


To: The Department of Infrastructure, Transport,
Regional Development, Communications and the Arts,
GPO Box 594
Canberra ACT 2601



Public and Published

To Whom it May Concern

Re: Submission - New ACMA powers to combat misinformation and disinformation (the *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023*)

I strongly oppose any form of censorship in Australia. I do not support this legislation

In Nazi Germany it was forbidden to listen to information sources that were not officially from the Government. Will this be the case in Australia? This legislation does not support democracy or the Australian people. It supports an agenda that is happening world-wide. Censorship violates the basic human right to information. There is an agenda for world domination by the World Health Organisation, World Economic Forum and the United Nations.

Worldwide today there is ample censorship and the Australian Government is among many governments world-wide that are attempting to censor its citizens further, under the guise of safety. There appears to be a global take-over. The European Commission's censorship law 24 August 2023 will make it punishable with incarceration if anything has been posted that is labelled 'disinformation'.

The World Economic Forum is calling for "Internet Governance" in order to prevent the truth from being told. Our E Safety Commissioner, who performs under the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts, has notable ties to the World Economic Forum as do other Members of the Australian Federal Parliament. We know who you are and how can these Politicians remain independent?

The World Health Organisation with their Article 18 of the Pandemic Treaty, will give them authority to shut down any source of information, that goes against their narrative. According to Children's Health Defence 17 August 2023, under new 'Medical Misinformation Policy' YouTube will delete content that contradicts WHO guidance.

Regarding the World Economic Forum (WEF), Newstarget states that 'in partnership with the United Nations (UN) and the World Economic Forum (WEF), tech giant Google is rolling out a new censorship scheme that aims to stop all free speech everywhere in the world'.

In the Netherlands, major lawsuits have been filed against government officials, for crimes against humanity committed during the alleged pandemic. In Australia, it is common knowledge that there are also lawsuits in motion and that several Federal Senators are exposing the Australian Government's censorship during COVID. Is all this censorship a desperate attempt to stop the truth coming out? The Australian Government and the mainstream media are continuing to ignore the terrible damage caused by the COVID shots.

On 6 June 2023, prior to this proposed Bill, the E Safety Commission has been censoring truth/facts. This illustrates the dangers of censorship and exposes an agenda. It is necessary to highlight this example as evidence against this Bill.

Article in part.....

"Controversial tweets saying biological men cannot breastfeed have been removed in Australia at the behest of the government," reports the Daily Telegraph.

The offending tweets, posted by Australian breastfeeding advocate Jasmine Sussex, were criticisms of a media article about a transgender woman's attempts to lactate.

From the Daily Telegraph,

Twitter sent a legal notice to Ms Sussex on May 16 and 17 saying the "Australian Government Entity or Law Enforcement Agency" had written to Twitter and claimed the account holder had violated Australian law.

In the tweets she criticised a media article about a transgender woman's attempt to induce lactation, saying that the silver lining of the story was that the baby would be almost exclusively formula fed.

In another tweet she stated: "Baby's can smell their mother's milk and turn towards it. This baby sleeping through his dad's sad attempt to be the mum."

Ms Sussex's tweets cannot be viewed in Australia, but they can still be viewed in other countries.

While Covid online speech was monitored by the Department of Home Affairs and the Department of Health, it is likely that this incident was actioned by the eSafety Commissioner, Australia's national independent regulator and educator for online safety, including issues of abuse (child, sexual, revenge porn) and bullying.

A spokesperson for the eSafety Commissioner stressed that they do not surveil speech on the internet. The eSafety Commissioner rather has a more passive structure, whereby they are tasked with acting on reports initiated outside of the agency (eg: by the public).

The likely scenario is that a member of the public reported Ms Sussex's tweets as 'bullying', and the eSafety Commissioner received the reports and issued a takedown request with Twitter, which Twitter then actioned. Ms Sussex has lodged an FOI request to confirm whether it was indeed the eSafety Commissioner that lodged the removal request.

The issue here is not whether moderation is required. It is required. From the little insight I have into the extent of online child exploitation and abusive content in Australia, I can only imagine the eSafety Commissioner does a lot of good and necessary work.

The issue is rather, where is the line around 'what requires moderating'?

A spokesperson for the eSafety Commissioner states,

"When responding to a complaint about adult cyber abuse under the Online Safety Act, the eSafety Commissioner must assess whether an ordinary reasonable person would conclude that the post was likely intended to cause serious harm and is menacing, harassing or offensive in all the circumstances.

Material targeting a person on the basis of their sexuality, ethnicity, disability, or gender identity may be specifically intended to cause this level of harm."

If tweets containing a breastfeeding advocate's opinion about a trans woman's attempt to lactate can be declared unlawful on the basis that they constitute "material targeting a person" because of their identity, what other kinds of speech might be declared unlawful under these parameters?

There is no bullying here but an agenda that is being pushed by international forces, including the World Economic Forum. Our E Safety Commissioner is involved with the World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Coalition for Digital Safety etc.

This is a dangerous Bill and will propel Australia, a country that many, many families fought and died for into a place that will have no freedom of speech other than what we are told is truth. Will Australians who do not agree with the “ truth of the Government” be incarcerated, have their bank accounts frozen etc? Will we be moving towards operating like China, under a social credit system? Klaus Schwab from the World Economic Forum has praised China’s Government and many of our Politicians and Public Servants have ties to the World Economic Forum, not to mention the World Health Organisation. How can they be working, as Public Servants, for the best interests of the Australian people?

The Australian Government is treading a dangerous line. This censorship may induce mental health issues in certain individuals, as per the above example regarding lactation. Certain individuals may be vulnerable to the fact that biological males are unable to carry a fetus to full term and are unable to lactate. The truth - women are distinguished biologically by their ability to bear offspring by producing eggs and lactating by feeding their young. And yet the Australian Government, notably the E Safety Commission is informing us what the truth is?

The former Prime Minister and current Prime Minister have publicly met with Bill Gates. Klaus Schwab from the World Economic Forum has outlined his vision for the future (Agenda 30) and it does not support democracy. Our Federal Politicians and Public Servants do not have to declare their affiliations with international corporations etc; therefore, a Royal Commission is vital. Seekers of the truth are aware that Government representatives govern a certain way that warrants scrutiny and I believe already, there is enough evidence that needs to be scrutinised by the National Anti-Corruption Commission.

A Federal Minister recently posted a derogatory comment about a former American President’s son and one has to question the arrogance of the statement in light of that person’s affiliation with the World Economic Forum. How can two masters be served? This is a Federal Minister of the Australia Government.

I strongly oppose any form of censorship in Australia. I do not support this legislation for the reasons above. The Australian Government without this Bill has already been censoring Australians and this is evidenced by the censorship during the COVID era; a censorship that continues to devastate the lives of Australians.

Yours faithfully



20 August 2023

