

SUBMISSION: Date: 18th August 2023

MISINFORMATION AND DISINFORMATION BILL

To: <https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/have-your-say/new-acma-powers-combat-misinformation-and-disinformation>

Inalienable human rights:

We are born into this planet, family, community, and country with inalienable human rights and under the government of Natural Law of our Creator.

Morally right – does no harm, people responsible for their actions

Morally wrong – causes harm, people NOT taking responsibility for their actions

It is commendable that the government wished to do something to protect people from “serious harm”. However is it the place of the government to control with threats of punishment the words people say or write?

Would it not be better to instruct children and people in the understanding of Natural Law which is moral law? Following moral law does no harm as it enacts the rule of “love thy neighbour as yourself”.

We already have some statutes that determine what is right and wrong about many actions with associated penalties. As far as speech and written words go we already have:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19

*“Everyone has the right to **freedom of opinion and expression**; this right includes freedom to hold opinions **without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.**”*

To restrict in any way the free expression, discussion and interaction of ideas and opinions is to restrict the development of mankind. Science, for example, is based on questioning and discovery, constructive criticism and analysis and all kinds of opinions, discussions and experiments. Similarly the development of businesses, products, education curriculum and medical practices benefit from this freedom - all areas grow and produce results in the real world for society depending on the input. The extent of the benefit could often be related to the extent/scope of the freedom of communication allowed/permitted.

Judgement and decision making? How and by whom?:

Who decides what is a **potential serious harm**, misinformation and disinformation?

The notes provided to assist in this response say:

Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023—Fact sheet:

“Freedom of expression

*The ACMA would have **no role in determining truthfulness**, nor will it have a role in taking down or requesting action regarding individual pieces of content.” (emphasis added)*

If “**truthfulness**” is not determined then there is no way of deciding what is misinformation and disinformation, what is false, and thus what constitutes **potential serious harm**. Truth must be “the whole truth” as indicated in this Bill. If vital

information is left out it will not be the whole truth and can be misinformation or misleading, resulting in disinformation. How can one determine what is omitted ???

ACMA equivalent to God – truth and prophetic future knowledge.

Who is to be the judge of that which is based on **truth** in order to determine disinformation and misinformation, and what are their qualifications for making that judgement?

It would have to be person/s qualified and experienced in the particular field as well as the full scope of effects upon people of the information. Science, for example, is “never settled” by definition, therefore how can anyone make such a judgement? ACMA is not God nor an expert with the final say on all matters concerning the human situation.

Therefore for one to act as such an omniscient judge would be pure tyranny and exercising fraudulent authority. Jesus said “I Am the way, THE TRUTH, and the life.” No one else has that qualification and knows everything and is also able predict the results of the communication of information being judged.

Furthermore ACMA would, by necessity, have to be **equivalent to God** - both as the font of **all knowledge** and as a true prophet of God to **predict potential serious harm** (considering all possible audiences) resulting from the content of the particular communication under scrutiny.

Who at ACMA can understand the whole of Creation, the environment, the universe and the full dimensions and operation of all kinds and ages of human beings, physical, spiritual, energetical, emotional, and mental and how and why “serious harm” may be perpetuated through some digital/published communication with any certainty such that heavy penalties could be reasonably and definitely applied to the author or carrier?

The Word of God, the highest authority in the courts, and as it says *Jn.8:32* “....*know the truth and the truth will set you free.*”

If “the whole truth and nothing but the truth” is not known in most cases, and thus judgements as to what may possibly cause “serious harm” from what is judged by partial knowledge as “misinformation and disinformation”, and penalties then imposed accordingly, the result is effectively enslavement of the people.

Is this proposed Bill of this government (purported to be representative of we the people) actual able to assess misinformation and disinformation and protect us from “serious harm” ? There appears no acceptable, reasonable or possible mechanism to do this.

Equality before the law - which law?:

If a “law” is beneficial and truly protects from harm, it should be applied to everyone including governments and professional entities. “Equality before the law” is a maxim of law. True law shows no partiality. Natural Law is true law. No exceptions.

No protection against governments and “exempted” entities.

If certain entities and people are ‘exempt’, then how does that protect the people? What if the “exempted ones” are actually doing harm even if in a clandestine/secret way, such as gaslighting, mind control/programming, subliminal messaging, etc.?

How then are their communications able to be judged when they are exempt and how would you know that this is what is happening anyway?

Governments and other “exempted” entities could possibly be guilty of:

- Showing discrimination against various groups in Australian society on the basis of ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or physical or mental disability causing harm in their messaging.
- Disruption to public order and the peaceful functioning of society by their messages and information.
- Harm to the democratic process and the constitutional functioning of government eg by restricting communication by others – public and professionals – inconsistent with the government narrative.
- Harm to the environment – by their policies and their perception of the “truth” about the environment and how it all works and discriminating against any other opinions or understandings.
- Economical or financial harm by the dissemination of their “policies” which are not beneficial to the people.

All of the above has happened in recent years because of censorship of communication on all levels and platforms - and a demand that the government issued “information” is the only correct information and all other opinions/research/discussion/expression is misinformation or disinformation or conspiracy theories. The result has been serious harm to many of the people of Australia and continues to this day. This Bill protects various “exempt” entities’, including governments’, misbehaviour from any liability, censorship or penalty to the detriment of the people.

Private messaging also threatened.

With a stroke of a pen this current Bill could be easily applied to all personal communications e.g. passed by Parliament without the direct consent of the people at a time when they are suitably distracted by other matters or during an all-night session of parliament.

Penalties

Threats of heavy financial penalties to obtain compliance with an ill-defined and questionable means of judgement is not a moral, natural, or reasonable law. If harm is done by some communication then there are already other statutes that can deal with the actual damages claims and any misuse of a carriageway of the information and any criminal action or intent.

Destruction of the development and growth of society.

In all aspects, restricting communication between people as proposed in such a tyrannical way in this Bill, would destroy the Australian society and any potential growth and development. The Bill could lead to dictatorial, tyrannical government controlled by the heavy hand of the ACMA and only “exempted” entities and people would be, by default, declared to know and disseminate truth in the form of correct and full information disclosure with no “checks and balances”.

Head of power and authority to enact:

In addition the Government needs to provide the lawful head of power and authority under which it proposes to have this Bill accented to:

- In reference to the non-negotiable covering **Clauses 2 and 5 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act UK**, that cannot be changed even by referendum, and
- The enumerated power enabling this Bill to be enacted under **s51 of the Constitution**.

otherwise this Bill, if passed, is unlawful and repugnant to the Commonwealth Constitution in violation of both the Commonwealth Constitution and the Australia Act.

By what lawful statute is the “crown” established today?

Who is the Crown that has the power and authority to give “royal ascent” to enact this or any Act?

It is MY WILL that this Bill shall be rejected in total.

I do not consent to this Bill becoming an Act in any form.