

The continual expansion of the eSafety Commission's powers beyond the scope of sex abuse image removal is disgusting. The eSafety Commission's powers are already being abused to censor opinions, views and footage that it is in the interest of the Australian public to see.

The eSafety Commission recently demanded X remove Billboard Chris' tweet informing the Australian public of a WHO trans health consultant's [REDACTED] [REDACTED] On top of that, he [REDACTED] in the interest of assisting the public's true understanding of the story, as opposed to the current journalistic trend of sex obfuscation, and thus committed the 'crime of misgendering,' a ridiculous notion that the people of Australia are strongly fighting back against. 'Hate speech' and 'offence' are being weaponised to mean 'views that go against the orthodoxy of the government.' An expansion of the eSafety Commission's powers might see the phrase [REDACTED] categorised as 'offensive hate speech' and removed from the internet with fines imposed, however it is an important phrase around which many women are organising politically to fight for their sex-based rights. This is the true goal of the eSafety Commissions expansion of powers. To chill free public discourse through fear and thus limit the public's true understanding of political and cultural issues.

The NSW Police Commissioner recently said that, "Police will be the source of truth," and I assume the government is included in that by extension, but that is a nightmare scenario given the findings of multiple royal commissions that prove the police and government must never be our one source of truth. They are too corrupt and, to put it simply: they lie!

The concept of 'violent content' has already been weaponised by the eSafety Commission to attempt to remove video footage of a piece of Australia's history. The government talks a big game about misinformation and disinformation while taking away the very content we use to combat those things. When others say, "It was a member of his own congregation, a Christian, that stabbed Mar Mari Emmanuel," we have the video footage proving that that is a lie.

Much like the eSafety Commission's views on the Priest's stabbing, the Chinese government thought images of a man in front of tanks in Tienanmen Square was violent inciting content too. They also thought it best removed in the interests of social cohesion. I am sure the Australian public do not think the Chinese government's views on censorship are ones we want to emulate, yet that is the path the eSafety Commission is taking.

Without images and video footage of events, we are left with only the word of the government as to what happened or, perhaps the government of the day may say nothing happened at all. Are war pictures to be removed by the eSafety Commission next? They are violent too. When war images are all gone the question will be, "What atrocities? The only images of bad things are of what the enemy did." Will the eSafety Commission remove KKK lynching images next? Then we can all breathe a sigh of relief saying, "What racism? Nobody got hanged. Where's your proof?"

I am reminded of another government that once used the safety of its people as an excuse to censor dissenting opinions and remove the public's access to the truth.

[REDACTED]
"For your safety!"

Let's not go down that path. Abolish the eSafety Commission.