

Thank you for the opportunity to allow me to express my thoughts regarding the proposed creation of the ACMA.

On the face of it, the formation of the ACMA sounds almost innocuous, protecting our safety, the Australian way of life, and our democracy. These are words that the previous government would use, over and over, and now our new government uses these words so freely and without any form of sincerity.

I have heard so many times the examples given of misinformation during the COVID pandemic. Yes, there was nonsense spoken on social media. Nonsense that any sensible or educated person was able to filter out. 5G towers spreading the pandemic? Of course not.

There was also discussion that questioned the narrative of the medical interventions and a number of the measures taken by the government of the time. Many of the discussions were led by renowned scientists who gave an alternative view and raised concerns, this being right of citizens in a free and democratic country.

Please can you tell me what is wrong with that? What is wrong with discussion? What is wrong with the freedom of critical thinking and the resulting freedom of choice?

I would have thought that governments would have entered into the debate, but no.....shut it down. Is that democracy and freedom? Is the definition of democracy and freedom that of being told what to think, what you cannot think, and stopping the freedom of free and open discussion?

Of course it is not. All this says of such governments is that they are not there to serve the citizens of the country. They are fearful of the citizens, they have no respect for the citizens and see them as entities to control as they wish. This control comes in so many ways, and we are starting to witness it now, before the formation of the ACMA.

This government is frightened of discussion, frightened to debate with the people of Australia and has an agenda that has nothing to do with protecting Australia, its people, its way of life and its democracy. If it was otherwise, then this Bill would not even exist.

It is interesting to note that the Five Eyes are working in unison right now, bringing in measures to suppress freedom of speech on social media. Is that a coincidence? Strange that the U.S. is doing exactly the same, right now.

Stepping back from the above, a number of questions come to mind. Who decides what is misinformation? Who decides what is hateful? Who decides what is dangerous? It can be argued that the ACMA will be formed to serve the government and can never be independent. These terms, that are used so much today, are ambiguous, and by nature cannot be defined. So, to me that says everything will be brought down to the lowest common denominator. What does that mean? Very little can be said that challenges the government or the narrative at the time. This is so wrong. This is the end of free thinking, free and open discussion, freedom of speech, and ultimately, freedom of choice.

This is such a dangerous proposal. It may be wonderful for a government that is moving towards a totalitarian state (and it is such a move) but it opens the door to so much more.

Mainstream media has lost the skill of journalism and has now become the mouthpiece of major corporations and industries, controlled narratives and government agenda. Am I being cynical? I have given up watching mainstream news as there is no debate, no alternative views, just “what you need to know”.

I have little doubt that independent media organisations will be shut down by this proposal, taking away the ability to see other points of view, and importantly, understanding the background and history to a news-worthy event. History is important and I have recently noticed that the mainstream media is lacking when it comes to this.

Many people will cite the book 1984 in relation to this Bill. There are many obvious comparisons that can be made, but the one that stands out for me is, that without detailed, and sometimes uncomfortable historical background to a story, the real truth is lost. It is becoming more and more up to independent media to call this out. Will this become misinformation, because it does not support the accepted narrative? It is not much of a stretch to imagine history being twisted to suit a narrative if this Bill passes through Parliament. The Orwellian character Winston Smith will no longer be fictional.

I do not agree with everything I see and hear. There are dangerous people that push dangerous narratives, and influence others. I can see that and accept that this is problem. Removing our freedom to express ourselves is not the answer. The government does not have the right to take away a basic human right. The right to free speech. I am registering my objection to this proposal and will continue to be a free Australian citizen, whatever this government decides to do.