CommonSense

Paul Jacob

The California Non-Consensus

Februrary 3, 2023

A judge has given California doctors a reprieve from an anti-medical-speech law produced by lawmakers and Governor Newsom. The judge has blocked the law until a lawsuit challenging it on First Amendment grounds can be resolved.

AB 2098 says that it "shall constitute unprofessional conduct" for doctors to spread "false or misleading information" about the COVID-19 virus, how to prevent and treat it, and the efficacy of alleged vaccines. (By using the word "alleged," I've lost my medical license right there.)

> ***As Judge William Shubb notes, "COVID-19 is a quickly evolving area of science that in many aspects eludes consensus."***

What constitutes "misinformation"?

Government-empowered medical boards would make these judgments in light of "contemporary scientific consensus."

Why is "scientific consensus" so sacred? Does it never err? Aren't facts and logic, which discourse helps to establish and convey, the proper arbiters, not a designated "consensus"? How does one actually arrive at a "scientific consensus" of any legitimate value? By divine revelation?

And if there are doctors, scientists and other researchers who dissent, especially in great number, doesn't that make "consensus" entirely mythical, non-existent? The word misapplied?

Of course, despite the issuance of government-approved dogmas and revised dogmas about these matters, every aspect of the pandemic has been the subject of intensive investigation and controversy for over three years.

As Judge William Shubb notes, "COVID-19 is a quickly evolving area of science that in many aspects eludes consensus."

It's a shame Shubb couldn't simply have shut down the law permanently. Do we really need a lengthy legal process while California doctors wait to learn whether they may still fully participate in professional discussions?

But it seems that the agents of repression must have their day in court too.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.