandemonium” period, is that even my formerly exalted “science” is not out of reach for those who would prefer a Single Acceptable Reality and stomp out dissenting voices. So my question to you, and those proposing this bill, is **“how on earth do you expect that one day you yourself will not find yourself censored when all you are doing is citing scientific results or expressing your doubts about what a politician is saying or demanding of us?”**

This bill, if passed, will spell the **end of democracy** in this country. If you think this is exaggerating, please read a bit of history about the years just preceding totalitarian regimes in any country. Censorship of dissenting voices and control of media is a prerequisite. Those people who have previously lived in totalitarian regimes, like Romania, were the first to wake up to the pandemic lies, while us sleepy-naive-trusting Aussies just went along thinking it was all fine and we were “being taken care of”. Because we’re not used to being lied to on SUCH a scale. But if this bill goes through, we will have to get used to it: ACMA will in its infinite wisdom decide what is Truth, and what is Misinformation, and woe betide any social media company that lets us, the Australian people, beg to differ from the TruthPolice.

Dear reader, is this the kind of country you really want to live in? Do you think that you will always agree wholeheartedly with ACMA’s TRUTH?

(And please don’t naively think that because ACMA will be an “independent regulator” that this will protect the Australian people - just look at other “independent” bodies such as TGA, AHPRA and the employers who danced in lockstep with the government-bigpharma-WHO agenda - so that the government could later smugly say “we didn’t mandate...”)

The facade is that this bill will “protect us”. This is the song of every wannabe dictator in history: I will protect you. So seductive. I will protect you from hearing, learning, of any information which contradicts MY VIEWPOINT.

On reading the descriptions of the bill provided, I’d like to **pose some questions**: is it “misinformation and disinformation” which pose a *“threat to the safety (1) and wellbeing (2) of Australians, as well as to our democracy (3), society (4) and economy (5)”* - or is it the **Censorship** of information deemed by ACMA to be “misinformation and disinformation”? Another stated aim: *“tackling harmful online misinformation and disinformation, while balancing freedom of speech.”* (6) begs more questions.

Questions based on my experience of pandemonium:

- (1) **Threat to safety?** The biggest recent threat to the safety of Australian people has been the censorship of doctors and scientists raising the alarm about the safety signals after the injection rollout. How can one ascertain a “threat to safety” if the regulators like TGA are so captured by BigpHarma (with its immaculate history of being the subject of litigation for fraud) that they deem a “vaccine” to be “safe & effective” and then fail miserably to report harms from said product?
- (2) **Threat to wellbeing?** The censorship of doctors, psychologists and economists who raised objections to government lockdowns, mandated jabs and masks have been the worst threat to the wellbeing of Australians;

- (3) **Threat to democracy?** This bill itself is the worst threat to democracy of all!! It is typical “crisis” legislation based on people who delude themselves that they, or an “independent” group of individuals, could possibly decide for a nation what is to be considered “truth” and all else be “misinformation”; reducing freedom of speech is cutting democracy’s head off;
- (4) **Threat to society?** This bill and the censorship it would enable is itself a threat to society; during the pandemonium the social division created by censoring objections to discriminatory government policies which created a medically-based apartheid system, is a long-lasting threat to our society: families, friendships and social networks were torn apart and many of these rifts may never recover;
- (5) **Threat to economy?** The censoring of economists who pointed to the harms of lockdowns enforced by the government has been the greatest threat to the economy; many small businesses went to the wall;
- (6) **What sort of “balance”** is possible when the government has the hubris to make itself exempt from this bill!! Some purveyors of misinformation (like the government and ABC) are obviously deemed to be **“more equal than others”**!! Did the government “balance” the risks and benefits from its authoritarian rollout of gene-based injections? The government is NOT a credible source of “balance”.
- **Who decides what is true, vs “false, misleading or deceptive”?**

The bill proposes that ACMA can **override** the existing voluntary DIGI Code of Practice (which acknowledges the importance of freedom of speech) with a code of their own **which will not be opt in but compulsory**. Ministry of Truth seems an apt description.

Alarm bells about such power already rang when I read your Scenario 2 (7) : “Over recent months, false and misleading claims have circulated on three platforms that a new telecommunications technology causes significant health issues leading to widespread concern and an increase in vandalism of telecommunications infrastructure. Independent technical research has found these claims are demonstratively false and the Chief Scientist has also refuted these claims.”

Even in this example, how credible is the Chief Scientist and “independent technical research”, as defined by who? Regulatory capture and research funding conflicts of interest are surely not unknown to you, dear reader. After the outright lies during the Covid debacle there is no longer in my opinion any automatic credibility of the “Science” from any government related or approved source. I have a PhD in science (biology) but the “research” and “science” used by governments around the world to “support” this medical-Pharma coup has completely destroyed any implicit trust I had in doctors, scientists, media, and politicians bar a few brave people with integrity who spoke out - people whom ACMA would probably knee-jerk-label as “misinformation-spreaders”!!

- **The role of censorship in democracies vs totalitarian regimes**

This bill reeks of totalitarian aspirations among “public servants” who have the hubris to believe they know the Truth, and what information is Best for the Australian population to be **prevented from accessing or sharing** “for their own protection”;

- **Is there any role for censorship in science? In medicine?**

Such censorship as has been occurring recently has destroyed science, which cannot function without free and open debate of theory, research and clinical findings as they

emerge; the censorship of Australian doctors by AHPRA has destroyed our medical system - good doctors with ethical principles retired or quit; the ones who stayed silent and continued to transfuse their patients despite knowing the accumulating data on harms have betrayed their profession and their patients irreparably. There is no place for censorship in either science or medicine. (Science is continually changing as data accumulates. The dance of the changing WHO recommendations over the last few years are a case in point.)

- **Are you aware of the history of pharmaceutical fraud?**

Pharmaceutical companies have paid out billions in damages and been convicted of fraud on multiple occasions. The idea that the government trusts to be “true” what a pharmaceutical company says about one of its products is laughable. The fact that the TGA puts a rubber stamp on such products merely adds to the hilarity/tragedy if one looks at the funding structure of the TGA. Captured regulators are a great source of misinformation which we saw in spades lately.

- **Have you heard of informed consent and the Nuremberg Code, Helsinki Declaration?**

Some Australians subjected to the government-condoned Narrative of misinformation and vilification of dissenters, spread by mass media, seem now to associate the above human rights protections as “conspiracy theories”, as if they have “nothing to do with” the violation of the rights of Australian citizens to bodily autonomy and informed consent. Informed consent relies on patients/research subjects having access to accurate information, not blank inserts, and certainly NOT captured regulators; for those readers unfamiliar with the Nuremberg Code (no, it is not a conspiracy theory as anyone with an ounce of historical education knows) please read:

The Nuremberg Code:

https://media.tghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ_No_7070_Volume_313_The_Nuremberg_Code.pdf

- **Are you aware that informed dissent is vital in a democracy?**

Censorship is incompatible with democracy - the right to free speech is paramount; without it any government claiming democracy will be naked as the proverbial emperor.

- **Surely you know examples of the changing “truth” historically?**

There are many examples throughout history of “truths” told by governments which have later been exposed to be lies - need I give examples? Politicians regularly accuse those from the opposite side of lying. Appointing people to an advisory body to somehow “independently” arrive at “truth” is laughable and/or terrifying.

- **Changing “truth” during Covid “pandemic”**

During the pandemonium it became blatantly obvious that governments were lying to us: about the origins of the virus; about a commonly used drug called ivermectin (the most obvious and tragicomic of all the lies) and eventually about the “safe & effective” preventing us from infecting our dearest elderly relatives - all lies. If you still believe them, reader, you are in for a rude shock when you learn the truth. How on earth does this government think it has any credibility left to be a defender of “truth”?

- **Are you aware of the “fact checker” farce?**

The social media and mainstream media “fact checking” debacle has also been demonstrated to be nothing but window dressing for a Stasi-like censorship regime; giving it the name of the “Trusted News Initiative” is Orwellian to say the least!

- **Are you aware of the Wikipedia farce?**

Even the online encyclopaedia Wikipedia, which people looked up to distinguish “truth” from “conspiracies” has been infiltrated by paid “truth engineers” so that it’s own cofounder no longer trusts the information on it! These skilful word-doctors were quick to rewrite the biographies of dissenters to turn away curious Wiki-trusting researchers;

- **How on earth is the ABC “exempt”?**

As someone who used to trust “my ABC” because it was supposed to be independent, unlike media owned by moguls, I have been aghast at how investigative reporting ceased to exist, how this source became nothing more than a propaganda device; I will never trust this organisation again and the idea that it is to be “exempt” from the “misinformation” labelling of this bill has got to be a work of dystopian satire!

- **The “exempt” government??**

A government which makes itself exempt from “misinformation” scrutiny deserves contempt, not exempt. It makes this whole exercise appear to be giving the thumb to the Australian people by “public servants” who have decided it is the public that should serve THEM and their agenda!

- **“Truth” as defined by WHO??**

Pandemic-Truth came down from on high, but Who funds the WHO? Need anyone say more? Are we to believe that these are benign bureaucrats with public health in mind and no conflicts of interest? Of course ACMA would use WHO-Truth to decide what is “misinformation”. The combination of this ACMA power-to-decide-Truth with the proposed WHO treaty and amendments to IHR is a ghastly prospect for anyone who truly values democracy;

- **The future of “truth”?**

Sadly, if this bill gets pushed through, there will be no “truth” in Australia. We can kiss our attempt at democracy goodbye.

- **Is this whole bill illegal?** Probably. But being illegal didn’t seem to matter to the gene-based-countermeasure pushers. Totalitarian governments know the trick: if anything is illegal, just pass a bill to make it legal. You may doubt totalitarian intentions, (I hope you are right), but Australian legislators had best take note of this recent **US legal case**:

<https://aaronsiri.substack.com/p/federal-judge-orders-biden-administration>

*“The Biden Administration is **HEREBY ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED** from taking the following actions as to social-media companies: (1) meeting with social-media companies for the purpose of urging, encouraging, pressuring, or inducing in any manner the removal, deletion, suppression, or reduction of content containing protected free speech posted on social-media platforms; (2) specifically flagging content or posts on social-media platforms and/or forwarding such to social-media companies urging, encouraging, pressuring, or inducing in any manner for removal, deletion, suppression, or reduction of content containing protected free speech; (3) urging, encouraging, pressuring, or inducing in any manner social-media companies to change their guidelines for removing, deleting,*

suppressing, or reducing content containing protected free speech ..." I somehow doubt that feigning an independent ACMA would save such a bill from legal challenges;

Finally, I'd like to end with **a joke**, provided to me by the government's own "Guidance Notes", which say:

"The Commonwealth makes no representations or warranties as to the contents or accuracy of the information contained in this publication. To the extent permitted by law, the Commonwealth disclaims liability to any person or organisation in respect of anything done, or omitted to be done, in reliance upon information contained in this publication."

So does that mean our Guidance Notes could be "misinformation"? Oh, but no worries, the government (and our trusted ABC) are exempt from this bill!
Excluded: authorised government content and "professional news content".

And, lo and behold! I noticed that **satire** will still be allowed! Perhaps we will still be able to write contemporary versions of novels like *Brave New World* and *1984*, hurrah! Except, unlike their predecessors, our new novels will not be warnings of a future to come, but rather accurate depictions of life in Australia.

Well, dear reader, you've reached **the end** of my submission, and perhaps **the beginning of the end** of our democracy? Congratulations! Box ticked!

If you ban from publishing and bin my words instead of taking on board my recommendation to **Bin the Bill**, may you live in interesting times! Perhaps you may remember this weirdly prescient submission from your isolation when you, too, become deemed by ACMA-and-its-minions to qualify as a "misinformation spreader"?

References?

By the way, I haven't included lots of references because I believe this is primarily a moral issue rather than a scientific issue that can be decided by facts. As a former scientist I would love to provide you with the emerging data about the pandemonium, but as often happens under a censorship regime (which we are already under), I have self-censored out of an assumption that any evidence I provide will be automatically judged as "misinfo" anyway.