

haveyoursay@acma.gov.au.

24 February 2020

Thank you for this opportunity to make this submission on “Impartiality and commercial influence in broadcast news”.

I will submit a response to each of the points raised where ACMA seeks feedback.

Thesis: Australia’s broadcast news system is unconstitutionally controlled by foreign ideology to further commercial interests of foreign oligarchs.

1. Elements of impartiality

Considering the various elements of impartiality, such as balance, fairness, and diversity of viewpoints, do any of the elements deserve greater regulatory emphasis in the current media environment?

‘Impartiality’ is a cognitive impossibility.

All we can do is develop a code of ethics that is consistent with the framework of our supreme law. There is no other appropriate way to minimise bias and serve the people. Australia’s supreme law is the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution 1901, plus the approved referenda by the people.

In the preamble to the Constitution, you will see the phrase “Almighty God”. Literature published by Quick and Garran (the publishers of the Constitution) is available about the meaning of these two words, and the global context for the law. There are also thousands of credible literary texts dedicated to the concept of the Christian moral framework that informs western law, including Australian law. By ‘credible’, I mean literary texts that have not been infected with historical revisionism that subverts European culture and the true concept of Christianity.

The role of broadcasters must operate within the context of the supreme law.

At this time, no commercial or State-controlled broadcaster operates within the law’s framework.

Broadcasters are obsessed with anti-Christian themes and activism.

These anti-Christian themes include multiculturalism, regressive liberalism, feminazi dogma, Marxist dogma, lobby group dogma, unequal criticisms of religions across the spectrum, and thousands of other messages that violate the respect that the citizenry deserve under the supposed protections of the Constitution.

We live at a time now where those who abide by the Constitution, and bring the message to the community about the obvious subversion of the constitution by politicians and mainstream media activism, are terrorized by broadcasters. Law-abiding citizens have been thrown off panel discussions, ridiculed out of the political system, deplatformed, unpersoned, and Christian symbols attacked. These attacks are championed by broadcasters, who use phrases in their headlines like: “far right extremist”, and “white supremacist” and “racist” and “sexist” and “toxic masculinity” and “Islamophobe” and “homophobe” and other such bumphukkery from the Pedo-Feminist Manifesto.

These headlines are informed by lies, and are an incitement to violence upon law-abiding citizens.

It is not a far right position to abide by the law.

This clickbait industry around white supremacy, racism, Islamophobia, and other fabricated concepts, are profiteering anti-constitutional industries that originate from foreign ideology and expressly seek to dehumanize working class Australians. Further, broadcasters are complicit in Australia’s decision to shut down servers that host alternative news platforms where law-abiding Australians flee because they are banned from participating in public discourse.

It gets even worse.

The fact that a radical move to appoint a Chairman to the State Broadcasting Service, who holds no cultural connection to the Australian identity or allegiance to the constitution, without the slightest resistance to this appointment, and not even any resistance after he launched the Islamic Council, is proof of how we've normalised unlawful employment practices in political institutions that are supposed to be the arena for law-abiding Australians.

Whether commercial or State-owned, broadcasters have become institutions hell-bent on overthrowing the Constitution. They are filled with journalists who graduate from arts degrees fed to them by subversive professors, and you would be hard-pressed to find any journalist in the mainstream who supports our law the way it is supposed to be supported. He or she would be vilified, just like all others are vilified by the press when a Christian dares to follow the law.

And, so, while journalists are busy inciting violence upon citizens with their sensationalist headlines, ACMA launches an embarrassing question about 'impartiality'. That is like asking a question about cobwebs on a front door while the whole house is on fire.

To the question about what deserves greater regulatory emphasis: journalists require a classical education on Christianity that is free from the subversive untruths about its history, a thorough education on the Constitution by appropriately qualified scholars, and they need to be prosecuted for headlines that incite violence upon law-abiding Australians.

2. Regulatory approaches

Is a common understanding of, and consistent regulatory approach to, impartiality desirable or feasible? What principles and definitions would enable consistency across different sectors or platforms?

A common understanding and consistent regulatory approach is desirable and feasible.

That common unified understanding is the Christian moral framework. No theft, no killing, no prioritizing foreign ideology, this is a basic start to the moral framework. Broadcasters need to revisit their role too, part of which is to hold politicians accountable to the Constitution. At present, only independent journalists (also banned incidentally) are shedding light on the persistent acts of theft, murder, the sale of the country, and foreign ideology controlling this nation's public discourse under the guise of human rights.

It is the independent journalists, those with no money and no support, who bring the appropriate news about the many acts of treason by politicians. The biggest fraud perpetrated on the Australian people is usury, which is unlawful foreign anti-Christian State-endorsed theft, and no mainstream broadcaster adequately reports upon this fraud.

It should be front page headlines every day.

Mainstream broadcasters need to be prosecuted for dereliction of duty.

Terms and phrases like 'multiculturalism', 'diversity', 'tolerance', 'inclusion', 'Islamophobia', 'white supremacism', 'racism', 'sexism', 'toxic masculinity', 'hate crimes' are attacks on the Australian Constitution, and therefore an attack on Australian identity. These are foreign definitions launched by foreign ideologues who are embraced by mainstream broadcasters.

In a context where over 90% of the world is non-European, broadcasters continue to use these bogus terms in their headlines to terrorize Australians into abandoning their minority European culture. Sounds like a war crime to me.

Terms and phrases like 'unity', 'Australian sovereignty', 'Christian principles', 'rule of law', 'Australian identity' are to be the default position given these are consistent with our law, and literature to clarify these concepts can be found in areas where the foreign terror virus is absent, if you can still find such an area with all the anti-European censorship going on.

To what extent should the regulatory approach distinguish between news and current affairs?

News is factual.

For example: "This happened at this place to Australians." / "The penalty for treason can be found on our dedicated <quote site>" / "Under the Constitution, Section 116 does not over-ride Section 44".

There is no sensationalism, no bias, no preferred positioning to get clicks. Commercial outlets will need to find a strategy to meet their profitable outcomes without the gross tactics that insult and compromise the mental health of the population.

Current Affairs programs blatantly boast how "progressive" they are. The term "progressive" is code for subverting the Constitution, and so the bias is already obvious. "Progressive" activists are obsessed with theft, kiddy fiddling, their genitals, pornography, drugs and whatever else keeps them distracted from building a strong mind and body.

Also, Current Affairs programs are infested with pedo-feminists who reject supporting their own European men, their own stock, to instead open their legs for the foreign patriarchy whose ideology endorses pedo and other anti-Christ activities. They pretend through their reporting that the pedo is a Christian problem, when pedos are actually anti-Christian degenerates desperate to find children in the church. You will never find a pedo-feminist reporting in a Current Affairs program reporting on the foreign grooming gangs however, because that would be insensitive to the men whose culture endorses ripping apart a five year old's vaj.

There are no Christian Australians in Current Affairs programs, nor even Australians who support the law, this is obvious, because they're not welcome in "progressive" organisations and the reporting reflects their absence.

The regulatory approach should be one that penalizes news and current affairs programs that do not operate within a code of ethics that is consistent with the supreme law.

How should the distinction between factual material and commentary or analysis be applied to hybrid programs that include, for example, news updates followed by panel-based discussions? How can this distinction be made clear to viewers?

The British and the subsequent Australian culture that emerged built a first world nation for goodness sakes, I think Australians are smart enough to know the difference between factual information and bias.

The fact that Australians, and many immigrants, have flocked to alternative sites for news because they recognize the attacks is proof.

What transparency measures might help to effectively and appropriately safeguard the impartiality of news? What are the practical implications of strengthening transparency measures?

All broadcasters are to explicitly highlight their investments, their activism adventures, the kickbacks they receive from lobby groups, the fake philanthropy and charities that they engage in and political donations. For the State-controlled broadcasters, transparency around the makeup of the journalists and their biographies would be appropriate. This helps to inform Australians of the extent of foreign ideology infiltrating the broadcasting system. Currently, Australians go to great lengths to research this information themselves and not enough information is available.

We are currently unable to rely on Wikipedo to offer accurate information.

3. Other models and additional principles

Are there alternative or overseas approaches to impartiality which may provide better community safeguards?

All European countries face the same issue. Western broadcasters globally are occupied by foreign forces thanks to treasonous politicians and so violations to their own constitutions occur throughout the 24-hour news cycle. For example, major broadcasters do not adequately report on the anti-Macron protests, the British do not adequately report on the foreign grooming gangs in British cities, major broadcasters do not adequately report on the rape epidemic in Sweden. Not even Australian broadcasters are reporting these issues, we have had to rely on independent journalists and content creators to bring us the facts about the political establishment's attacks on its own citizenry, a citizenry they are legally obligated to protect and preserve. Even Big Tech manipulates their algorithms to suppress this news at the demands by anti-Christian lobby groups.

Only today I received a notification that more independent journalists are throttled by Big Tech. Much of the activism to destroy independent journalists is from the mainstream broadcasting system.

Are there other principles or considerations not included in this paper that the ACMA should have regard to in its consideration of regulating impartiality in news broadcasting?

Yes.

Please place appropriate passages of the Constitution on your website in relation to broadcasting, and revisit the code of ethics to properly serve the Australian people.

Thank you for your time.

Deanna F