

1. [Have your say](#)
2. Statutory Review of the Online Safety Act 2021

Statutory Review of the Online Safety Act 2021

The Problem

We have taken our freedoms for granted and neglected the need to maintain them, allowing unethical factions to gain influence.

The issue we're confronting in Australia and globally is an unprecedented level of corruption within our governments. Power-hungry individuals, similar to those found in North Korea, China, and Iran, have managed to infiltrate governments worldwide.

We've grown lazy and complacent, resulting in a government that fails to represent our interests. Many government officials now seem incapable of independent thought, merely following instructions from unelected entities.

Many of these individuals in our government simply follow orders due to pressure from powerful figures who control global operations. They are often constrained by financial obligations, which leave them too afraid to question or hold others accountable within our governmental structures.

Tactics

The strategy of these malevolent individuals is straightforward: they claim that an idea is for the greater good, prompting people to accept these ideas unquestioningly. However, their actions primarily serve their own agendas rather than the interests of the people.

They disguise their motives as beneficial for the populace, such as the creation of an e-safety commissioner to ensure a "safe" internet. Yet, this approach empowers the

government to become the arbiter of truth and silence any debate – eerily reminiscent of methods used by communist regimes.

Let's consider the term 'misinformation'. Harvard-trained doctors were censored under this label. What was deemed misinformation in 2020 is now acknowledged as fact four years later. This shift occurred because open debate was stifled during those years, but the truth eventually emerged as inconsistencies became apparent. It was never misinformation; rather, it was inconvenient truths challenging the agendas of those seeking power.

This is the crux of the issue: when debate is suppressed, truth is also suppressed. Strategically, 'misinformation' is a tool used to discredit inconvenient truths because they undermine plans. These entities rely on public belief in their falsehoods to advance their agendas and cannot afford public scrutiny or debate.

‘Harms’

Now we're confronted with the term 'harms.' Once again this appears to be a deliberate inversion tactic used to stifle debate. It is rational and reasonable to oppose ideas such as men breastfeeding, children being taught they are a different sex in schools and undergoing medical procedures, or men using women's facilities or competing in women's sports. Silencing discussions on these crucial issues is both irrational and detrimental.

Engaging in such debates is not only constructive but essential. Furthermore, engaging in such debates is not harmful; what's harmful is being unable to discuss them and the ideology itself. We risk inflicting both psychological and physical harm on children in a world that appears to have lost its way.

Now those who propagate and endorse this concerning, cult-like ideology want to silence the debate on it? They appoint figures like eSafety Commissioner Julie Inman Grant, paying her an exorbitant salary of 400K, which appears to cloud her judgment and priorities, dismissing ethics and moral principles.

Democratic Principals

The contest of ideas is essential for allowing the best concepts to prevail. This process ensures that sanity and reason can emerge, as it enables people to engage in meaningful debate where the truth naturally rises to prominence.

In a democracy, the essence lies in vigorous debate. Hence, it is highly concerning when the government assumes the role of arbiter of truth. Granting one person or a select group within the government the authority to define truth opens the door to potential corruption and undue influence. It becomes imperative to question whether such entities are truly impartial.

Julie Inman Grant has a dedicated page on the World Economic Forum (WEF) website. The WEF primarily serves the interests of billionaires, not the general populace. Klaus Schwab himself has publicly declared the WEF's intention to stifle debate, ensuring their agendas proceed unchecked by government scrutiny or public discourse. These tactics aim to silence any opposing voices, preventing the truth from ever being exposed through open debate.

By controlling permissible thought and expression, the government risks becoming the thought police. Suppressing debate does not reflect the actions of a democratic government but rather those of a regime, despite public claims of democracy. A true democracy fosters open debate and the exchange of ideas across a wide spectrum, rather than limiting discussions to topics approved by the government, which can lead to corruption through undue influence.

In a democracy, the government should serve as a facilitator of dialogue, not as the arbiter of acceptable opinions. It has a responsibility to represent the diverse array of opinions held by its citizens. This includes views that may challenge or oppose the prevailing ideology.

Accountability

To whom is the government accountable? The people. Citizens cannot hold their government accountable if they are silenced, if debate is stifled. This is the tactic being employed here. The government avoids accountability because it does not truly represent the interests of the people; instead, it follows directives from unelected entities.

A genuinely democratic society must vehemently reject any suppression of debate, any attempts to gag opposing voices. The cornerstone of democracy lies in upholding the unrestricted exchange of ideas and fostering robust debate. It is through open dialogue, where diverse perspectives can be freely expressed and critically examined, that societies can make informed decisions and progress collectively.

Any endeavour to stifle this exchange under the guise of 'safety' or any other pretext not only undermines democratic principles but also risks eroding trust in governmental institutions.

Upholding the integrity of democratic values requires an unwavering commitment to protecting the rights of individuals to voice their opinions and hold their leaders accountable. Only by ensuring an environment where ideas can clash and evolve freely can a society truly flourish and advance.

Conclusion

Democracy cannot thrive under the suppression of debate, exemplified by the presence of the e-safety commissioner. Such actions undermine and dismantle democracy itself.

It is unequivocal that Julie's powers should not be expanded; such an expansion would only amplify the undue influence of the corrupt, unelected entities she represents. The government's attempt to stifle debate under the guise of 'safety' sets a dangerous precedent, one that diminishes accountability.

To address the pervasive corruption and infiltration within our government, the role of the e-safety commissioner and the entire department must be dissolved. Our elected representatives must serve the interests of the people in their free expression, not shadowy unelected forces behind closed doors.