

By any means necessary the voice of the people must be silenced. Shutting down freedom of speech has become a global initiative on an industrial scale. Shut down, censored, shadow banned, fined, imprisoned and blacklisted for words. This is where the world is and the eSafety Commissioner is playing her part in this globalist agenda. Back in Australia, not satisfied with a large percentage of the over 23,000 submissions to the introduction of the Misinformation Disinformation Bill being critical of the Bill, which passed (of course), we now see another tyrannical overreach of government by extending the powers of the eSafety Commissioner. How very convenient.

We know that since 2015, eSafety has grown from 37 staff to 125, and now has an annual budget of AU \$42.5 million. Its remit encompasses a broad range of online harms, including child sexploitation, image-based abuse, cyber bullying, adult cyber abuse, and violent and terrorist content. eSafety also has an educational role, providing resources and running programs geared towards harm prevention. On the surface, all very laudable objectives.

eSafety is led by the Commissioner, Julie Inman Grant, who has been at the helm of the Australian Government agency since 2017, and is incidentally supported by both major political parties.

The critical issue is that the eSafety Commissioner's powers are discretionary under the *Online Safety Act 2021* (OSA, [Section 88](#)), which leaves the potential for bias in its application. That bias tends to swing in favour of whatever it is that the eSafety Commissioner deems relevant at the time. Of particular note is gender ideology, with a growing number of gender-critical posts on social media being censored due to removal notices issued by the eSafety Commissioner, including nonsense suggesting that men can't breastfeed.

Additionally, Inman Grant's World Economic Forum-aligned globalist sensibilities (including her [infamous assertion](#) that free speech online is a right that needs to be "recalibrated") has drawn criticism across the Internet since she started appearing regularly on the WEF talkfest

circuit several years ago. It is clear that there is a fundamental misunderstanding of the principle of freedom of speech by the eSafety Commissioner and subsequently the bureaucracy that she reins over. Freedom of speech must include the freedom to articulate by any means any idea or thought, including the right to offend. Other laws are in place to deal with those who overstep such freedoms, including defamation, racial vilification laws etc.

The role of the eSafety Commissioner must be above politics and follow the law, not the current fashion, nor the current politics of the day. Misused, the powers of the eSafety Commissioner enable some of the most draconian crackdowns of speech on the planet. Rather than protecting the public, the eSafety Commissioner has engaged in removing material for political purposes. People who have been genuinely subject to abuse have **not** been protected, while her office has waged political crusades. The result has been to undermine Australian democracy and damage Australia's international reputation.

Until now the approach by the eSafety Commissioner is authoritarian. The [Electronic Frontier Foundation](#) has said that the injunction she sought "set[s] a dangerous precedent that could legitimise practices of authoritarian governments, which do not fully value the rights to freedom of speech and access to information."

A recent stouch between eSafety and X over violent footage of a non-fatal church stabbing, deemed a terror incident, displayed another sort of overreach - in this case, geographical. eSafety obtained a temporary injunction in an effort to force X to remove the footage globally, arguing that geo-blocking the footage did not go far enough to prevent Australians with VPNs from viewing the content. However, a judge refused to extend the injunction, determining that eSafety's attempt to censor content outside its jurisdiction was 'not reasonable.' Shortly after, eSafety dropped the case against X.

It should be noted that while Elon Musk (CEO of X) publicly criticised the eSafety Commissioner and her agency, as she does regularly of him and X, he did not call for or condone harassment, doxxing or

violence towards her. It should also be noted that eSafety Commissioner has not publicly acknowledged her role in drawing a high volume of criticism towards herself personally, and towards her office.

The eSafety Commissioner's repeated jabs at Musk have been a point of contention since he took ownership of the social media platform, formerly Twitter, in 2022. Inman Grant worked at Twitter before Musk's ownership, and she has expressed strong disapproval for his cuts to the platform's trust and safety teams in particular. In the XCorp proceedings, she has also been alleged to exceed her jurisdiction, in other words, purport to exercise legal powers she does not have.

This level of corrupt overreach in the hands of one person in the position of eSafety Commissioner must not be tolerated by the Australian people. Under the powers the eCommissioner already has, she has wielded dangerous decisions legitimately or illegitimately to condemn individuals, businesses, and indeed corporations for breaches of the OSA on whims or fashion or whatever is front of mind. This sets a dangerous precedent for unelected bureaucrats to control the freedoms of the population for their own personal or political agendas. This must stop and the current eSafety Commissioner must resign immediately.

