Response to No., 2023 Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and disinformation"

Initially the thought of wanting to combat misinformation could be viewed idealistically as a positive. If one trusted the bodies incorporating this legislation. Where it falls short is:

Mainstream distrust of our current media because of

- 1. Bias
- 2. Obvious Censorship of information as had been seen time and time again.

Opposing information is needed on which to base good sound decisions. i.e. Censorship as seen around covid vaccinations has angered even the most conservative and trusting of people.

Finding ways to further censor information will lead to further erosion in trust.

By the definition: "excluded content for misinformation purposes...." covers our government, bodies recognized by foreign government, government approved education, and news medias.

I don't think I need to elucidate what image this conjures up for people who are familiar with history.

What would be the punishment handed out to these excluded bodies if they have been found to have censored information that turned out to be correct or true in nature? What if it is found that censoring the information turns out to harm people in the long run? What if it is found that the government, education system or foreign government bodies knew this to be the case?

For a misinformation program to be rolled out and seen as fair, it MUST have added to the exclusion list information from professionals and researchers. It MUST allow viewpoints that counter the mainstream viewpoints. In science we would not get anywhere if discourse contrary to what is known is not allowed.

Perhaps individuals, instead of being vilified for having a different view, could have stated that this is their "personal opinion" rather than believed as outright truth.

Finally, who gets to identify harm? What individual or group. It is well know that what is good for one group is harmful to another. So, do we decide on the greatest good for the greatest number as in ethics? Or is it the greatest good for corporations? Or those in power?