

# State Attorneys General Threaten to Silence Dr. Mercola

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Government officials are misusing their positions of power to openly call for censorship of certain groups, organizations and individuals in direct violation of Constitutional law
- › The latest in a series of free speech attacks comes from two state attorneys general, Letitia James and William Tong, who in a Washington Post op-ed threaten social media companies with legal ramifications if they do not censor a dozen individuals claimed to be responsible for 65% of “anti-vaccine” content
- › In a recent ruling, in which he weighed in on the ability of social media giants to control free speech, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas clarified that “The government cannot accomplish through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits it from doing directly”
- › The basis for the AGs’ censorship push is a report by two previously unknown groups called the Center for Countering Digital Hate and Anti-Vax Watch, neither of which has declared funding sources
- › Opinions are protected speech under the First Amendment, as is reporting on published science – even if that science is later found to be flawed, incomplete or, in worst case, outright fraudulent

While, for many years, I’ve been a popular target for Big Pharma smear campaigns, 2020 onward has really given new meaning to what it means to be under attack. I’m

not alone, by any means, as censorship of anti-propaganda narratives have ratcheted up to unprecedented levels for many others seeking to uncover the truth.

These days, even elected government officials misuse their positions of power to openly call for censorship of certain groups, organizations and individuals in direct violation of Constitutional law – the highest law of the land.

The latest in this series of attacks comes from two state attorneys general, Letitia James of New York and William Tong of Connecticut, who in an April 8, 2021, op-ed<sup>1</sup> in The Washington Post stated, right in the headline, that “Anti-vaxxers put us all at risk,” and that “Facebook and Twitter must ban them.”

According to James and Tong, COVID-19 vaccine availability marks “the end of the pandemic and the start of our recovery,” but “vaccine availability means nothing without vaccine acceptance.”

This lack of acceptance of novel gene therapy technology, they claim, is all because a small group of individuals with a social media presence – myself included – are successfully misleading the public with lies about nonexistent vaccine risks.

*“The solution is not complicated. It’s time for Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg and Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey to turn off this toxic tap and completely remove the small handful of individuals spreading this fraudulent misinformation,”* they write.<sup>2</sup>

## **‘The Disinformation Dozen’**

The basis for their censorship push is a report by two previously unknown groups called the Center for Countering Digital Hate (CCDH) and Anti-Vax Watch, both of which are opaque in the extreme as to their history and funding.

According to that report,<sup>3</sup> “The Disinformation Dozen,” a mere 12 individuals “are responsible for a full 65% of anti-vaccine content on Facebook and Twitter,” Tong and

James write, again stressing that “they must be removed from the platforms.”<sup>4</sup>

But, just who are these “social media researchers” whose word Tong and James take as gospel? An online search for “Anti-Vax Watch” delivers a single hit for a site called antivaxwatch.org, which is nothing but a simple news aggregator. Its “About” page provides no names, no indication of who is part of this group, or who funds them.

The CCDH is only marginally better. As detailed in “[Pressure Mounts to Ban My New Book From Amazon](#),” the CCDH is a one-man organization with undisclosed funding and connections to technocrat-led institutions that support [the Great Reset](#).

By way of its board members, the CCDH can be linked to the Trilateral Commission, the Atlantic Council, the European Council of Foreign Relations, Save the Children Fund (funded by the Gates Foundation and a partner of Gates’ GAVI Vaccine Alliance), the British Parliament, the CIA and Reuters. CCDH chairman Simon Clark even has ties to a participant of Event 201 (former CIA deputy director Avril Haines).

Event 201 was a coronavirus pandemic exercise held in October 2019 that foreshadowed and “played out” the draconian countermeasures implemented when COVID-19 appeared mere months later. Curiously enough, a primary focus of that exercise was how to best censor and counteract problematic narratives about the virus, public disagreement with pandemic measures and doubts about vaccine safety.

## **It’s All About Social Engineering**

You would think that if public health were the primary concern and impetus behind such an exercise — as opposed to wealth transfer, economic destruction and societal reformation — it would focus on the medical and scientific strategies of how to best contain and control the actual virus, and not how best to contain and control information about the virus. Infectious disease control science would have been the key feature, not the science of [social engineering](#).

*“Let us be clear — nothing is wrong with asking questions and researching*

*vaccine effectiveness and safety,” Tong and James write.<sup>5</sup> “We are not in any way looking to limit the ability of individuals to ask these important questions, but the small handful of people we’re talking about are simply promoting dangerous lies ...”*

People in search of vaccine information should “seek out legitimate medical experts ... and official sources, such as local departments of public health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,” they say, adding that:

*“As the chief law enforcement officers of our states, we can say that there is no First Amendment right to spread disinformation on social media.”*

## **What Is Disinformation?**

The problem with this argument is that what they perceive and label as “disinformation” is entirely subjective. The definition of “disinformation” provided by the American Heritage dictionary is: “Deliberately misleading information” and “Dissemination of intentionally false information to deliberately confuse or mislead.”

I – and, as far as I know, none of the others on the CCDH’s hit list – am not engaging in the dissemination of “intentionally false” information with the “deliberate intent” to confuse or mislead. We provide information – the other side of the story – that “official” sources and mainstream media not only refuse to share but social media platforms will ban them for sharing. We provide a counterbalance to the wholly one-sided official narrative.

With respect to my own site, my articles are fully referenced to publications in the medical literature, and I make every effort to clearly indicate where I insert my own opinions.

I’ve also published my own research in peer-reviewed journals, the last of which was a scientific review<sup>6</sup> on the impact of vitamin D in COVID-19, co-written with William Grant, Ph.D., and Dr. Carol Wagner, both of whom are part of the GrassrootsHealth

expert vitamin D panel. You can [read the paper for free on the journal's website](#).

Opinions are protected speech under the First Amendment, as is reporting on published science – even if that science is later found to be flawed, incomplete or, in worst case, outright fraudulent. The [fake hydroxychloroquine study in The Lancet](#), which was ultimately retracted after being exposed, is a perfect example.

This study, which was found to be completely fraudulent, was reported as fact, worldwide, by virtually all mainstream media and continues to serve as the basis for the WHO's discrediting of hydroxychloroquine. If opinion and scientific reporting were not protected speech, Tong's and James' own op-ed could be banned, as could every single mainstream media report on scientific findings that has ever been published.

No one has unequivocal rights to the truth. No one "owns" the truth. There is no single group or organization on this earth that knows everything, has all the facts and tells the unbiased truth. Tong and James would like you to believe otherwise. They want you to listen to select sources only – sources which, curiously, only present one side of any given argument. This is what social engineering is all about.

"Show me the man and I'll show you the crime," Lavrentiy Beria once said. Beria, described<sup>7</sup> as "the most ruthless and longest-serving secret police chief in Joseph Stalin's reign of terror," claimed he could prove criminal conduct on behalf of anyone, even people who were completely innocent.

Indeed, anyone can be made to look like a crook. Facts can be twisted through clever wording salted with hidden bias. But, usually, truth tends to win in the end. You just have to survive long enough.

## **Illegal Attacks on Free Speech**

In their op-ed, Tong and James admit they intend to use their official powers to force social media companies to comply with their demand to censor certain individuals. If platforms refuse to violate the free speech of select people, they will find something

to prosecute. Does this sound unethical to anyone else but me?

**“ The government cannot accomplish through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits it from doing directly. ~ Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas ”**

As noted by Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in an April 5, 2021, ruling<sup>8</sup> in which he weighed in on the ability of social media giants to control free speech:

*“The government cannot accomplish through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits it from doing directly ... Under this doctrine, plaintiffs might have colorable claims against a digital platform if it took adverse action against them in response to government threats.”*

As attorneys general, Tong and James are government officials and, as such, they are legally barred from accomplishing “through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits [them] from doing directly.”

In other words, they do not have the legal right to pressure social media companies into violating the First Amendment rights<sup>9</sup> of Americans when they do not have the legal right to censor or “abridge”<sup>10</sup> free speech themselves. Put yet another way, it is illegal for government officials to pressure private companies into censoring free speech on their behalf or at their request, since they as government officials do not themselves have the right to infringe on free speech.

## **‘Free Press’ Pushes for Censorship, and More**

The fact that attorneys general are now getting involved and calling for censorship is to me a sign of just how desperate Big Pharma and the Great Reset interests are getting. There’s no room for free speech and the U.S. Constitution’s First Amendment

in that New World Order.

To their credit, they have, over the decades, masterfully infiltrated and now appear to control all the required areas of influence, from media, Big Tech and Hollywood, to nongovernmental organizations with global influence, government agencies and intelligence agencies of all stripes.

In a sane, free world concerned with democratic processes, we simply would not see a “free press” calling for the censorship of books,<sup>11</sup> we would not see public officials calling for the selective elimination of free speech (as has been done by several congressmen and senators in recent months<sup>12,13,14</sup>), and writing legislation aimed at penalizing social media companies that refuse to censor.<sup>15</sup>

We would not see a dozen state attorneys general – chief law enforcers – calling for the selective elimination of First Amendment rights by private companies,<sup>16</sup> and we would not see intelligence agencies using sophisticated cyberwarfare tools to aid in the elimination of select speech online.<sup>17,18,19</sup>

In a free world, all of these would stand squarely on the side of free speech rights. So, that must mean we no longer live in a free world where democratic processes and Constitutional rights are given their due consideration.

## **Decentralized Uncensorable Web Is Part of the Answer**

In his legal commentary,<sup>20</sup> Supreme Court Justice Thomas presents an intriguing idea for how to address the monopolistic power over speech currently wielded by social media giants like Facebook and Twitter, which would be to treat them as public utilities that, like phone service providers, must serve all customers, without discrimination.<sup>21</sup>

That’s certainly one way to go, and would probably be a positive strategy. Beyond that, however, we really need a more censor-proof web in general. This is something a decentralized, blockchain-based web can provide. I am currently working with some

**of the brightest minds in the tech space who are committed to preserving your personal freedoms and liberties.**

**The technology<sup>22</sup> focuses on maintaining data sovereignty, giving you control over your data and privacy, and undoing the current system of surveillance capitalism where Big Tech profits off your personal data and uses it against you at the same time. In this Web 2.0, tech monopolies also will no longer have the ability to censor.**

**In the meantime, consider ditching social media networks that erode your civil liberties, and to join those that promote freedom of speech instead. For example, free-speech alternatives to Facebook and Twitter include Gab, MeWe, Minds and Parler. Uncensored alternatives to YouTube include Bitchute, Rumble, Brighteon, BrandNewTube, Banned.video and Thinkspot.**

**For content creators and alternative news sources that no longer have a social media presence due to censoring, subscribe to their newsletter if available, and/or mark their website in your favorites and check back on a regular basis.**