

An Argument against Government and Mainstream Media driven Censorship of online Information Sharing: The Danger of Censoring Truthful (Expert) Dissent while Only Accepting an Officially Approved Narrative

The following submission addresses the issue of closing down truthful dissent – the censorship of material that is not (for whatever reason) officially endorsed by the Government and/or by the mainstream press - and would likely be unfairly categorised as misinformation or disinformation via the proposed legislation. If there are issues with defamation then that can already be addressed through existing laws. In a robust democracy, errors and disinformation become exposed by more debate, not censorship. Closing down debate is a sign of tyranny. It's also anti science. The answer to misinformation or disinformation is more debate not less. At the end of the day the truth fears no investigation.

The proposed Law is fundamentally flawed since it assumes the Government as the arbiter of truth and that the mainstream media is following proper standards of journalism which they are not. Both Government and mainstream media are on record as having grossly misled the public about many life and death situations (covered below), where an accurate account of events could only be found in the online independent press (now shared on social media). The unfortunate public has had to put up with whatever the mainstream media airs. The new law means we won't be able to engage in our own exchange of ideas when it comes to sorting out truth from fiction, as if this exchange of ideas is going to cause some great harm. The most harm, in recent years, has come from failed Government policies carried by the media that shuts out important (expert) dissenting voices. If there is a lack of faith in Government, then it is the Government and media that is to blame for not being honest and transparent with the public.

The reason why there has been an explosion in online independent media, including information sharing (that comes with errors and disinformation) is because of recent history where the Government, and mainstream media, has failed to pick up on the truth about things such as the non-existent Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction, going back to 2002, and where they failed to come clean on the role of Nation States supporting Islamic terrorism. They also failed massively with the Covid pandemic as more and more evidence comes to light that the dissenters, almost wholly following expert medical opinion, were correct and that the official narrative was faulty or completely incorrect.

Turning to the issue of misinforming the public about the War on Terror (something that helped build the online media) ... anyone can now discover, from declassified US Defence Intelligence documents (August 2012), that it was the “The West, Gulf Countries and Turkey” who were supporting the insurgents in Syria that comprised of ‘Salafists, the Muslim Brotherhood, and Al Qaeda in Iraq’ (these are direct quotes). It was the online press that revealed this information to the public thanks to sources on the ground, in near real time, where the mainstream media, to this day, is still obfuscating these undeniable facts. US officials issued their own disinformation about these DIA documents telling the public they were draft documents, implying that the content was erroneous. This is easily countered by independent journalists and via admissions from individuals such as former NATO commander, General Wesley Clark, and the former DIA chief, General Michael Flynn. Converging lines of evidence proved what was happening. You can even work it out for yourself by understanding that the leading Syrian opposition groups, labelled as Al Qaeda on Wikipedia, ended up with the weapons supplied by “The West, Gulf Countries and Turkey.”

Jane’s Defence magazine worked out what was happening by tracing the arms purchased by various Gulf Countries to the extremist groups. These nations, with the knowledge and support of the West, were buying equipment they did not use(!) that then ended up in the hands of Al Qaeda groups. Early on in the war, from 2011, it was known that arms from NATO-destroyed-Libya were being shipped into the war zone, with evidence of US and Turkish involvement. The mainstream media story, supported by our Government, that the rebels in Syria were largely independent ‘democracy loving’ rebels is a transparent lie. The leading fighting groups were all sectarian extremists. When you email the media with these facts, that a cabal of countries is supporting extremist forces against a secular Government, as I have over many years, nothing changes. They never address the data or documents. The same lies about this war are aired again and again, and so thinking people turn to social media to warn others about the actual harm being done from these lies.

Going back further, with the Iraqi WMD lies, we have clear evidence that the US neocons cooked up the intelligence and sold the idea that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq was an imminent threat to the public. This is a criminal action and led to the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Middle Easterners and thousands of Western soldiers, including a number of Australians. Lives could have been saved if the media told the truth about what had happened. It

would have cut the occupation of Iraq short and the Bush neocons would have faced criminal charges. The evidence for the crime is on the public record.

Along with documents such as the Downing Street Memo, and testimony from intelligence insiders, we now have the declassified US National Intelligence Estimate, from October 2002, which was available in 2008, that clearly states Saddam was not an imminent threat - unless provoked.

Bush officials criminally altered this assessment, so that it said the opposite, and then launched the war.

There was an attempt at accountability by US politician Dennis Kucinich, also in 2008, who levelled 35 counts of high crimes and misdemeanours at George W Bush, in tabled Articles of Impeachment, that was ignored by the mainstream press. I wrote a letter of complaint about this matter to the ABC, that the ACMA looked into, that went to the Commonwealth Ombudsman's office, before it was finally rejected on political grounds (in my opinion) because I asked them to accurately describe what had happened as a war crime. The mainstream media, in this case the ABC, wrongly kept reporting the matter as one of 'mistaken intelligence', not deliberately cooked intelligence. The documents proved what happened and the truth was wilfully ignored.

The only place where the public could discover the facts about these wars was through the online press and social media. Ten years of writing letters to journalists amounted to nothing. Were the journalists incompetent? Were they corrupt? They certainly did not follow the journalistic guidelines cited in the proposed laws here. This is why you cannot rely on the 'approved press' as arbiters of truth (along with the Government). It is one thing to set up standards and another thing to follow them, especially if politics and money (coming from media owners and editorial) stands in the way. This is why there is now a preponderance of social media news sharing. If the mainstream media was doing its job people would be sharing that content. The online press would be out of business.

Of course the proposed media law, that effectively censors public and online media, where only the official narrative is allowed, did not likely come about because of Government and media lies about war. This looks like a reaction to dissent over the Covid mandates, including the roll out of the experimental mRNA injections. Once again, this is a case where the online media and social networks, who were sharing content from dissenting medical experts,

including from professors of medicine, were correct. The truth is that the lockdowns were not needed, the virus was not a threat to healthy individuals, drugs like Ivermectin were effective (it is disinformation, put out by big pharma advocates, to say this drug was dangerous and ineffective), and it is further true that the mRNA jabs were not properly safety tested and that they were also ineffective against later strains of the virus.

The debate over the effectiveness of the jabs, when it comes to later strains, needs to be explained here - where it is important to understand that the official positions are wrong (official misinformation). One cited data set comes from NSW Health. Their latest figures showed no unvaccinated Covid hospital admissions and an overrepresentation of jabbed patients. If the injections worked we would see some unjabbed admissions, not zero. The official line is that the data is 'misleading' because older, more vulnerable people, were the ones taking the shots and more likely to be in hospital if they caught the disease in any event. However, there should have been some unvaccinated people in those figures. We were told many times there would be a pandemic of the unvaccinated. More revealing is the fact that the more injections people took the more overrepresented they were in the NSW data set (something predicted by dissenting medical experts). There's been a lot of official handwaving to explain away these facts, but the arguments don't hold water including for the widely cited US Cleveland Clinic data showing a similar trend. Furthermore, anecdotal accounts, that are useful in real world investigations, supports the data. Open debate is necessary to get to the truth here, not official pronouncements and attempts at censorship, notably made by those that advocated for the experimental injections.

One other issue, when it comes to the effectiveness of the experimental injections, stems from the highly questionable practices of Pfizer that used a relative risk reduction strategy in their initial trial that obfuscated the fact that very few people were catching the virus and that their medicine was of very limited overall benefit. They claimed a 95 percent efficacy rate but the absolute risk reduction, the overall benefit, was only 0.84 percent. The Canadian Covid Care Alliance, a group of 500 independent medical experts, including data specialists, explained the problems with Pfizer's trial. They showed, from Pfizer's own data, that more people became sick in the vaccinated group, due to adverse reactions, than those getting sick in the placebo group (<https://rumble.com/vqx3kb-the-pfizer-inoculations-do-more-harm-than-good.html>). And more people died in the vaccinated group. The key thing to understand in medicine is to first, do no harm. Through politics, or

conflicted interests, health officials seemingly missed, and now obfuscate, this important information. Admitting error would raise questions of liability in terms of injury claims by those that took the shots.

In terms of the basic experimental vaccine technology itself, the idea of using lipids to distribute highly modified mRNA into your body's cells, was warned about as being inherently dangerous by people such as Dr Sucharit Bhakdi (a former professor of microbiology and immunology) and Dr Michael Yeadon (a former Vice President and research leader at Pfizer). Both men were wrongly smeared online by 'fact checkers' but were correct in what they were saying about how the technology worked and the inherent danger. Pfizer's own biodistribution data, released in Japan of all places, proved the jab material does not stay in the arm but circulates throughout the body. The danger is if the material ends up in the heart or brain, which can lead to fatal results, since the body ends up attacking its own cells that take up the mRNA. In muscle tissue this is not so much of a problem, but in the brain, or heart, in the cell walls of your blood vessels in those areas, the immune attack can have devastating consequences (which has been shown in autopsies conducted in Germany by Professor Arne Burkhardt).

Today we know, via released emails, that key US officials were the ones peddling misinformation about many aspects of the pandemic which were repeated worldwide. We were misinformed about the severity of the virus, its origins, and that they (Dr Fauci et al) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We know now that NIH director Dr Anthony Fauci [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We know Moderna paid the NIH 400 million dollars for the use of patented technology relating to the production of the mRNA shots. This is a clear conflict of interest that helps explain why the experimental jabs were rushed through when there were multiple warning signals that should have stopped the program (at various stages).

Open debate is certainly warranted to get at the bottom of things, and yet the mainstream media and Government continue to fail to report accurately on the life threatening issues here. Shutting down dissenting online voices actually harmed people. It was not all misinformation. The truth is now acknowledged on platforms like Facebook where content that was previously banned (by the so called 'independent fact checkers' who were/are taking money from funds

run by billionaires who advocated for the jabs) is now allowed. Pretty much ALL of the dissenting content on Covid turned out to be true where it was the officials and media that were carrying the misinformation. If the laws you propose go ahead there will be no way to warn the public about such malfeasance and danger. If something similar is tried again, and no dissent is allowed, more lives will be put at risk.

One other undeniable truth, banned in the media, but vitally important to recognise in relation to Covid, is that forcing people to take an experimental medicine, no matter the circumstance, is a crime under Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article 7 should be applied to politicians, health officials, media chiefs, judges and anyone else that was in a position of authority that coerced or tricked the public into taking the experimental shots, where there was no informed consent process. This argument first arose in the UK and would have stopped the roll out of the experimental jabs if the mainstream press had aired this truth. The mainstream media never mentioned it. If we go by the rules proposed in the new laws then material outside of official policy, that is not aired by the mainstream media, that could save people from being human guinea pigs, would be disallowed.

The problem we face is from corrupted Government, their academic advisors, plus the mainstream press, who are mired in connections to big money and special interest groups, where they are further bound by political sensibilities that stops issues getting a fair hearing. And because almost all politicians, media, corporate bosses, even judiciary, and health officials, advocated for, or facilitated the experimental injections, they are now loath to admit any mistake or liability. So rather than looking objectively at what occurred we face a political battle. This is not what scientific inquiry should be about. Now, more than ever, do we need an open (online) public square in order to air dissenting views.

An open exchange of ideas, with competing experts, is something you would expect in a Democracy – and this is NOT happening. Where were these expert vs expert discussions airing in the mainstream media? This should have happened. Enacting laws to further shut down dissent makes the country more akin to some kind of dystopian totalitarian State and goes against Western enlightenment values (based on individual rights, logic and reason).

The key thing to understand, whatever your view on the cases mentioned in this submission, is that censorship is not the answer. The answer is more

engagement, and that the truth fears no investigation. If online quackery is afoot then open engagement is the answer. By trying to shut down material, that is not officially endorsed, you end up throwing the baby out with the bath water. Let dissenting experts speak freely and give the public some credit to make up their own minds and be responsible for their own actions. Thanks for your time.