

Submission about ACMA Bill

I disagree with everything about this bill. The statement of the Issue is even catastrophising rather than honest. Australia is largely a tolerant society, caring for the plight of others and not splitting them into groups. It is “Marxism” that splits a society into groups of oppressed and oppressors. By doing that our Democracy is in danger. We are One Nation. The premise of this Bill is that we need big Government and levels of bureaucracy to protect us from our own critical thinking.

The wording used is actually a clause that has a particular political bias and it implies an external need for judgement by an outside body of exactly what ‘Truth’ is. Sometimes truth comes to light in time because we humans only see part of what is happening. So is it or is it not a society where everyone has their ‘own truth’ or is it a society of ‘Absolute truth’. If this society is to have Absolute truth then the outside source of that can not be someone human, someone with a conflict of interest, or an organisation controllable by Government bribes. It can only be a Deity and ACMA is no deity.

“Misinformation and disinformation” are words that imply some have “right” think and some have “wrong” think. This notion is divisive. Journalism and Research and Statistics provide “Information”. Some is useful for individuals to analyse and some proves not useful for individuals to analyse. To rob a citizen of choice of information is a step too far.

As for “posing a threat to our safety and well-being” the Australian public are not children needing big Government and dictatorial bureaucracies to protect them from ‘bad words’. Rather we are free to think outside the box, to behave ridiculously on social media for likes, and to explore ideas others put forward. Anything other than this takes away our humanity. What poses a threat to our safety and well being is being afraid of Government spying on us and what we say, and punishing us for not having “groupthink”. That is what Stalin, Hitler, Polpot, and Kim Il Sung did. It is Authoritarian, not “safe” or “well”.

“Threat to democracy”. Given that freedom of speech,, freedom of thought and freedom to choose are Democracy it is actually this Bill that threatens democracy. Totalitarianism is not democracy.

“Threat to our society and economy”. Is not true. Free thought shapes societies and helps bring innovation. Conforming thought does not. It is not a threat to our society to disagree with and criticise Government decisions. How else do we the people get through to Parliamentarians that their policies are not working in real life?

“Harm” and “Deliberate harm”. Exactly what constitutes “harm”? Harm needs to be very well qualified if penalties are issued for it. This could be a legal minefield. Harm cannot stray into the area of “feeling offended” personally or “exposing new areas of truth” corporately. This is why the amounts quoted as fines are excessively unfair. You do not have the right to cripple a business due to them having a different “opinion” to the Main stream media. Nor do you have the right to cripple an online platform for doing what journalism actually is - reporting both sides.

“Harm to the health of all Australians”. So does that mean not telling the truth about Western Australia’s own statistics on vaccine injury. Are statistics “harm”?

“Harm to the environment”. Does that mean we cannot tell the truth about how much steel it actually takes to make a wind turbine, and that farmers will get banned online for complaining about their land being taken for solar?

“Hatred” is another loaded word. How is “hatred toward a group” determined? True “hatred” requires an obvious public onslaught over time of foul language, calls for violence or other clear evidences. “Hatred” is not just a difference of opinion. Exposing more of the truth to someone who cannot see it is not hatred. Saying you disagree with a groups point of view and showing why is not hatred. Having a peaceful demonstration because you want society to consider all groups opinions is not hatred. Communication leads to better understanding.

Shutting down debate is not “safety” because debate is not “harmful” and using it is not “hatred”. Things called “conspiracy theories” keep getting proven as fact and that is a good thing for an open inclusive society.

So what is the REAL reason the Government wants sweeping censorship? I believe the algorithms already pick up people planning physical harm to others. We already have cyber security measures for scammers and foreign espionage. We do not need more. It is flawed but so are the people who use it. Given this power no one can predict how much will end up censored or fined by ACMA. Yet If our society is free to think for ourselves, then our society will balance out.

All opinions need to be allowed to be expressed respectfully. Especially every average Australians ability to “fact check” stuff for themselves. The “fact checkers” even have to change their information when they learn more. No Department has the right in our Democracy to decide what “facts” are acceptable and what “facts” are not, and therefore called “disinformation” to cover up the common sense of the other side of debate.

Scrap this and leave us alone.