

It seems to me that while it is obvious that both 'mis' and 'dis'-information have the potential to muddy the waters of truth; attempts to fix the issue run into more problems than they fix. As soon as one particular group in society [and particularly the government] assumes the right of 'knowledge' while carrying with it the power to enforce this knowledge by ridding society of other voices- we are not far from suppressing free speech and ushering in an Orwellian state of affairs.

The beauty of democracy is that free speech is a key foundational idea that makes democracy work so powerfully. I know that in Australia my personal views are not held by everyone AND I am free to not only hold those views but also share them robustly with others- as they are to share their counter thoughts to my way of thinking. This is not only in regard to discussions on an existential level, where truth along with mis and dis information about the big picture issues are lived out, but also in the subtle practical affairs of life like vaccine mandates and climate change. In these it is obvious that truth is not fully known by anyone! So, there is danger in defining it and in so doing painting other views as pariah voices.

The government must never mandate its take on truth and in so doing define what is mis or dis-information. Forget this legislation! Fake news becomes obvious and I think increasingly, people distance themselves from falsehood and are drawn to truth. If you want more people to come toward your version of truth, then promote it clearly, with an open-handed communicative style and people will respond. If you mandate your version of truth, you will inevitably trap people- locking them in silence... but you won't change their mind.

Sincerely

AKA Winston Smith

(This kind of legislation keeps people behind walls of fear of expressing what's inside them)