

SUBMISSION.

60 pages of rules to shut people up, all for our own good. The target - online misinformation and disinformation, but how that's defined casts a wide net. It should apply simply to information that's not 'correct' but we've seen how that works with 'political correctness'. It doesn't matter whether it's false or true, it's what's politically acceptable.

It's no surprise that this originated with the previous government and no surprise either that the present government is pushing along with it and has ramped it up. Restrictions on individual freedoms generally is a long-term bi-partisan effort and in all this we're just following others down the same path, particularly the U.S. where it's gone into overdrive.

The problem here is who decides what is 'correct'. It will be up to a politically driven bureaucracy with extraordinary powers, backed up by horrendous penalties to decide in a purely arbitrary and subjective manner what the truth is or isn't and whether it can be said or not said. It would be enough to claim as a matter of opinion, like the notorious 'fact checkers' do, that a statement is misleading or deceptive and reasonably likely to contribute to serious harm to label it as misinformation, though it might be quite true. In the U.S. it's gone even further and they've come up with a new problem - 'malinformation'. Accurate information that might lead people to come to the 'wrong' conclusions and do the 'wrong' things.

When you hear a bureaucrat talking about 're-calibrating' free speech, you might wonder exactly what they have in mind, but when a political leader tells people openly that "We will continue to be your single source of truth - remember that unless you hear it from us, it is not the truth" then it's pretty clear what's on. Particularly when government politicians, mainstream media and educational providers are exempted from this legislation - but opposition politicians are not. We already have government politicians here routinely calling out any criticism of the government as misinformation. Incredible when the whole basis of politics is misinformation and disinformation. Who would trust a politician to tell the truth? Now they want to control the narrative completely.

Singled out particularly as mis/disinformation problems are public health responses, foreign interference in elections and the undermining of democratic institutions - straight off the U.S. script sheet. What a sick joke is that?

The last three years of the so-called pandemic, the official lies and deception at all levels here and worldwide to promote it, the brutal response measures and the cancelling of all opposing viewpoints and treatments, will go down in history as one of the greatest frauds ever perpetuated on humanity. This legislation will certainly assist a future re-run.

Claims of foreign interference in elections in the U.S. have been revealed as nothing more than politically motivated home-grown lies to influence those elections.

As for the undermining of democratic institutions, well that's just what the Twitter files in the U.S. have revealed, with the government there as the instigator and censorship being conducted on an industrial scale. Just what this legislation will allow here. Already here during the 'pandemic' they set up their secret National Cabinet by-passing the elected Parliament, where politicians made plans that the people weren't allowed to know about and they wonder why people became suspicious. Undemocratic, no transparency and it's still operating despite promises to shut it down. Now they want to by-pass Parliament again with the unelected, undemocratic Voice that will be telling the elected government what to do.

Exemption for the mainstream media? After the 2016 election in the U.S. there were universal calls for people to only get their news from 'reliable' news sources, the mainstream media of course. But people everywhere were waking up and moving away from the mainstream and turning to online independent sources. The mainstream was increasingly seen as anything but reliable and in fact had a long history of not reporting the truth and again the U.S. is a prime example.

It was there way back in 1917 that President Wilson issued Executive Order 2594 creating the Committee on Public Information at the suggestion of journalist Walter Lippmann to control news during the war. Fellow journalist

Arthur Bullard suggested what the committee should do. Outright censorship was prohibited so he proposed a different approach - outright lying. "Truth and falsehood are arbitrary terms" he said. "There is nothing in experience to tell us that one is always preferable to the other. There are lifeless truths and vital lies. The force of an idea lies in it's inspirational value. It matters very little if it is true or false".

Well the war finished but the lying didn't. More than 70 years later American author Gore Vidal wrote "The corporate grip on opinion in the United States is one of the wonders of the Western World. No First World country has ever managed to eliminate so entirely from it's media all objectivity - much less dissent".

And it was all happening way before that. In 1880 at a function, New York journalist John Swinton had this to say to his fellow journalists about the 'independent press' - "The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it and what folly is this toasting an independent press? We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes".

George Orwell put it more succinctly referring to "the lords of property and their hired liars and bumsuckers".

So much so for the mainstream media that people are expected to get their 'reliable' news from. When they tell people 'fake news is a threat to our democracy' you'd have to agree and people are starting to realise where it's coming from. And the mainstream is protected by this legislation. ACMA won't be hounding them for pedalling misinformation and disinformation. It will be hounding anyone else who calls them out for it.

Enough is enough and people have had enough of the BS and we don't need to further institutionalise it with this legislation. Next they'll be raiding libraries and burning the books.

Rod Lewis,

[REDACTED]

ph. [REDACTED]

email [REDACTED]