

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

7th March 2022

Committee Secretary
Select Committee on Social Media and Online Safety
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Submission to the Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to this inquiry. **I wish my submission to be public.**

I completed TAFE's Introduction to Communication module, SES Qld's Communication certificate & have held various roles where persuasive language has been fostered. I have a DipAcc & I am experienced with the use of establishing algorithms in accounting for extrapolating selective data.

Since 2018 I have been an avid Social Media user & have been exposed recently in Covid-19 to various aspects of social media companies that concern me about the safety of users in Australia. I note I have already reported some of these findings (again lodged public) to the Royal Commission Disability & some of the paragraphs herein are word verbatim of my commission submission. However, as this affects all Australians it requires a broader scrutiny.

Thank you again for consideration,

Yours faithfully,

Tracey Hoolachan

.

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

1. In consideration of “(a) the range of online harms that may be faced by Australians on social media and other online platforms, including harmful content or harmful conduct”

1.1 The use of politically persuasive propaganda & censorship.

1.1.1 While researching the motivation behind the censorship of anti-COVID-19 material I became aware of the existence of “Trusted Partnerships” in Twitter. Dr. Shiva is an independent US politician & in his current court action he found that US Govt & State Govt players are having Twitter throw people off their sites using a portal for “Trusted Twitter Partnership” members². Twitter is applying the “The Election Influence Operations Playbook” Part 1 & 2 from the Harvard Kennedy School, aka Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs Cambridge MA which lists Twitter Legal as a Contributor. WHO, Govt & State entities can use their access to target any political issue they want & apply behavioural economics through that portal? They identify “Influencers” on a political issue & coordinate cyber terrorist attacks against them. Part 1 page 8 of “The Election Influence Operations Playbook” shows they have identified COVID-19 as an election issue. Twitter and/or its Trusted Partners have been using the portal access to remove all potential arguments & “influencers” (political opponents & in the case of COVID-19 really “independent” health advocates) they choose.

1.1.2 Twitter and/or its Trusted Partner Portal users, have been targeting innocent citizens for social & mental harm on their site for political & probably financial gain. These targeted attacks are not gentle, but coordinated teams pack attacking. In Part 2 of “The Election Influence Operations Playbook”¹, the term “target” is used 21 times & “respond” 29 times subtitled “the Mis/Disinformation Response Plan”. I have experienced the same pack attack teams using nudge behavioural economic nudges now in both Robodebt & COVID-19. Twitter is a foreign company that is using this targeting & attacking Australian citizens. While I could say affecting our elections for health may be for foreign health interests Robodebt is without a doubt a home-based issue. That means we more than probably Twitter has Trusted Partners in Australian Parliament House (APH).

1.1.3 I was on Twitter from the end of December 2017 until I was suspended permanently for posting anti-COVID-19 information just before former President Donald Trump & probably because a US Senator picked up on a tweet I did, noting that 99.98% of the world’s population, had survived Covid the super spreader by the end of December 2020. I note I submitted to Senate Covid 27 May 2020, with an estimate of deceased by Covid that per Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) was 12 out along with a lot of other medical observations now proven to be 100% validated by research - my submission was rejected. The very fact a social media could remove a person for blogging correct health information & a President for any reason means there are major problems allowing Twitter to operate in Australia in any capacity.

1.1.4 I moved from Twitter to Facebook shortly after January 2021 & though its Facebook staff are not named in the Belfer Playbook, they are using exactly the same increasing nudge targeted attacks as Twitter, also alleging keyword detection & have Trusted Partnerships operating in their domain. An example of Facebook’s “Trusted Partners” is the Public Good Projects Vaccination Demand Observatory. The Observatory was founded by Joe Smyser who is reported to have partnered with both Facebook & Google. They have been brainwashing people to take vaccines & get it from the “vial to the arm” for their Board members that include Merck Pharmaceuticals’ Director of Public Partnerships

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

Diana Acosta MPP is on their Board. They have been creating the BOTs & internet crawlers to troll people who oppose them.³

- 1.1.5 One Social Media's company targeting a person in a health issue may be coincidental, but two & private foreign entities is not. The total absence of online security to defend Aussies supports my belief that Trusted Partners are operating inside APH.
- 1.1.6 The most likely place for Trusted Partners to be is inside Behavioural Economic Team Australia (BETA) who are, in PM & Cabinet. However, there is a clear agenda of directing electoral directions. Ergo, there is a high probability there are Members/Senators, their staffers or donors, who also have Trusted Partnerships. As Twitter is a foreign company that partnership aka an allegiance, means these Member/Senator Trusted Partners are in breach of the Constitution Section 44(i). This makes them electorally ineligible as candidates federally & I would argue in light of Federal trumping State stateside also in light of section 109. In my opinion Social Media companies should be legislated to provide details of all their "Trusted Partners" in the interest of electoral transparency.
- 1.1.7 On divisive issues like e.g., Covid-19 political candidates enabled to target their political opponent's platform positions, on free social media, is an unconscionable abuse of power undermining democratic fair play. It also creates an advertising free road advantage. Even if the social media company is an Australian entity this effectively is a donation of advertising. Accordingly, any "Trusted Partnership" interest should have been, declared to the Registry by Members or Senators like any other potentially beneficial interest.

1.2 In consideration of "(b) evidence of:

1.2.1 (i) the potential impacts of online harms on the mental health and wellbeing of Australians"

1.2.1(a) In a defamation action brought by John Stossel against Facebook⁶ its lawyers argued "that Facebook's "fact-checks" are merely "protected opinion" and therefore immune from defamation". I would argue that even adults let alone impressionable children seeing a Fact Check assume it is a fact check & not an opinion. So, the fact checks themselves are "Misleading" & "Missing Context" and are not being fact checked accordingly. The fact checks aka opinions misrepresent that a safe environment is in place at Facebook. We expect newspapers to identify opinion pieces & there should be no difference online.

ZeroHedge



Opinions are not subject to defamation claims, while false assertions of fact can be subject to defamation. The quote in the above complaint is:

"The labels themselves are neither false nor defamatory; to the contrary, they constitute protected opinion."

Beyond this threshold Section 230 problem, the complaint also fails to state a claim for defamation. For one, Stossel fails to plead facts establishing that Meta acted with actual malice—which, as a public figure, he must. For another, Stossel's claims focus on the **fact-check articles written by Climate Feedback**, not the labels affixed through the Facebook platform. The labels themselves are neither false nor defamatory; to the contrary, **they constitute protected opinion**. And even if Stossel could attribute Climate Feedback's separate webpages to Meta, the challenged statements on those pages are likewise neither false nor defamatory. Any of these failures would doom Stos


1.2.1(b) Further Facebook portrays that their fact checkers are giving an "independent" "opinion". That independence though, is certainly not independence on the topic. In Covid-19 whistle blowers outed Facebook as using the same keyword targeting methods as in the

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

Belfer Centre Playbook & they were certainly targeting anti-Covid-19 bloggers & groups. Whilst Facebook & Twitter are private USA companies, they promote themselves to users of their service as being free speech platforms in line with the American constitution. It is not free speech when people are being censored because of a medical position they promote. 1.2.1(c) Whilst free speech is not enshrined in our Australian Constitution, Aussies would have a fair case to argue that it is a common law right & it is harmful to their wellbeing for it to be removed by any entity online or otherwise. Both the constitution of Australian Labor Party (freedom of expression s5(n)) & the Australian Liberal Party (free speech s2(d)(iii)) include free speech provisions. This heralds, both consider the same to be for the good wellbeing of Australians & a requirement of provision to have their registrations as political parties in Australia recognised. The constitutions are part of registrations that validate their ability to collect donations & memberships. Seems to me that an erosion of that free speech under the guise of protections would be a breach of their constitutions under which they have collected their revenue.

1.2.2 (ii) the extent to which algorithms used by social media platforms permit, increase or reduce online harms to Australians

1.2.2(a) The Belfer Centre playbook with the Twitter link concentrates on targeting keywords & a similar algorithm is been used by Facebook⁵. Both have been focussing on COVID-19. The argument keeps surfacing that this monitoring for keywords creates a safer internet. To be blunt it is garbage. Australia's internet interference was increased after the NZ terrorist. Well before now, any decent communications adviser, should've advised using keywords is just plain dumb for tracking terrorism. I can dismiss there being any valid homeland security need for this application being imposed on citizens. In general conversation, many things can set off a key word alarm e.g., bomber = bomber jacket. There are too many variables in language & then there are slang/alias terms created daily. A quick check of anti-Covid bloggers reveals already they are using urban slang synonyms to work around the obvious keywords. Instead of vaccines most are using things like jabs, jabby jabby the list of aliases is endless. Marijuana in this link references 41 aliases inclusive of "bomber".⁴ Inevitably people recognise their blogs are being fact check banned when the use certain words & use an alternative. This would make the dialogue of real terrorist harder to pick up on. Further if you get a real bomber using an alternate term in blogs e.g., plastic fantastic referring to plastic explosive instead of a credit card, how could you avoid creating an element of doubt in the court arena about text message contents for showing premeditation.



1.2.2(b) In COVID-19 on social media they have been targeting Covid related keywords. Who are the people most likely to be saying a lot in a health & welfare emergency? Obviously, Health & welfare advocates & first responders. When the Belfer Centre targeted us as

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

“influencers” they crippled Australia’s emergency network, with their pack attack cyber assaults. This was an act of terrorism in itself by the social media companies for either their own interest of those of their “Trusted Partners” & was certainly for financial profit.


1.2.2(c) Even if you can find a keyword synonym or hashtag used by a terrorist group, there would be no guarantee that all the people using that hashtag are terrorists. They may be hitching onto a popular group feed. A simple search of coronavirus on Twitter allowed many tweeters to see different hashtags. Adopting those hashtags guaranteed bloggers an increased circulation. I had a number of groups offered to let me regularly use their tags to show alliances on social media in order to get more retweets on Twitter on topics. I rarely used them unless my topic was directly relevant to their group. Using them doesn’t make you a terrorist just a smart advertiser for your voice. Rusted on group supporters & collective rusted-ons are usually easy to spot even without alliance hashtags or banners. They have almost no personal comments or observations on their retweets or posts & retweet from the same limited sources repeatedly. The object is to get the topic trending. If it is trending main stream media will pick up the topic increasing the reach. Political party rusted ons are the worse abusers of this which is why I believe political party members should be compelled to show their memberships in profiles. Suspicious accounts are those that quickly get numerous followers/friends with few posts, because they are usually all BOTs, they have a lot of pictures but no comments.

1.2.2(d) Health affects everyone. How do you identify a terrorist when everyone is affected by health issues? The simple answer is you can’t. Almost every man & his boomer (dog) on the internet would’ve used keywords like Coronavirus, COVID-19 & vaccine at some time over across 2020 & 2021. Even using a combination of words is worthless on hot topics, unless words & users are caught early before trend words attract hitch-hikers e.g., “Karen”. People adopt to family sayings, mis-sayings patterns of speech with regular exposure to words – you know, you know, you know.


1.2.2(e) How could you target keywords & then let the keyword searches indiscriminately lead you from there to the so-called misinformation spreaders? Not without an awful lot of resources & both Facebook & Twitter have cried poor for staff to do reviews even when requested. It is illogical that is what happens & not what I have observed on Facebook or Twitters. COVID-19 is health & welfare in an emergency. You would have to be thick as a brick not to realise the people likely to be posting avidly on this topic would be those that are trained to be first responders. Me & other Australians trained as first responders have been pack attacked as if we terrorist in Covid-19 for providing our trained knowledge to help. When the social media companies are foreign & their “Trusted Partners” highly likely to be Australians, I would expect this inquiry considers a recommendation, that actions are investigated under section Part 5.4 – Harming Australians sections 115.3 & 115.4 of the Criminal Code Act 1995.

1.2.2(f) Below is a fact check warning – it is a George Orwell quote. This was a test & Facebook failed. It didn’t matter what I posted in this period I was going to be blocked. Every time there is a terrorist attack, an election or a large COVID-19 protest they target a post indiscriminately & suspend me for 7days before. I am currently on a 3month Facebook suspension for no reason, but posting the science we have been told to follow on-Covid-19. My suspension will finish just after the election. This is because COVID-19 has been identified as an election issue & as a health & welfare advocate as my prior submissions to Senate can validate, I have been identified as an “influencer”. The George Orwell above holds no COVID-19 keywords, but was still targeted because Facebook did not target a keyword, but me as an individual that is deemed an “influencer”.

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety




1.2.2(g) Below is a crystal-clear example that validates my claim that in COVID-19 Facebook has been targeting individuals & not posts. I reposted exactly the same blog that another blogger posted 7hrs before me. In less than half an hour my re-blog was not just fact checked false, but harmful. This is an alleged Pfizer whistle-blower, whistle-blowing the harmful Pfizer production processes to prevent harm. My comment gets listed as a “violation history” with a note “Your post goes against Facebook’s Community Standards on misinformation that could cause physical harm” (harm to Facebook & fact checkers that is). Facebook & before it, Twitter have used exactly the same process to block & suspend people on the sites for political advantage. They build up a ridiculous amount of their opinionated fact checks, prevent your access to fair reviews of the fact checks in order to suspend & block “influencers” from their sites at key political times. They are using the methods they use to detect terrorist on people whose only crime is supporting the belief that people should have their human rights entitled fully informed medical information.



1.2.2(h) The disparity with which COVID-19 pro-vaccination bloggers are treated by both Twitter/Facebook partners is breathtaking. In the first picture below there is a video blog from the Financial Times¹²⁷. It features Bill Gates who is a financial investor in vaccines. **Bill Gates foundation donates to CEPI who funds the laboratory to check the safety of the vaccines UK¹²⁶**. The Financial Times video repost is using obvious keywords. “Vaccine” was ignored by optical character recognition in the picture. “Vaccines”, “vaccine” & “Coronavirus” was used in text. If the keyword targeting was being indiscriminately applied by a computer, I would be seeing at the very least the redirect rider to WHO on the bottom of the Gates article, but I’m not. Mr Gates must have a Trusted Partnership with Facebook. Despite numerous references that should have been picked up by a keyword scanner there is no recognition. This video really is “Misleading” & “Missing Context” information. It

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

refers to variants, but does not tell you that variants, are almost always less of a threat or the same level as the original disease. It does not tell you that COVID-19 is not a High Consequence Infectious Disease. Note my fact check underneath the picture below that correctly advises of the inconsistency in treatment of a pro & con material. It supposedly gets the rider underneath redirecting people to WHO for information about vaccines as a keyword detection. The Financial Times article should have been fact checked "Misleading" as it is "Missing Context", but it wasn't. (All vaccines may go through many checks, but it only needs one fail for the vaccine to be a killer. It is also "False", because you are not generally monitored for longer than quarter of an hour at the vaccination sites in Australia. The reported serious side effects occur days later, when if you have them, you are at home & hopefully well enough to phone an ambulance).



- 1.2.2(i) Early in COVID-19 I noticed an increase in the use of the word "momentum" in quotes, by certain people ramping up COVID-19 in Australian media. I ran my own test using Google search. First, I targeted the word "momentum". As you would logically expect it brought up a ridiculous number of references(204million) that would be too laborious to check through. Then I targeted "momentum" with "COVID-19" & "Coronavirus", but we were still in the multi-millions (30million). Finally, I targeted an individual's name first & then "momentum", "COVID-19" & "Coronavirus". The more refined search logically resulted in a reduced no. of found blogs (26.6 thousand). Screen captures on request. I just do not believe that Facebook & Twitter were not using the same algorithm principle targeting individuals first as this would reduce down their overhead costs dramatically. In criminal searches we have laws about doing searches without valid suspicion & it is logical we should expect the same indiscriminate searching online & based on evidence of a crime.
- 1.2.2(j) When you accept that Facebook, Twitter & the Trusted Partners were open to targeting health & welfare in the first instance with absolutely no consideration of the health & welfare of their users only their profit & political interests you realise these are dangerous

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

people that cannot be trusted to self-regulate. What will be the next political issue they target? Oh wait, they are currently ramping up WWII....

1.2.3 (iii) existing identity verification and age assurance policies and practices and the extent to which they are being enforced

1.2.3(a) Though I am on social media primarily for research, I have noticed on both Twitter & Facebook there is a push to get more “followers” or “friends” as a popularity status. The more people you have joining encourages your reach. On both Twitter & Facebook I research all my followers & group members own pages before I accept them. If I think the content on their own pages are obviously immature, I message them before I accept them & warn them that I use edited swear words, cover controversial health topics & that sometimes they can be visually disturbing & leave the decision to them if they stay or leave. If I think they look like a troll/BOT I will report & block. The very fact I have had to do that on both Facebook & Twitter means identity verification is poor. The very fact that Facebook is willing to make partnerships with companies like the Observatory that boast about them making BOTs (artificial intelligence social media identities) means they don’t care. It is logical Facebook’s advertising reach & ergo shares are likely to be a whole lot rosier the higher the Facebook user numbers visually are. What surprises me though is when the share value would be linked to the number of users how it has managed to remain as a public traded company & its partnerships with companies endorsing the existence of fake users in its realm hasn’t come under the scrutiny of the stock exchanges.

1.2.3(b) The more friends/followers you gather daily means you cannot have the time to be social with them all individually. Ergo are these still by definition “social” media or an interactive promotional media growth tool. Accordingly, should children be encouraged to use them at all without full adult supervision? If we were talking about child actors/workers as a western country we would expect adult permissions & supervision. At some stage impressionable children will enter every user’s online space. Expecting social media companies or individuals to keep them out is like trying to stop teen boys from seeing a Playboy magazine or teenagers using fake ids to get into clubs. You won’t stop kids getting in, or them pushing the boat & exploring when they get there.

1.2.3(c) I seriously doubt Facebook or Twitter are safe social media outlets for children. Not based on content of the majority of other tweeters & bloggers, but from their own systemic inadequacies. Consider the pictures of the fact check at 1.2.2(g). It being ridiculous aside, it took 7 hours before being re-blogged by this targeted “influencer” to get the allegedly offensive blog identified & pulled up as, “Your post goes against Facebook’s Community Standards on misinformation that could cause physical harm”. When it takes less than a minute to upload a picture with an address/ph. no., unless paedophiles were already under a radar, I am not seeing much protection from that response time.

1.2.3(d) The question that should be asked is why do social media companies need to retain your birth date. Many of the telco’s, energy companies etc usually use the date of birth to establish identities for privacy checks.

1.3 In consideration of (c) the effectiveness, take-up and impact of industry measures, including safety features, controls, protections and settings, to keep Australians, particularly children, safe online

1.3.1(a) “How do you do?”, “How are you?” For centuries it has been common practice, when we meet socially to enquire & discuss our health & well-being. For centuries those discussions have formed part of the information that has moulded our medical pathways & provided us with first hand experiences that enable us to give our fully informed consent for medical decisions. If social media companies were acting ethically & socially, they would be encouraging the same free natural social interactions online as we have offline. COVID-19

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

has shown us that is not what is happening. People online have been targeted, censored, bullied & intimidated for what is their offline right to discuss & obtain first-hand experience & knowledge of others, so that they can make their own medical choice. If that doesn't scream that the social media companies need a whole lot of regulation to ensure that pompous Cloud does not start to lead how we live back down to earth what does?

1.3.2(b) Facebook & Twitter have created a realm where they are the thought police, judge & executioner & both have relied too heavily on their own & Trusted Partners opinions. The following sections show a network structure designed to hide & protect their own skins & Trusted Partner interests. I have long been an advocate of free respectful speech, but it is clear from the following, Australia's 2 major social media discussion companies Twitter & Facebook cannot be trusted to implement their own safety features, controls, protections and settings. Nemo Jux in Causa Sua.

1.3.2(b)(i) Fact Checker Conflict of Interest - The Reuters fact check below was for an article that questioned the validity of PCR tests among other things. Promoted as an "independent" fact checker, Reuters Fact Checkers are like many of the fact checkers part of Thomas Reuters one of the largest news agencies in the world. They misuse their alleged independence & target articles from independent newspapers on social media to increase their sister entities own news market share. News agencies get billions annually in advertising from Big Pharma (\$6.58b in 2020¹¹⁴). In the fact check below, despite a WHO advice "clarifying" previous advices on incorrect settings which were clearly being misinterpreted and 2x Courts & the President of another country finding the PCR tests were rubbish for detecting COVID-19 the Facebook fact checkers Reuters opinion continued to pump out fact checks discrediting anyone questioning the accuracy of the PCR tests. It doesn't matter if an article is correct, they are financially motivated to discredit it & when they do that Facebook punishes with suspensions & defames the people who post the article. Millions of people have had PCR tests now in Australia that never got past its emergency use status. Big Pharma withdrew PCR tests from use in USA end of December 2021, because they knew they would fail as a COVID-19 mass detection test. The opinions of Fact Checkers like Reuters that have no problems concealing the worthlessness of those PCR tests that have been given to children is the jewel in the protection crown for social media.



1.3.2(b)(ii) Below is Facebook fact checkers, factcheck.org. They are more directly bankrolled by Big Pharma specifically Johnson & Johnson. This bunch upset so many with their totally biased opinionated fact checks on the efficacy & safety of the vaccines, a US Senator & bloggers fought back & fact checked their independence & raised concerns⁷. Factcheck.org released a comment on their "independence"

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety


basically saying it's all good they can be trusted, because they have independent fact checker professionals to back up their non-independent Big Pharma love fest⁸.



1.3.2(b)(iii) Of course, the fact checkers lied err correction gave an opinion. I did my own fact check on their “independent” professionals. One of the “independents” was on the CDC (who as at 18 Feb2022 were still trying to claim masks were okay for the general public) & another links back to Dr Feigl-Ding’s old stomping ground Harvard Chan School of Public Health. Ding was one of the two ex-Liberal Democrat candidate doctors I identified in my Royal Commission Part 2 (RC P2) submission as ramping up COVID-19 at the start. Dr Ding was a faculty member⁹. I'm also including another link purely to show an affiliation between Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health with John Hopkins¹⁰. John Hopkins received an enormous donation from Michael Bloomberg in 2018, just because it's his old alumni & nothing to do with him being a Liberal Democrat's runner hoping for Presidential candidacy¹¹. Michael Bloomberg is primary owner of the rag Bloomberg that I noted was leading WHO by the nose on deceased numbers across the Australia Day long weekend of 2020 as covered in RC P2. If Facebook was genuinely naïve on the blatant bias of factcheck.org at any time it could have reversed all the fact check nudges done by factcheck.org restoring the status of many groups. It never did that & has failed a social contract to uphold a duty of care in its virtual environment

1.3.2(b)(iv) User Reporting - The other line of safety defence on social media is individuals dobbling in bloggers. Unfortunately, though, political staffers have been abusing this defence by reporting people for things like bullying to get them suspended relying on Facebook’s poor provision of timely reviews to give themselves a political advantage in social media (see the example from a Labor staffer at the bottom of this . Facebook’s encouragement allowing its “Twitter Partners” to BOT attack victims & own political interests guide its “opinion” of right & wrong. So, we have had a whole lot of people warning about the extraordinarily high by normal standards side-effects of the vaccine continually being Belfer pack attacked & then reported by Big Pharma trolls & when they retaliate. Here is a fact check spam for circulating a Fair Work Australia advice that they confirmed the vaccine had side effects. You would think that this would be a message any responsible company would encourage to be promoted.

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety



1.3.2(b)(iii) Fact checker accreditation – The mostly medically unqualified Facebook’s “independent” fact checkers often boast they are accredited fact checkers of Independent International Fact Checkers Network (IFCN) to increase their presence. However, IFCN is a division of Poynter Institute which Wikipedia reports got a \$1M donation from Poynter Foundation to help it along the way with Politifact. Poynter Foundation has Board Member Craig Alexander Newmark who is a big donor for Democrats & helped Obama in his election campaign¹². You can literally file IFCN in the bin as an “independent” accrediting body. It took me less than 5 minutes to find out this information. If a company really intended to responsibly qualify an “independent” contractor to do its “independent” fact checking this information was incredibly easy to find.

False information in your group

Content shared in COVID19 - CONTROVERSY NOT CONSPIRACY contains the same information as a post checked by independent fact-checkers. It may have small differences.

shared information that's been reviewed by Faktograf.hr. We've added a [notice to the post](#) so others can see that it's false.

[Learn more](#) about how Facebook works with independent fact-checkers to stop the spread of false information.

From independent fact-checkers

FAKTOGRAFI HR [Fact checker](#)

Okuplja li America's Frontline Doctors zaista 17.000 liječnika?
Organizacija America's Frontline Doctors se pred Vrhovnim sudom SAD-a izjasnila da joj članstvo


Groups that repeatedly share false information might have their posts moved lower in News Feed so that people are less likely to see them. Facebook may also stop suggesting that people join the group. In most cases, you can avoid restrictions if you remove false information from your group as soon as you've been notified.

Doctors censored based on a reporters opinion on a medical issue. Group Administrators continually threatened for sharing any blogs that give alternative health options.

1.3.2(b)(iv) When I consider safety, I consider how a company problem solves & resolves complaints/issues raised to their attention. Reviews are almost impossible to get from the social media companies. After over a year on both Facebook & Twitter with multiple ridiculous fact checks from both like e.g., circulating spam for including a St John’s Ambulance DRABC chart in an online discussion on resuscitation. Like e.g., false fact check/opinions from a glorified reporter that disagreed with the Malone intrinsic in the mRNA vaccine invention on the vaccine’s safety & a large number of medically & scientifically qualified opinions of others, I have only been granted 3 reviews. When I

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

look at some of my fact checks it is blatantly clear that neither Facebook or Twitter have any intention of creating a safe environment, but a controlling, bullying one for their & their Belfer Trusted Partners own financial interests.



1.3.2(b)(v) It is logical that we should expect social media companies, like any other offline business open to the public to regulate health & safety within their own businesses. My observation of Twitter & Facebook is that they could not give a stuff about their users & are willing to physically & mentally endanger them at the whim of their Trusted Partners. It is therefore logical that we have every right to demand not just expect Govt to regulate a framework under which Facebook, Twitter or any other social media company operates their business. Such framework to ensure our elected political parties constitutional promise of free speech & the international human rights to same that we are a ratified international signatory to.

1.3.2(b)(vi) Whether the social media companies is as a result of Trusted Partners financial/political influence is impossible to identify. Without seeing who the Trusted Partners are it will be impossible to determine how to regulate & how much regulation is needed for the social media companies.

1.4 In consideration of (e) the transparency and accountability required of social media platforms and online technology companies regarding online harms experienced by their Australians users

1.4.1 In 1.3 I have outlined a pretty clear case that both Twitter & Facebook are actively endorsing the harm of their users by applying the Belfer Centre Playbook pack attack nudge strategies. If they are willing to cyber assault health & welfare advocates for the interest of their Trusted Partners there are major not minor problems. They are creating online harm themselves.


1.4.2(a) I am the Administrator of a public group on Facebook for Covid-19. I have had numerous false fact checks now for blogging medical experts. Even when the data & in some cases the Tribunals/Courts as shown in the PCR instance above, prove the content of my blog was correct these fact checks are never removed from my groups record. Of the 3 reviews I have had, 2 have been them unprompted apologising to me for getting it wrong.

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety


On both of these 2 occasions, they still left me on suspension, because while there, my group that collates information of anti-Covid Court interest, is not transparent to the public. Let me by very clear Facebook has been actively targeting & cyber attacking health & welfare people using “nudges” to remove & distort the transparency of health data in a health emergency. While on suspensions & restrictions, they brag that they disrespect you by putting you at the back of the Facebook bus & shadowing ban you. Like with Twitter the reviews are window dressing for Govt oversight.

1.4.2(b) At the bottom of my submission, you can see what a targeted “influencer” account looks like. I am currently being defamed by Facebook as a Restricted account for breaching Facebook community standards meriting the harshest 3month suspension. This timing is just unsurprisingly enough, to make sure the real health information on COVID-19 doesn’t get out before the upcoming Federal election. It will finish 22 May 2022 & as this is my second back-to-back suspension, they have probably already arranged my next. So, what did this Facebook villain do to merit my 3month suspension. There are only 2 links on my rap sheet page. The first is from Michael Yeadon former chief scientist & VP of the allergy & respiratory research division of Pfizer who obviously knows about correct laboratory testing procedures & is discussing same. The other is Dr Ryan Cole CEO/Medical Director of Cole Diagnostics, Mayo Clinic trained Board Certified Pathologist. He is Board Certified in anatomic and clinical pathology & was discussing Vitamin D deficiency & COVID-19. Blogging their qualified medical opinions is what Facebook’s opinionated fact checkers deem as spreading misinformation. The Fact Checkers are too ashamed to include the links to the other blogs, but I have included within this submission negative fact checks for sharing everything from St John Ambulance resuscitation charts to George Orwell & FWA rulings. They are reflective of the other rubbish fact checks.

1.4.3 When social media rarely give reviews the first step in any accountability, the chances that the level of harm done by them will ever be transparently seen is slim. I will never get my status reviewed as long as Facebook is allowed to self-regulate. If people can actually ever find my group that has been Restricted & placed at the back of Facebook’s bus for telling people the truth, all they can see are multiple false claims that appear to be from “independent” fact checkers but really are just as admitted in Court an “opinion” that they use to defame me as spreading false misinformation. I am one of many. This is the social media company transparently harming me & my reputation. What has the Australian Govt & Opposition done...nothing but encourage it.



Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety



1.4.4 It should not be overlooked that it is not just individuals that are affected by social media's opinionated suspensions. Australian businesses that rely on building a network of clients use the social media for promotion. When for e.g., Facebook suspends these accounts they affect not just the reputation of the individual but also the business.

1.5 In consideration of **(f) the collection and use of relevant data by industry in a safe, private and secure manner**

1.5.1 There is nowhere safe from data collection/theft online & that includes the data collected by the Australian Govt.

1.6 In consideration of **(g) actions being pursued by the Government to keep Australians safe online**

1.6.1(a) I am aware that some Govts are considering legislation making it criminal to spread misinformation online. Consider how COVID-19 misinformation has been dealt with, cyber attacking & assaulting the little people whose "opinions" are now scientifically proven to be fact. We vote for Govt Representatives to represent our opinions not their own. It is for us to decide what is misinformation & not politicians or social media. Making it a crime to have those various "opinions" to censor our free speech to voice those opinions & arrest us for having them is not democracy & it is not for our safety, but to punitively control us. It is overstepping the mark.

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

<div> <div> 25 Jan 2022 You can't take part in groups for 30 days </div> <div> Why was this restriction removed? We reviewed the posts that led to this restriction again. Some of them did follow our Community Standards. </div> <div> <div> Tracey Hoolachan You shared this in Sky News Australia CLOSED · 25 Jan 2022 </div> <div> <p>@[100058939551600:2048:Far Ken Oath] To be clear FK-O any idiot CAN be vaccinated the question is why would you want to be vaccinated when natural immunity is now proven better. Why would...</p> <p> Bullying</p> </div> </div> <div> <div> Tracey Hoolachan You shared this on Facebook CLOSED · 14 Jun 2021 </div> <div> <p>The post repeats false information about COVID-19 that goes against our Community Standards.</p> <p>This content is no longer available.</p> </div> </div> </div>		<p>Ken Oath (FK-O for short) is identified as a female by Facebook but portrays herself as a male post digger from NZ but lives in Mexico. She/He has few comments or photos, no Facebook friends has all the feel of a BOT. After insulting me numerous times because I politely was able to answer its questions proving there was a poor case for vaccines this BOT reported me for bullying based on this comment answering its question. Despite me getting this review & winning Facebook still had me restricted for 7 days from posting & this BOT is still alive on Facebook</p>
<div> <div> 25 Jan 2022 You couldn't post or comment for 7 days </div> <div> Why was this restriction removed? We reviewed the posts that led to this restriction again. Some of them did follow our Community Standards. </div> <div> <div> Tracey Hoolachan You shared this in Sky News Australia CLOSED · 25 Jan 2022 </div> <div> <p>@[100058939551600:2048:Far Ken Oath] To be clear FK-O any idiot CAN be vaccinated the question is why would you want to be vaccinated when natural immunity is now proven better. Why would...</p> <p> Bullying</p> </div> </div> <div> <div> Tracey Hoolachan You shared this on Facebook CLOSED · 14 Jun 2021 </div> <div> <p>The post repeats false information about COVID-19 that goes against our Community Standards.</p> <p>This content is no longer available.</p> </div> </div> </div>		<div> <div> Restrictions Your group has been restricted because it didn't follow our Community Standards. We know we're not always right, so if you think that we've got something wrong, you can let us know by disagreeing with our decision. In some cases, you can get the restriction removed by disagreeing with a takedown or removing misinformation. </div> <div> Your group's distribution has been reduced due to false information </div> </div>
Ref	Links	
1	https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/IO%20Playbook%202%20Part%202.pdf	
2	https://www.facebook.com/212669305456262/videos/472309483995838	
3	https://www.sott.net/article/452606-An-army-of-Big-Biotech-companies-is-using-psych-tactics-to-create-vaccine-demand?fbclid=IwAR3YBwWDZAGJEWAPu6tDMYz7hqqXfdldoL3nHJ52VB0OAMrPdJOsGrRtfQ	
4	https://casapalmera.com/blog/nicknames-street-names-and-slang-for-marijuana/	
5	https://www.mrctv.org/blog/whistleblowers-tell-project-veritas-facebooks-effort-to-secretly-censor-vax-concerns	
6	https://www.zerohedge.com/political/stunning-facebook-court-filing-admits-fact-checks-are-just-matter-opinion	
7	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=44B-OJcOXxc	
8	https://www.factcheck.org/2021/04/scicheck-and-our-committment-to-transparency/	
9	https://theforum.sph.harvard.edu/expert.../eric-feigl-ding/	

Submission: - Tracey Hoolachan to Inquiry on Social Media and Online Safety

10	https://www.jhsph.edu/.../dire.../profile/1944/sara-n-bleich
11	https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/18/us/michael-bloomberg-johns-hopkins-donation.html
12	https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Craig_Newmark