

20/8/2023

*Anonymous Submission in response to the Exposure draft of the Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023*

Dear Department of Infrastructure Staff,

I am totally against the Government censoring any information on digital or any other platforms, beyond that which is currently legislated (eg. pornography). The concept that the Government, or any other entity, is capable of being the arbiter of “truth” is abhorrent to our fragile democracy. Censorship is synonymous with totalitarianism and fascism. I therefore do not support this Bill in any form.

During COVID our federal and state governments have shown that they are not capable of gathering and presenting varying information, sides or aspects of an idea or argument in order to facilitate the decision making of an individual. Individual interests are much further advanced by being able to gather their own information sources, weigh the merits of the information and make their decision in accordance with this information. During COVID, social media, inspite of the Australian Government’s requirement that social media platforms undertake censorship on its behalf, was a valuable source of information and education.

During COVID we have seen that the federal and state governments are willing to falsify data, censor valid alternative information and coopt universities, media and various corporate organisations to pedal its own misleading and deceptive lines of argument.

As an economist that uses data on a daily basis, I had never seen purposeful data fraud undertaken by our Government until COVID.

The scale of the fraud that the Departments of Health around Australia undertook with no accountability is shocking and frightening. For example, they:

- ⑩ counted vaccinated individuals as “unvaccinated” until 14 days post vaccine to hide vaccine injuries, which were most common in the first 14 days after vaccination.
- ⑩ Counted admissions and deaths as COVID admissions and deaths, even though COVID symptoms were not the primary reason for admission or death.
- ⑩ Made claims of ‘safe and effective’ when they had no information to substantiate that claim. This is especially the case, given that pregnant women, immunocompromised and older people were not in the vaccine trial cohorts.
- ⑩ Made claims of ‘preventing transmission’ when they had no information to substantiate that claim. Transmission was never an end point of the vaccine trials.
- ⑩ Grossly exaggerated the susceptibility of younger age cohorts to COVID disease and death when the evidence was to the contrary.
- ⑩ Have ignored the screaming vaccine safety signals in DAEN and their own state-based databases.

Organisations, supposedly independent of government, have willingly adopted the government’s position on COVID, inspite of clear information that the Government’s approach was increasing deaths and disabilities, enabling the greatest transfer of wealth from small business to corporates, etc. Examples of organisations that compromised themselves are AHPRA, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and Universities.

AHPRA has entirely lost health professionals’ and the public’s confidence. Its issuance of the

directive that health professionals must agree with the Government's approach to vaccines being the only treatment or face disciplinary proceedings has undermined the quality, safety and integrity of Australia's health services. The disciplinary proceedings against doctors brave enough to raise concerns regarding the vaccines and advocating for more effective and safer alternatives (eg. Ivermectin, Zinc and Hydroxychloroquine, vitamin D, antibiotics to treat secondary pneumonia, etc), were fascist, akin to the McCarthy trials, in nature.

The Australian Broadcasting Commission's active censorship of views or information that did not support the governments' line was shocking. Announcers and reporters refused to air alternative views and twisted or dumped any dissenting views that made it to air. How much better would Australia's economy and health be if the ABC had done it's job? Independent journalism is a pillar of democracy. The ABC has failed the Australian public badly in this respect. If the ABC had done its job it would have interviewed:

- ⑩ Professor Robert Clancy, who has made it abundantly clear that antibodies developed in response to a parenteral vaccine do not cross to the lung interface, where they would be required to counter COVID, ie. the COVID vaccine are useless.
- ⑩ Professor Thomas Borody, who demonstrated that Ivermectin, zinc and Doxycycline were safe and effective against COVID.

Universities and affiliated research institutes were willing to compromise and purger themselves to align with the government's line regarding vaccines and masks in exchange for research funding. For example, Peter Doherty negated the existence of natural immunity.

Unfortunately, COVID is not the only destructive outing for the state and federal Governments of Australia. We are now seeing a second misleading and deceptive stance with respect to climate change. Again, the scientists with an alternative view (eg. CO2 movement lags temperature movement, whether we are in a warming or cooling period depends on the starting time period, CO2 is in decline and we are at sub-optimal levels for plant life, solar changes are causing weather changes rather than anthropogenic drivers) are silenced.

Hence, I do not consider that the Government or any other body is the arbiter of "truth". This legislation, if passed, will push us ever more firmly into the totalitarian or fascist realm. Again, I reiterate, I do not support the intent to censor the sharing of information or views, as per this draft Bill.

Yours sincerely,

