

The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts (**the Department**) have invited feedback on an exposure draft of the *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023* (**the Bill**).

FEEDBACK

I originally wrote this objection to The Bill as a work on the epistemological contradiction and the vague, nonsensical and subterfuge nature of your proposed bill. However, Gary Christian's *Freedom of Speech Submission* which you already have is a fine articulation, and so please count my feedback as in concordance with his on those points.

Thereafter, I wrote something on the illegality, the sheer legal illegitimacy of your proposal. Then, I found that *Maat's Method* and *Australians For Science and Freedom* submission was everything that could be said in that context. So include my sentiment as in agreement with all that they state. Likewise, The People's Revolution took an important, well stated position on your aberrant proposal as well.

So given that I stand in agreement with the above authors (and many more I am sure), and they have done well to articulate how the Emperor indeed has no clothes, I wanted to do something a little different, and ask some serious questions of you.

Incidentally, I note that submissions containing profanity will not be considered. So whilst that might have been the most appropriate and indeed cathartic of responses to you—I seek some retaining of validity for my feedback here—and so will stick to your ill-deserved code of addressing you.

Firstly. How does such repugnant detritus as the present Bill becomes manifest into being, as words upon paper, I have to wonder.

Does a collection of callously egocentric bureaucrats get together in a huddle and compete in their suggestions for the most outlandish violation of human rights? (Perhaps, hoping that after the inevitable controversy that ensues, that they somehow gain ground of attrition, along the path to the development of their orgiastic desires for full-blown tyranny for our nation?)

Or, have the proponents, like self-serving automatons, been given their orders from entities such as the U.N., W.E.F., Global Banking & Investment, Beelzebub, etc., that they simply must instate such a wish-list without question? How proud our freedom fighting forefathers must be with you?

In the haze of such obsequious order following, do you even realise what you are doing to this country and its future, or understand the gravity of your proposal? A proposal which is tantamount to irreparably degrading the lifestyle and existence of both the present and all future generations of all Australians that might suffer under the tyranny of it.

I hence write merely to express my deepest concerns regarding the Bill. A bill which is superfluously, purportedly aimed at addressing 'misinformation' and 'disinformation' on digital platforms. However, given the Australian Government (and its lapdog legacy media's) propensity for, and widely showcased skills in the generation of misinformation and disinformation, this can only be seen as ironic, oxymoronic—and perhaps simply moronic. The mere suggestion of The Bill is an insult to the intelligence of Australians. It succeeds equally as well in its' proposal to erode our inalienable human rights and our natural law rights. This bill's proposal represents a flagrant violation of the right to freedom of expression as enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—for which we apparently need to remind you—our country ***is a signatory to***.

This reminder is poignant, given the past few years of rights violations that the Australian Government, and in its' various illegitimate corporate appendages, has chosen to basically assault the Australian public with. It is in this darkest of chapters of history that the Government has proved its supreme hypocrisy, and that it cares not for the safety of Australian Citizens, and nor does it care for the truth. It cares only for the unrestrained promulgation of its own particular breeds of disinformation and misinformation.

This accusation of Government misinformation and disinformation is clearly now indicated by the Australian "all-cause mortality" that, since the recent mRNA injection rollout, has risen to a rate of over 15%. A rate not seen since World War Two (and probably still significantly on the low side of reality, via 'statistical massage'). It is apparent "all-cause mortality" should really be seen as a pseudonym for what is manifestly, predominately 'covid' 'vaccine' caused harm and death.

After the initial rollout of the injection, the unprecedented rate of death, seen as an insurance event, rapidly eclipsed a one-in-200-year event by four (4) times (OneAmerica, 3rd Quarter 2001 death claims data—corroborated by Society of Actuaries Research Institute SOA citing a 37.7% spike in life insurance death claims). As of mid 2022 the 6 month period after 'covid

vaccination' indicated in the USA in 18-44 year olds an 84% increase in all-cause mortality. A 10% increase is determined to be a 1-in-300-year event, and exceeding periods of war. Bogeyman 'covid' can only be blamed for around 10% of these deaths, probably with the same kind of pro-narrative statistical aggression that provoked the unwarranted fear of the world to the purported pathogen in the first place. The alarming group of (as best as we can estimate to) true statistics (which includes stillborn and miscarriage data elevations) is echoed worldwide through even government avenues such as VAERS, EUDRA and UK and Israeli Health Department data. Even the TGA's likely very skewed data is indicative of this trend in non-'covid', post-injection mortality. Australia is probably quite like Germany, where health insurer BKK Provita had to tell its government that there was a "very considerable under-recording of suspected cases of vaccination (sic) side effects after patients received the COVID-19 vaccine (sic)". Globally, the extent of claimed population 'vaccination' seems to be statistically correlated very closely with this 'mysterious' all-cause mortality increase.

Nevertheless, this unprecedented data on Australians dying is deemed unworthy of special investigation by a predominately obfuscatory senate here in Australia. Fortunately, a minority of senators exist as a thorn in their (eugenicist) side, to at least have on record the genocidal ramifications of the Australian Governments narrative and actions against its' people and its own economy.

And so you wish to protect Australians from criticism of all such narratives that contradict the officially sanctioned one? Already, the above facts would not be apparent to someone who naïvely relies upon the mass media to tell them about what is going on. So why bother to pretend your actions are for public health, when any fair take on the data tells such a clearly contrary story? Why not instead, state that it is for the protection of those hallowed pharmaceutical institutions. Be they "oh, such a public health necessity", etc. (i.e., the same mendacity-laden malfeasance used to justify the US Government's 1986 Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, along with its kangaroo closed court, and its protection of pharmaceutical companies from litigation due to the harm unleashed upon the US public; namely, manifesting as vaccine adverse reactions.)

The government's stated intention to 'protect' Australians and 'maintain democracy' does not require such a bill, nor is the bill in any way in alignment with such acts of protection or maintenance of democracy. The bill is ironic—it's suggestion is to suggest the antithesis to democracy and to freedom. The current bill presents as utterly untenable. It has deeply problematic aspects that demand nothing short of the complete abolition of this suggested travesty to Australia.

Another overriding concern is that ACMA cannot even be seen as capable, with it's supposed role to properly regulate RF EME transmissions for the true benefit of public health, since it defers to the industrially captured organisations of ARPANSA and WHO ICNIRP for it's so called 'science'. Organisations which, with massive selectivity, deliberately fail to acknowledge a vast body of scientific knowledge and a scientific community chorus, both indicating clearly that harm is posed to most biological life forms upon this planet, by artificial, non-thermal levels of RF EME. Thus, giving such an organisation as ACMA a mandate for a far wider scope upon any sort of transmissions would appear to be a recipe for disaster. If your competence with electromagnetic radiation exposures in the context of public health is indicative, your operations should be scaled back. Preferably into non-existence, with replacement by a competent organisation. Or you should be confined to something more benign such as exclusively dealing with CB spectrum licencing.

The Bill, as presented in the 'Guidance Note' and 'Fact Sheet,' speaks of the need to combat misinformation and disinformation for the safety and wellbeing of Australians and the overall stability of our society and economy, attempting to allay concerns of overreach by stating that the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) will not directly regulate individual content and that the focus is on encouraging digital platform providers to implement robust measures. You claim that the Bill's powers will only apply to content that is reasonably likely to cause or contribute to serious harm. But the Bill's actual provisions indicate that the Bill would extend your ACMA powers not just to digital platform providers but also to individual content creators who post content accessible to others. So ordinary citizens expressing themselves online may be subject to regulations and penalties under the Bill. This is a draconian, unacceptable, and an undue imposition upon freedom of speech and expression in a democratic society. This bill alone actively existing in any democratic society, would be anathema, and potentially change its nature from a democratic society to something far more tyrannical.

Culpably Vague Definitions of Misinformation, Disinformation, and Serious Harm: The definitions of misinformation and disinformation in the Bill rely on ambiguous terms such as 'false,' 'misleading,' and 'deceptive,' without providing any clear parameters to either the meanings or the interpreters. This vagueness poses a risk of stifling political and scientific debate and legitimate expressions of differing opinions. The definition of 'serious harm' is also farcical, having no clarity. This bill thus suggests and condones potential misuse of power in determining what content is reasonably likely to cause harm.

The Principle of Legality and Unchecked Power of ACMA: The Bill's generality and ambiguity raise concerns about its potential implications for fundamental inalienable rights. It grants ACMA excessive power to create enforceable rules, codes, and standards without sufficient oversight and the ability for users and platforms to challenge them. Additionally, the quasi-judicial powers bestowed upon ACMA to compel individuals to provide evidence without adequate privacy protections are draconian and should be deeply troubling to any sentient/ethical being.

The Erosion of Public Trust and Implications on the Legal System: The Australian public is the arbiter of truth. This bill represents for that role to become usurped by bureaucrats and governments operating in a corporate fascistic symbiosis, with

the ever-present assistance of the avaricious, mendacious lapdogs of the mass media. History suggests that such censorship erodes the public's collective trust in authority. The Bill unworkable and illogical, illustrating a fundamental lack of understanding, or lack of care, for the human rights of Australians; and in particular for the right to freedom of speech and expression. The Bill sponsors provide no evidence to justify the intrusions it proposes into the private and civil autonomy of Australian citizens, whilst purporting to vest unrestrained investigatory, quasi-judicial and non-reviewable policing power into a body without Constitutional authority.

The suggestions made by this bill are intolerable, and indeed should not be tolerated by any Australian who values fundamental human rights. Should such laws be enacted there is little doubt that complex and myriad litigations will ensue. The impact on the Australian legal system will be overwhelming, and could prove to be detrimental to the administration of the entire legal system.

As it stands, I fundamentally and vehemently oppose this Bill. If such a law is allowed to pass, it will not only signal the death knell of the internet as a free marketplace of ideas in Australia, but it will signal to Australian citizens, and to citizens of the globe, that the Australian Government seeks total control of the dissemination of information within its borders, and that such control is more valuable to that Government than the individual rights of its citizenry. That would be a dark day for democracy indeed, were such a thing to pass.

Severe shortcomings of this absurd proposal include (but are not limited to):

1. No clarification of the scope of the Bill to exclude individual content creators posting on social media platforms from its operation.
2. The definitions of 'Misinformation,' 'Disinformation,' and 'Serious Harm' must avoid contingent judgments on truth and would need to focus on content that constitutes criminal offenses.
3. No clear intentions delineated by the Bill, which would need to incorporate far stronger protections for freedom of speech and expression in our democracy.
4. Implement statutory mechanisms for review and challenge of ACMA decisions, ensuring independent oversight for transparency and accountability.
5. Limit ACMA's discretion within specific parameters to prevent arbitrary decision-making.
6. Include a clause that protects providers from disclosing information that may breach privacy legislation, and the strengthening of privacy laws in order to prevent ACMA violational incursions into this human right.

As it stands, the proposed Bill fails dismally to align with the democratic principles we as a nation supposedly value. The government needs to address concerns related to misinformation and disinformation without infringing upon citizens' fundamental rights and without such heavy handed draconianism.

In light of the above concerns, I strongly urge the complete abolition of the bill and furthermore demand the legislated reassurance that the very suggestion of such tyrannical insults against the Australian people will never again be contemplated by any element of the Australian Public Service, at any level. As it stands, I would like to see the public servants who formulated such proposals to stand accountable, in real courts of law, as treasonous individuals acting with extreme antipathy to the public and national interest. Those courts could be courts that deal with Nuremberg 2.0, since the violations experienced by Australians have a lot to do with that other international Code that we are also signatories to.