

Need to complete and shoot off before August 4th!!!

To whom it may concern,

Having been warned of the impending legislation regarding control of information within Australia most specifically regarding independent media and individuals, I was compelled to investigate the proposition and pen a response. Due to time away it has not been fully realised and is a little skittish, but hopefully conveys some sense of and justification for the concern felt.

It is argued that these new powers will enable the tackling of “harmful online misinformation and disinformation, while balancing freedom of speech.” In truth these new powers will nullify the possibility of balance where freedom of speech or exposition of truth and reality are concerned. These new powers are a gross overreach by design and they will be a stranglehold on democracy’s final throes.

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

This may be true, but it is not the online realm who pose the greatest risk nor certainly any one area’s exclusive domain.

All information may be at times portrayed in a manner not intended by those providers or creators of it.

Qualitative assessment of information, who makes this determination? Does this begin and end at a state/territory level? Federally? Or is it to be overseen and directives taken from international organisations? Where will it begin and end?

Energies and taxpayer finances would better be directed toward quality education.

This legislation and discussion thereof is disrespectful of citizens at multiple levels. Primarily it denigrates one’s ability to make their own determination. One cannot view seriously ‘our government’ as being concerned about threats to safety or wellbeing of Australians. To claim any government (especially Australian) of the past fifty years has had any concern for democracy, society, or the economy is equally ludicrous.

Proposed here is the abuse of a serious issue in order to commit a heinous level of interference. It is not legally tackling, this is an attempt toward blatant decapitation of civil liberties. We have already experienced this effect most prominently beginning with the Covid. This same method of manipulation has been rife and in full fruit for a very long time. Relatively recently, David Marr’s hit piece a prime example. Our apparently honourable and non-biased “journalistic” media conspired to remove then overwhelmingly elected Prime Minister Tony Abbott from office.

It has been more conspicuous with Trump mania. This mania is a reference to media and all other pathologically afflicted folk who without reason despise Donald Trump, rather than those who appear to follow him with zeal. Neither dedicated party in most cases having adequately researched or considered their position.

“Covid misinformation/disinformation” cited. Is this the same ***information*** proven correct and never addressed by non-online (or the majority of online) media sources despite their having promoted the genuinely flawed information people relied on as though unimpeachably empirical with incredible diligence and urgency?

Or shall this legislation deal with proven government-stamped misinformation that led our population to accept untested pharmacological intervention under extreme duress without opportunity to appropriately discuss with medically trained doctors or even friends, colleagues, and family?

Proven misinformation that was indeed subsequently promoted and endorsed by medically trained doctors to assist uptake of probably dangerous intervention in accordance with the will of pharmaceutical giants and their primary stakeholders/shareholders?

Misinformation that was utilised by bureaucratic agencies of governments to disbar medical experts from practising or being able to suitably advise and treat patients?

Obviously not the kind of misinformation this legislation will be interested in. Nobody with any government connection is concerned about the information their misinformation has spawned. The legislation being pushed is a means to cover rumps and move on without scrutiny.

This period provides no grounds upon which to justify the establishment of such a body or enshrinement of powers to people based on some spurious claim to sovereignty of knowledge.

“Infodemic” as described within the Executive Summary of “A report to government on the adequacy of digital platforms’ disinformation and news quality measures” from June 2021 owes as much to the probable origins of the ideology of those presenting this advice to government.

It is a direct corollary of ‘disinformation’ and this term’s emergence within Soviet Communism. More doublespeak gobbledygook designed to overawe and articulate the idea of substance to an essentially insubstantial movement of absolutely negative people incapable of doing anything. Disinformation really is a stupid term. Information either exists or it does not, its quality has no bearing on its state.

“The propagation of these falsehoods and conspiracies undermines public health efforts, causes harm to individuals, businesses and democratic institutions, and in some cases, incites individuals to carry out acts of violence. The propagation of these falsehoods and conspiracies undermines public health efforts, causes harm to

individuals, businesses and democratic institutions, and in some cases, incites individuals to carry out acts of violence.”

Public health efforts that are guided entirely by bureaucratic input against medical enquiry or consensus? Medical experts and enquiring scientific minds were shut out of discussion. Those with opposing viewpoints in any capacity were stripped of credentials and their *raison d'être*! This was championed and celebrated by gormless nitwits across the media spectrum but most acutely realised by the blanket media.

Social media was shamelessly weaponised to attack voices of reason and discredit reputations. At any other time this should have qualified as harassment and probably hate speech or at least encouragement toward harm, as people wished ill and death upon those who failed to share their point of view. (Really the government's/pharmaceutical companies' point of view.)

As for the apparent concern raised here of harm to individuals, businesses, democratic institutions? Fluff and drivel. If these entities lack the fortitude to withstand such assaults on their intelligence - which is highly unlikely - perhaps they need to experience the consequences. Most people grow beyond infants school level cognitive capability at least in late-early to middle adulthood.

Propagation of falsehoods and conspiracies? And in some cases inciting individuals to carry out acts of violence? Who composed this drivel? This reads like the maladjusted ramble of an undergraduate activist. Please advise further on these acts of violence. To my recollection there were no cases of violence perpetrated by anybody other than regulation criminals, or by the people who are supposed to serve and protect the public.

The police and military were given license to extend their remit to hitherto unknown regions. These were the tools used by our so-called democratically elected (but in effect undemocratic) government to pummel 'their' people. An extension of the derision those in government and their advisors hold for their constituents. Our government were the primary exercisers of violence.

Propaganda has been so effective in desensitising citizens to injustice, they have become spellbound and many championed the egregious activities of their government and enforcement agencies. This is evidence alone that there is already gross overreach.

Businesses across the country were crushed by misinformation and as you call it, disinformation. Thank heavens there was the nirvana of the internet to provide relief for anybody seeking clarity through the massive psychological operation designed to imprison and probably bring more substantial harm to them.

The internet is far from perfect but at least it does not pretend to be so. Unlike the government and the collegiate blanket media machine now completely under control of Communists. This is the desperate act of Communists who are terrified of the truth and the possibility people may have free and open access to it. There is good reason our democratic institutions are in question, it is because they are all gone. Their very being has been eroded to an irretrievable degree.

“Misinformation typically spreads via highly emotive and engaging posts within small online conspiracy groups. These narratives are then amplified by international influencers, local public figures, and by coverage in the media.”

This is the most incredible observation. It really is classic! Precisely the method by which the conspiring Communist movement have taken root and rapidly proliferated. Just like the highly emotive and engaging posts pertaining to falsehoods like the evolved “Global cooling/ozone layer hole/global warming/Climate Change” narrative. Now our very own Sarah Hanson Young cites the United Nations or some other criminal cabal in declaring we are living through a period of “global boiling!”

What are the affiliations of those parties who drafted these documents and are petitioning the Australian government to adopt their recommendations? Please detail exhaustively all affiliations of all involved down to their third cousins’ first Party meeting attendance.

“ providing financial assistance and grants to news outlets, government and not-for- profit organisations to bolster the spread of credible information and news.”

Here is the kicker. Those already at the trough will be lapping harder than their tongues can carry them. This is all about creating a state of absolute control through a global state of nouveau absolutism. It is money laundering and corruption of a colossal scale with the goal of crippling “western” civilisation.

One quickly realises this whole thing is a front when noticing the parties in question are already adherents to its outlined mechanisms - Google, Facebook, Tik Tok, Twitter. These are all massive companies with government and military connections. Anybody that blindly trusts these organisations with information of any form let alone to self-regulate and responsibly adjudicate transfer of information needs help but not the sort of ‘help’ this programme brings. Discussion here of global involvement is all we really need to know.

These groups determined and continue to determine without any transparency the integrity of information. These essentially nameless faceless people were and are in charge of regulating the flow of information and asserting its validity.

This is especially important given the nature of these ‘platforms’ and the echo-chamber mechanisms upon which they thrive. They monetise fear, stupidity, and other human emotions and possible shortcomings or frailties. They like other forms of media including the traditional arms, prey on gullibility and abuse the contract of trust that extends between the broadcaster and their receiver.

This is not exclusive to internet or independent media as certain arbiters would like us to believe. It is most prominent within established branded media like commercial television networks (Seven, Nine, and Ten) and newspapers and the interminably charter-corrupting ABC/SBS.

It claims this agency will improve transparency. This is nonsense. The further development and implementation of this agenda will cede all hope for transparency. There will be only one source for acceptable information and anybody can and will be at their sword for straying into territory deemed unsuitable by government and their contractors. The purpose of this legislation to crush opposition.

There appears little need to venture beyond the Executive Summary of this particular document in knowing something terribly foul is afoot.

Reading through this document's opening leaves me with even more questions as to our nation state and those informing or pretending to inform those in charge of its keeping.

Furthermore, using algorithms and Artificial Intelligence programmes to monitor all information and prohibit free discourse or dissemination of ideas is hardly a development our civilization requires, and introduces a much broader compass of concerns.

It really is humorously alarming that you feel it acceptable to continually cite democracy and its preservation as though it were your noble goal.

This is one of the most pernicious and cynical moves by any government in the Anglosphere. It unashamedly eviscerates democracy and feasts on its rich organs.

Those responsible for drafting this legislation and promoting it at any level have no right naming preservation of democracy as a source of inspiration nor intended goal, but that is the realm of pleasure through perversity upon which only deviants could delight.

Sincerely and greatly disturbed by the direction of this country

