

STEVE KIRSCH

2 and 2 = 4 : But Also 3! - And 5!?

2435 LB

Censorship is bad – no, wait, it's good – oh, hold on, what's the right answer?

- 1 In George Orwell's novel 1984, there is a scene involving a "debate" about whether two and two always make four. The scene continues with a further "debate" about whether O'Brien is holding up four fingers – or five.

This scene, in many ways, encapsulates the novel. It's not enough for Winston Smith, the protagonist, to SAY O'Brien is holding up 4 fingers when really, he's holding up 5. Smith has to BELIEVE it. In a recent interview a psychologist shows us "goodthink" – which is thinking 'in-line' with the determined *right* narrative. How odd and worrying at the same time!



- 2 Assembly Bill No 2098, called Physicians and Surgeons: Unprofessional Conduct has been passed into law in California, oddly. I say oddly, because the Medical Board and the Osteopathic Medical Board of California were already required by law to take action against any doctor charged with unprofessional conduct. As would be expected.

The [California Legislative Bill No 2098](#) defines the "dissemination of misinformation or disinformation" related to SARS-CoV-2 or Covid-19 as "unprofessional conduct." It doesn't relate to any other illness or condition – just Covid-19.

Why would such a bill be considered necessary in the USA, where doctors are already regulated?

As a California Globe article, [Gov Newsom Signs Bill to Censor CA Doctors Accused of 'Spreading COVID Misinformation'](#), says, it's impossible to imagine doctors being similarly censored over cancer treatments or heart ailments.

"Unprofessional conduct" includes advocating for early treatment with off-label drugs for Covid-19 and asking questions about Covid vaccine safety. The first of these *crimes* involves doctors treating patients using their informed clinical judgement.

The second *crime* involves doctors ensuring that medical treatments are safe.

Both of these *crimes* are aspects of doctors caring for their patients and complying with the Hippocratic Oath.

Why would the state of California wish to interfere with that?

- 3 This new bill reminds me of a long-ago boyfriend who always hesitated before he laughed at anything funny. Why the delay? He needed to make sure that it was funny – he didn't want to get it wrong.

The link between getting a second opinion on humour and doctors in California having to get a second – or even a first – opinion from the state before they treat patients, is a recent event. It was a case of someone clearly wishing they'd looked up the *goodthink* answer before they answered.

A clinical psychologist in California took part in an interview about whether the state should have control over the doctor/patient relationship.

Her response was - a definite NO.

Except that, a few minutes later, it was an equally definite YES.

In the interview, she described a doctor losing their licence for giving advice or treatment to a patient based on their own clinical judgement, rather than "the medical consensus," as *a pretty serious consequence of saying your clinical or medical opinion*.

She said that it wasn't good for patients' medical care if doctors were constrained from expressing their informed and professional medical opinion.

What happened?

Why did her answer change?

Her own answer was: a definite NO to censorship of doctors.

However, she then found out that the state said - that the correct answer was YES. Nothing had changed – except that the bill defines sharing information or treatment that disagrees with the medical consensus as "medical misinformation." The same thing – just rebranded. She thus went from disagreeing with doctors being struck off for sharing information or treatment that disagreed with the medical consensus - to agreeing that they should be.

The short interview can be watched from Steve Kirsch's post – which describes what happened AFTER he interviewed her - on Substack: [Clinical psychologist Cindy Eaton says censorship is bad and good](#).

In the analysis of this exchange, it is clear that she was not a happy bunny – and that is because she had been made to look very silly and was clearly afraid of being found to be out-of-step with *goodthink*.

You can alternatively watch it on Odysee at [Clinical psychologist Cindy](#)

[Eaton says medical censorship is bad OH WAIT IT'S GOOD DELETE THE INTERVIEW!!!](#)

- 4 Like the interviewer, Steve Kirsch, I am fascinated by how the description of the bill changed the psychologist's answer.

Like Steve Kirsch, I also wonder if the state of California will extend the new bill to ALL fields of medicine so that any doctor who doesn't comply with the consensus loses their licence. As he says - why stop with COVID-19?

It's all in the language. Rather like Winston, the protagonist of 1984, this psychologist now perhaps understands that sometimes two and two make four, sometimes they make five, sometimes they make three... and sometimes, two and two can make all of these different totals - three, four and five - at the same time.

Goodthink in real life is nothing new. I wonder if the psychologist interviewed by Steve Kirsch knows of some experiments carried out by psychologists in the 1950 and 60s into how people often behave in the same way as other people. In these experiments, there was no threat - real or perceived - for giving a wrong - or right, depending on how you look at it - answer.

In the 50s, Solomon Asch discovered in the [Asch conformity experiments](#), that people were often willing to ignore reality and give an incorrect answer to a question if other people did so.

In the 60s, John Darley and Bibb Latané found in [The Smoke-Filled Room](#) that people ignored reality and chose not to report the smoke pouring into a room because everyone else was ignoring it.

There's also an experiment in which, when everyone stood up every time they heard a beep, other people did too. One interpretation, in [Social Experiment: Information Cascade](#), is that this didn't prove conformity but instead an information cascade. People stood up due to the inference they drew from other people standing up - that it must be a good thing to do for some unknown reason. To me, the result is the same.

It can take a lot of hard work and a lot of pain to make oneself believe that the answer to a question is whatever you're told it is, as can be seen in a clip from the film 1984, ["How many fingers am I holding up, Winston?"](#)

For some people, that is.

For others, embracing goodthink it's quite easy, it appears.

So, to sum up, sometimes censoring doctors is good.

Sometimes, it is bad.

Sometimes, it is bad AND good.

Trust the science - it's settled.

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions - we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Source: CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

- 2 [LINK](#) California Legislative Information: Assembly Bill No. 2098
- 2 [LINK](#) California Globe: Gov Newsom Signs Bill to Censor CA Doctors Accused of 'Spreading COVID Misinformation'
- 3 [LINK](#) Substack: Clinical psychologist Cindy Eaton says censorship is bad and good
- 3 [LINK](#) Odysee: Clinical psychologist Cindy Eaton says medical censorship is bad OH WAIT IT'S GOOD DELETE THE INTERVIEW!!! - Steve Kirsch
- 4 [LINK](#) Very Well Mind: The Asch Conformity Experiments
- 4 [LINK](#) Weird Universe: The Smoke-Filled Room
- 4 [LINK](#) Cornell University: Social Experiment: Information Cascade
- 4 [LINK](#) "How many fingers am I holding up, Winston?"
– scene from the film 1984

FURTHER READING

[LINK](#) Wikipedia: 1984 [novel]

[LINK](#) Fiction Encyclopaedia: Goodthink

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END