

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	21/540
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Voices for Freedom
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Voices for Freedom, Unaddressed Mail
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	1 February 2022
<b>OUTCOME</b>	Upheld Advertisement not to be used again

### **Summary of the Complaints Board Decision**

The Complaints Board upheld 45 complaints about an unaddressed mail advertisement published and distributed by Voices for Freedom. The Board said the advertisement was not socially responsible and it was likely to mislead consumers.

While the Complaints Board acknowledged the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 protection of freedom of expression, it agreed the following reasons justified it taking a higher-level approach to the assessment of this advertising based on the Principles in the Advertising Standards Code which are the requirements for social responsibility and truthful presentation in responsible advertising.

The broad public health implications of the COVID-19 global pandemic at a population level provided a counterweight to the usual liberal assessment of advocacy advertising with regard to social responsibility and truthful presentation.

The Board agreed the rapidly evolving nature of the pandemic also meant information used to support statements for and against vaccination could quickly become out-of-date.

The Complaints Board said the advertisement and its unrestricted distribution via letterboxes was not socially responsible. This is because in the context of the pandemic, it presents selected information likely to cause fear and distress to a vulnerable audience (parents of younger children).

The Complaints Board said the Advertiser was presenting selective information about the paediatric vaccine as established facts and this was likely to mislead and confuse consumers.

The advertisement was in breach of Principle 1, Rule 1(g), and Principle 2 of the Advertising Standards Code.

### **Advertisement**

The Voices for Freedom double-sided flyer contains information against COVID-19 vaccination for children. The front shows an image of a child with the words "You can't take it back...". Underneath are eight bullet points with information that implies the vaccine is risky and that COVID-19 has a low risk for children. The other side of the flyer is titled "Common Questions" and contains information addressing questions such as, "How serious is COVID-19 for children?", "Can vaccinated children pass on the virus to adults, and vice versa?", "How safe is the "vaccine" for children?", and "What are the health risks associated with the jab?". The Voices for Freedom logo is visible at the bottom beside the URL [www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz/kids).

**Summary of the Complaints:**

There were 45 Complainants who were concerned the advertisement was misleading for cherry-picking facts and ignoring the full medical context, and it was fear mongering and undermining public health messaging.

**Issues Raised:**

- Social Responsibility
- Advocacy Advertising
- Truthful Presentation
- Health and Wellbeing
- Decency and Offensiveness
- Fear and Distress

**Summary of the Advertiser's Response**

The Advertiser states Voices for Freedom is concerned with defending basic human rights, including medical freedom and freedom of speech. It says the flyer is an educational publication assisting in the public's informed consent decision-making process by providing information they might not know. The Advertiser said one million flyers have been printed and the resulting complaints are minimal. The Advertiser said each claim is backed with information on the website. The Advertiser recognises the information presented on potential risks can be challenging, however, arming individuals with information is justified given the important subject of an irreversible medical procedure intended for use on healthy children. The Advertiser said it is not the advertisement's objective to provide a balanced reporting overview of the pros and cons.

**Relevant ASA Codes of Practice**

The Chair directed the Complaints Board to consider the complaints with reference to the following codes:

**ADVERTISING STANDARDS CODE**

**Principle 1: Social Responsibility:** Advertisements must be prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society.

**Rule 1(c) Decency and Offensiveness:** Advertisements must not contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule.

**Rule 1(g) Fear and distress:** Advertisements must not cause fear or distress without justification.

**Rule 1(h) Health and well-being:** Advertisements must not undermine the health and well-being of individuals.

**Principle 2: Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must be truthful, balanced and not misleading.

**Rule 2(b) Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise. Obvious hyperbole identifiable as such is not considered to be misleading.

**Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising:** Advocacy advertising must clearly state the identity and position of the advertiser. Opinion in support of the advertiser's position must be clearly distinguishable from factual information. Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

### **Advocacy Advertising**

The Complaints Board said the advertisement before it fell into the category of advocacy advertising and noted the requirements of Rule 2(e) of the Advertising Standards Code. This Rule required the identity of the advertiser to be clear; opinion to be distinguished from factual information and factual information must be able to be substantiated. The Advocacy Principles developed by the Complaints Board in previous decisions considered under Rule 11 of the Code of Ethics remain relevant. They say:

1. That section 14 of the Bill of Rights Act 1990, in granting the right of freedom of expression, allows advertisers to impart information and opinions but that in exercising that right what was factual information and what was opinion, should be clearly distinguishable.
2. That the right of freedom of expression as stated in section 14 is not absolute as there could be an infringement of other people's rights. Care should be taken to ensure that this does not occur.
3. That the Codes fetter the rights granted by section 14 to ensure there is fair play between all parties on controversial issues. Therefore, in advocacy advertising and particularly on political matters the spirit of the Code is more important than technical breaches. People have the right to express their views and this right should not be unduly or unreasonably restricted by Rules.
4. That robust debate in a democratic society is to be encouraged by the media and advertisers and that the Codes should be interpreted liberally to ensure fair play by the contestants.
5. That it is essential in all advocacy advertisements that the identity of the advertiser is clear.

### **Complaints Board Discussion**

The Chair noted that the Complaints Board's role was to consider whether there had been a breach of the Advertising Standards Code. In deciding whether the Code has been breached the Complaints Board has regard to all relevant matters including:

- Generally prevailing community standards
- Previous decisions
- The consumer takeout of the advertisement, and
- The context, medium, audience and the product or service being advertised, which in this case is:
  - Context: The dynamic nature of the global pandemic and criticism of Government decisions to address the spread and impact of it
  - Medium: Unaddressed mail to letterboxes
  - Audience: Unrestricted via household letterboxes to adults and children
  - Product: Advocacy messaging from an organisation opposed to vaccinations for children

### *Adjudicating on Advocacy Advertising*

The Chair noted that advocacy advertising presents some of the most challenging advertising adjudicated on by the Complaints Board.

It is usually characterised by parties having differing views that are expressed in robust terms. This results in strong objections from complainants and an equally strong defence from advertisers.

Through the requirements of the Advertising Standards Codes of Practice and the Advocacy Principles, the Board supports issues being openly debated and has generally endeavoured not to apply a technical or unduly strict interpretation of the rules and guidelines.

Complainants sometimes ask the Board to in effect decide which side in an advocacy debate is correct. The Complaints Board has consistently declined to have a view on the merits of either side in an advocacy debate. The Complaints Board's only role is to determine whether there has been a breach of our Codes.

Under Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising of the Advertising Standards Code:

- The identity of the advertiser must be clear.
- Opinion must be clearly distinguishable from factual information, and
- Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

### *Evolving Context*

The Complaints Board discussed the importance of the context in which the advertisement before it had been distributed and the impact of this on the Complaints Board's assessment of Code compliance.

The Board noted we are in the third year of an international global pandemic, which has been declared a public health issue of international concern by the World Health Organisation and has resulted in over 5.7<sup>1</sup> million deaths worldwide. The Board also discussed the context from a national perspective. New Zealand currently has community transmission of the Delta variant of the virus and more recently, the more infectious Omicron variant. The Board noted the Government's public health measures have evolved to include vaccinations for the aged 12+ population age groups, booster shots and recently a paediatric vaccination for 5–11-year-old children, following advice from Medsafe, the Government's expert body on medicines.

The Complaints Board noted the Human Rights Commission published *A human rights and Te Tiriti o Waitangi approach to Aotearoa New Zealand's proposed Covid-19 Protection Framework* – November 2021, which says in part:

“Under human rights law some rights can be limited by public health measures which respond to the outbreak of a disease posing a serious threat to the health of a population. Also balances have to be struck between competing human rights ... International human rights law principles set out when and how public health measures may limit rights. Such measures must be specifically aimed at preventing disease ... They must also be based on scientific evidence...”

The Complaints Board took into account a number of legal challenges to the rights protected under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 in relation to Government health orders have been unsuccessful. In these precedents, the Courts have consistently found that the rights of the population in the context of the global pandemic carry more weight than the rights of individuals.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.Covid19.who.int](http://www.Covid19.who.int)

While the Complaints Board acknowledged the protection for freedom of expression in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, it also noted the rapidly evolving nature of the COVID-19 pandemic meant information used to support statements for and against vaccination could quickly become out-of-date. Taking these exceptional circumstances into account, the Board agreed to take a higher-level approach to the assessment of the advertisement, based on the Principles in the Advertising Standards Code which are the requirements for social responsibility and truthful presentation in responsible advertising.

*Consumer takeout of the advertisement*

The Complaints Board agreed the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement was the COVID-19 Pfizer vaccine has serious health risks for young children and is not necessary given the low risk of serious illness when children do catch the virus. The Advertiser states in the advertisement they have evidence to support this view. The Board also agreed the advertisement implies that Pfizer has released an inadequately tested drug for profit, which preys on a vulnerable audience trying to make health decisions on behalf their children.

*Has the advocacy advertisement met the identification requirements?*

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement had been adequately identified as an advocacy advertisement and the Advertiser's identity was clear. The advertisement includes the Voices for Freedom logo and the website address, [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids), is shown on both sides of the flyer. The Advertiser's position on the issue of children receiving the COVID-19 vaccine was also clear.

The Complaints Board agreed the broad public health implications of the pandemic at a population level provided a counterweight to the usual liberal assessment of this type of advocacy advertising.

The Board noted the advertisement included a disclaimer at the bottom of page 2, in a smaller print, which states: "The information on this leaflet is educational only and does not constitute medical or legal advice." The Board said the inclusion of the disclaimer did not offset the need for the advertising to be truthful and socially responsible, considering the likely consumer takeout.

*Is the advertisement socially responsible?*

In making a ruling on whether Principle 1 of the Advertising Standards Code had been breached, the Complaints Board noted the following statement from the Interpretation section of the Code.

*"Social responsibility in advertising is embodied in the Principles and Rules of the Code. In interpreting the Code, emphasis must be placed on compliance with both the spirit and intention of the Code. It is possible for advertising to be in breach of one or more of the Principles in the Code without being in breach of a specific Rule."*

The Complaints Board noted 45 complaints had been received about this advertisement which signalled the level of concern in the community about this advertising.

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement and its unrestricted distribution via letterboxes was not socially responsible. This is because, in the context of the pandemic, it presents selected information likely to cause fear and distress to a vulnerable audience (parents of children). In particular, the Board noted the requirement in Principle 1, to observe a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society. This required a consideration of the rights of the whole population of New Zealand rather than just the rights of the individual.

The Complaints Board said the evidence provided by the Advertiser, via website links and videos, were not sufficient to support the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement, that the risk of vaccinating children far outweighed the benefit.

The Complaints Board agreed it was possible for an advertiser to raise concerns about vaccination for children without being alarmist or inciting fear in an unsolicited audience. The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement went further than just presenting an alternate view, it took selected information likely to cause fear and distress to a vulnerable audience without justification, with claims such as the vaccine was experimental gene therapy.

Taking into account medium, audience, product, the Complaints Board unanimously agreed the advertisement was not socially responsible.

Having agreed the advertisement was in breach of Principle 1, Social Responsibility, the complaints were upheld under this and Rule 1(g) regarding fear and distress, the Board said there was no requirement to consider the advertisement under Rules 1(c) and 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code.

*Is the advertisement misleading?*

The Complaints Board noted the SARS-CoV2 virus is a novel virus and the science and corresponding advice based on that science, is evolving as the pandemic progresses. It noted both public health responses and criticism of those measures must adapt their reasoning and responses as the science emerges. The Complaints Board noted the advertisement subject to complaint has been distributed over several months.

The Complaints Board then turned to consider the advertisement and its compliance with Principle 2 of the Advertising Standards Code which states: "Advertisements must be truthful, balanced and not misleading."

The Complaints Board said the Advertiser was presenting selective information about the paediatric vaccine as established facts, and this was likely to mislead and confuse consumers.

The Complaints Board said the advertisement was in breach of Principle 2 of the Advertising Standards Code.

**In Summary**

The Complaints Board said the advertisement was not socially responsible, taking into account context, medium, audience and product and was misleading. The advertisement was in breach of Principle 1, Rule 1(g), and Principle 2 of the Advertising Standards Code.

**Outcome**

The Complaints Board ruled the complaints were **Upheld**.

Advertisement not to be used again.

**APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website, [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing with notification of the intent to appeal lodged within 14 calendar days of receipt of the written decision. The substantive appeal application must be lodged with the ASA within 21 calendar days of receipt of the written decision.

## APPENDICES

1. Complaints
  2. Response from Advertiser
- 

### Appendix 1

#### COMPLAINTS

##### Complaint 1

Hello, on Monday, 22 Nov we found this content in our letterbox - it is disturbing and not nice for our kids to find when normally going to the mailbox is a fun lockdown activity. Each statement omits the full medical context and are instead written to be alarming, raise concern and mistrust of extremely important public health advice. I.e. '...vaccine does NOT prevent...' yes we know, but if they say this, they should be obligated to message the benefits of the vaccines, reduced transmission, reduced symptoms, reduced risk of hospitalisation. These comms put our communities at risk. They are appalling and they should face repercussions for distributing such irresponsible messaging - they can keep it to their own channels.

##### Complaint 2

I am writing to share my concerns in regard to the latest leaflets that has been dropped in my mailbox by Vices of Freedom. Aside from the half-truths and the cherry picking of facts from legitimate websites and sources without an explanation of the conditions under which those statements have been made, the following are a list of items from their two latest leaflet that are blatantly wrong. The claim that the Pfizer vaccine is experimental and in clinical trials – this is incorrect. The vaccine is not in the experimental stages and had passed the required certifications in several countries. The claim that the Pfizer vaccine is gene therapy is incorrect - Gene therapy, in the classical sense, involves making deliberate changes to a patient's DNA to treat or cure them. mRNA vaccines will not enter a cell's nucleus that houses your DNA genome. The risks to healthy children outweigh the benefits. The source for this claim is the JCVI UK. The JCVI UK did not make this statement. They state "Overall, the committee is of the opinion that the benefits from vaccination are marginally greater than the potential known harms" The committee recommends one dose. Masks have been shown to cause hypoxia and mask wearing does not reduce the SARS-Cov2 infection rates – This statement neglects to consider the appropriate usage and types of masks as recommended. The medical fraternity have been wearing masks for decades without a loss of oxygen to the brain, The leaflet claims that the ASA states that six statements were adequately substantiated – this is incorrect as the complaints were largely upheld.

##### Complaint 3

Good Morning, Today our household received this deceiving personalised letter, that was in fact marketing material. My complaint to the Advertising Standards authority is about the contents of the two brochures. They are factually incorrect, are of a fear-mongering nature, and have been delivered deceitfully to households in the guise of personalised mail. Is there something the ASA can do to stop this organisation from doing this again?

##### Complaint 4

These guys are using your ASA tick to support not wearing masks and to advocate against vaccinating children - is this misinformation how do we know this Is a reliable data source and they are using your name which does concern me because it would appear legitimate

##### Complaint 5

This leaflet was addressed "to the householder" and delivered via DX Mail on 24 Nov 2021. It contains numerous false statements, as well as a claim that they have your blessing and that their misinformation could continue to be spread under the guise of "advocacy". (Note the seal

of approval, in your name, in one photo.) Specifically they make claims that: -mask wearing doesn't reduce spread of COVID-19 -masks will cause hypoxia -Pfizer's Covid vaccine is "experimental gene therapy" -reactions are common and serious adverse events are effecting people -comparing Covid to a "mild flu-like illness" They also use inflammatory language, only use stats when it suits them (and not when it shows minuscule odds of adverse effects of vaccines that they want to artificially inflate the fear of. Their purpose is to encourage people to oppose a life-saving vaccine and also to encourage the unvaccinated to apply for "mask exemptions", both of which are incredibly dangerous to all New Zealanders, vaccinated and unable to be vaccinated. (Particularly those who are vaccinated and remain at a high risk.) Lastly, they give a number of statistics and appear to be quoting studies, but don't cite sources, giving the impression what they are stating is fact when it is not. I'm sure mine won't be the only complaint about this group that is actively and aggressively spreading misinformation. I look forward to hearing the next steps that will be taken to stop this dangerous campaign.

### **Complaint 6**

This dangerous brochure is spreading misleading, incomplete, biased, and unreferenced information regarding mask wearing and the Covid-19 vaccination for children. It has the potential to cause very real harm to public health in the middle of an unprecedented pandemic. It is unsolicited and offensive.

### **Complaint 7**

The brochure is completely misleading around almost all of it's claims. Mask wearing does prevent infection Mask wearing does prevent viral particles from passing through masks there is nothing i can find that states 98% of viral particles may pass through cloth masks. On the common questions page. a "significant number of serious side effects" that's purely not true. Neither the word significant or serious applies in this statement. This is scaremongering and irresponsible.

### **Complaint 8**

Hi there. I'd like to report two addressed pamphlets delivered today, the 25th November 2021, to Mount Albert, by Voices for Freedom. There were two double-sided pamphlets (I can only select one attachment in this form): 1. "Going to Wear that mask all summer?" followed by selective interpretation of mask wearing in relation to covid-19. There are no references listed for the claims either, so the recipients are not able to easily substantiate the claims. 2. "You can't take it back...once they're jabbed" followed by "Did they tell you?". Then we see information such as: Pfizer's Covid-19 Vaccine is an experimental gene therapy still in clinical trials. This is clearly false and alarmist, combined with a picture of a scared looking child. The vaccine is not experimental gene therapy. It's easily busted by checking facts, and again, the source is not cited on the pamphlet. Instead you need to go to their website (and risk being further upset or misinformed). I busted the experimental gene therapy claim in a two second web search which brought up multiple sources to refute this claim; here is one: <https://www.genomicseducation.hee.nhs.uk/blog/why-mrna-vaccines-arent-gene-therapies/>

The website that the pamphlets lead you to by the QR code is: voicesforfreedom.co.nz At the very least, they need to be able to accurately reference (such as in an academic paper) their claims, so that recipients can do their own fact checking. They don't, because they know most people will not dive into a Lancet article and read the whole piece in context. This advertising directs inhibits our public health response by targeting people for Voices for Freedom's political gain.

### **Complaint 9**

Covid vaccine misinformation Fear mongering Public endangerment Intentionally misleading regarding covid vaccine and mask wearing

### **Complaint 10**

I received the attached pamphlets in a "to the householder" letter in my mail box. I am concerned that: \* These are promoting misinformation and encourage vaccine hesitancy, and discourage mask use to protect oneself and others. This is especially egregious and offensive during a global pandemic when over 5 million people have died worldwide from COVID-19. \* This pamphlet states that their claims are substantiated by the Advertising Standards Authority. There are several complaints in your database which show that claims against them have been upheld in the past, so I feel this statement is misleading. \* This pamphlet claims that mask wearing does not help reduce COVID-19 infection rates. There is a lot of evidence to contradict that, for example a recent article in the Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences found "The preponderance of evidence indicates that mask wearing reduces transmissibility". <https://www.pnas.org/content/118/4/e2014564118> \* This pamphlet claims that adverse reactions to the Pfizer vaccine are common. While reactions are common (fever etc), severe reactions with permanent side effects are rare. Their statement is misleading, and will encourage vaccine hesitancy. Specifically the claim regarding a "significant number of serious side effects". This is unsubstantiated, and they offer no citations to back up these claims. \* This pamphlet claims that the Pfizer vaccine is an experimental gene therapy. This is incorrect. RNA vaccines are not gene therapy, and do not permanently alter a person's genetics. This claim is misleading, and fearmongering, and will encourage vaccine hesitancy, which will ultimately cause people to die from COVID. \* This pamphlet contains many statements which are fear mongering in nature, designed to cause vaccine hesitancy with respect to vaccinating children. Vaccinating children is important to stop onward transmission of COVID in the community. \* This pamphlet states that the "vaccine does NOT prevent a person from catching or passing on SARS-CoV-2 virus". While this is technically true, they neglect to state that a vaccinated person is much less likely to contract and pass on COVID-19 to other people, and that the rate of hospitalization and death is greatly reduced in vaccinated people. This statement could be misinterpreted to suggest that vaccination isn't worthwhile, and that is untrue. As can be clearly seen by the stabilization of case numbers here in NZ as our vaccination rates have risen, vaccination is a key tool in reducing transmission of COVID-19 in a community. We can also see that the number of unvaccinated people in hospital with COVID-19 is much higher than the relative number of unvaccinated people in the community, clearly showing that the vaccine helps reduce the seriousness of COVID-19.

### **Complaint 11**

This seems to me to be saying the ASA signed off or sanctioned the statements (eg, Mask wearing does not reduce infection rates; COVID particles easily pass through mask fibres, masks are shown to cause hypoxia). They've used weasel words to indicate the strength of their messaging, when in actual fact "adequate substantiation" is likely to be the bare minimum, disputable source. I find this whole campaign misleading and am annoyed they cannot be held to account.

### **Complaint 12**

2 leaflets attached not very educational

### **Complaint 13**

I received this in my letterbox despite notice for no junk Mail. It is factually inaccurate, purposely misrepresents information, uses innuendo and scare tactics.

### **Complaint 14**

Anti Vaccination flyer is deceptive. Describes the Pfizer vaccine as "Experimental Gene Therapy". Discussed serious adverse events in the same sentence that it is mentioned that vaccine reactions are common, without mentioning that most reactions are mild.

### **Complaint 15**

Direct mail to house. Others have clearly complained about this group before, but they persist. Fear mongering, perpetuation of falsehoods about public health data. I can go through and list all the falsehoods if you would like, but I suspect you already have a comprehensive list.

### **Complaint 16**

Very dangerous right now to twist information to suit an agenda

### **Complaint 17**

This leaflet makes a number of serious health claims and overall suggests that children shouldn't be vaccinated. I think all the claims made in this brochure need to be substantiated, not just the six statements listed from a prior complaint. I think the whole brochure is misleading and will confuse people from getting proper health advice. The small disclaimer at the bottom had to be searched out and doesn't alter this message. The final page also has a circle tick saying 'all claims substantiated ASA' that makes it look like the ASA is endorsing or certifying this pamphlet. I think this is confusing and will make people think this is official ASA communication, or that the whole brochure has been checked, rather than just these few claims.

### **Complaint 18**

I wish to make a complaint about a few points in the recent Voices for Freedom leaflet "You can't take it back... once they're jabbed" relating to Covid-19 vaccines and children. This flyer was delivered to our letterbox at 21 Landscape Road, Papatoetoe some time between 20-30 November. Following my own investigation, I find the following statements to be false or insubstantiated: 1. "Pfizer's "Covid-19 Vaccine" is an experimental gene therapy still in clinical trials - including for children" 2. "Reactions to the vaccine are common and serious adverse events are having devastating and likely life-long, effects" 3. "The UK's joint committee on vaccination and immunisation has assessed that the risks to healthy children outweigh the benefits at this time" 4. Two linked parts: a) "Mounting evidence in countries expanding emergency use of the vaccine to children aged 5 years and older and young adults, shows a significant number of serious side effects" b) "these health issues include myocarditis, pericarditis, vaccine-induced thrombotic thrombocytopenia, related cerebral (head) vein thrombosis (blood clots) and menstruation problems" As I believe these claims are false or insubstantiated, I do not believe they are appropriate for materials distributed by an advocacy group. I think that this leaflet should not be allowed to be circulated.

### **Complaint 19**

We received a flyer from Voices For Freedom that contains false and misleading information. Amongst other things: They state that Pfizers COVID-19 vaccine is "experimental gene therapy". This is false information. Vaccines that use mRNA technology are not gene therapy because they do not alter your genes. They state that the vaccine does not prevent a person from catching or passing on COVID-19. This is misleading. Much like a seatbelt does not prevent all injuries or deaths, the vaccine does not prevent all illness or death. However, it does drastically reduce your chances of contracting the virus, passing it on, or becoming seriously ill. (see: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseasesand-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-vaccines/covid-19-vaccine-effectiveness-and-protection>) They suggest a number of serious health risks and side effects for children that are not substantiated or are so over-emphasised as to be misleading.

### **Complaint 20**

False advertising arrived in my letterbox. The covid vaccine is not gene therapy. Of course reactions to the vaccine are common, they are supposed to be. They show it is working. Although teenagers have the right to give consent to the vaccine, it is recommended that they discuss it with their parents. This is just mischievous.

**Complaint 21**

Not welcome in my letter box which says Addressed Mail only. Promoting unsubstantiated ideas.

**Complaint 22**

Twits spouting nonsense

**Complaint 23**

They claim the covid pfizer vaccine is experimental They claim serious adverse vaccine events are having a devastating effect on the community

**Complaint 24**

Misleading information, that is a danger to public health

**Complaint 25**

More dangerous misinformation from VFF - and unbelievably disappointing that it is endorsed by the ASA who have not investigated any of the facts substantially or fairly with credible or verified sources & are putting people's health & wellbeing at risk In addition they are illegally putting these offensive leaflets in my letterbox which clearly displays a no junk mail sign

**Complaint 26**

Pamphlet contains a toxic mix of misinformation and disinformation with serious consequences, including: undermining of public health; incitement to breach public health regulations; promoting dangerous and potentially fatal behaviours; confusing the public into harmful behaviours; eroding confidence in the Advertising Standards Authority; misleading the public into believing the ASA judged the pamphlet to be accurate and informative.

**Complaint 27**

Most of the information is incorrect and inflammatory

**Complaint 28**

I am very disappointed to have received two Voices for Freedom pamphlets in my letter box that push debunked theories, but even more so that these falsehoods have been signed off by the Advertising Standards Authority. This sort of validation legitimises the group to continue to spread their idiocy throughout the country. I have to wonder how carefully these claims were examined by the authority when they haven't been substantiated by reputable voices. I see that the ASA says: "Statements presented as facts need to be adequately supported" - but it's clear that they aren't supported by trustworthy sources.

I realise that the horse has bolted in this case, in that thousands of New Zealanders will already have received this tripe, but at this time of dealing with the pandemic and all the associated difficulties, having our watchdog authority appear to give credence to this conspiracy group is just so depressing.

**Complaint 29**

The leaflets were posted through my door. These have misleading and untrue "facts". These leaflets have a misleading effect on public health crisis management.

**Complaint 30**

I received this brochure in my apartment mailbox on 3/12/2021. I believe that in distributing this brochure, the advertiser did not exhibit social responsibility. The claim "Pfizer's "COVID-19 Vaccine" is an experimental gene therapy still in clinical trials - including for children." is misleading and unsubstantiated in the brochure, and very similar to a previous unsubstantiated claim made by the advertiser, detailed in ASA complaint number 21/215 (claim 7 covered in ASA 21/215: "All COVID-19 vaccines are currently experimental! Some

trials won't end until 2023.") I believe that the claim "Reactions to the vaccine are common and serious adverse events are having devastating, and likely lifelong, effects." is also misleading, because the way it is written suggests that serious adverse events are common. I also believe that the brochure may be in breach of Rule 1(g). Specifically, the title "YOU CAN'T TAKE IT BACK... ONCE THEY'RE JABBED" next to a picture of a young child's face which is half in shadow, implying that vaccinating children is likely to cause their deaths.

### **Complaint 31**

I was offended and distressed by advertising material delivered to my letterbox this week from "voices for freedom" - 3 double sided colour flyers. They have presented convincingly packaged misinformation designed to mislead consumers about preventing, testing for and treating Covid-19 and attempt to cast doubt on important public health and safety measures. This material undermines the ability of consumers who may rely on it to make an informed decision. A decision cannot be an informed one if you are making it on the basis of untruths. In addition the material incites consumers to disregard information from trustworthy sources such as health authorities and avoid public health measures such as vaccination, mask wearing and getting tested. Although the information contained in this advertising fails to meet a reasonable person standard for factual information and does not stand up to any level of scrutiny or fact checking, inexplicably the ASA appears to have endorsed the information as substantiated. The group has highlighted this on their material in order to give it the illusion of legitimacy. I am the mother of an 11 year old with a genetic condition involving heart defects that likely means that he is more vulnerable to this virus. He is not yet eligible to be vaccinated so is relying on friends, family, teachers and neighbours to be vaccinated and comply with public health measures to keep the virus away from him. This matter is not just an academic exercise, trusting our medical professionals and our vaccination programme will save lives in these extraordinary times. Despite the group's name this material does not promote freedom or autonomy, instead it undermines it in an insidious manner

### **Complaint 32**

The attached pamphlets were delivered unsolicited to my mailbox. They contain a lot of single data points designed to misleadingly accentuate their biased and incorrect perspective — for example "Masks have been shown to cause hypoxia" ignores the fact that "There is no evidence that this decrease in oxygenation is clinically significant." (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04670484>). "Reactions to the vaccine are common and serious adverse events are having devastating, and likely life-long, effects" — this strongly insinuates that serious adverse events are common, they are not. They quote a Lancet article directly, stating "the vaccine's effect on reducing transmission is minimal" but omit the very next sentence of the article which concludes that therefore "higher vaccination coverage rates need to be achieved." They also contain some patently false statements, including: "Typical mask wearing does not reduce SARS-CoV-2 infection rates". FALSE. There is an abundance of scientific material to the contrary (e.g. [https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/5/e002794?ijkey=82e6ec695a26fb3a151b4e8b0a03755a95255bcc&keytype=tf\\_ipsecsha](https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/5/e002794?ijkey=82e6ec695a26fb3a151b4e8b0a03755a95255bcc&keytype=tf_ipsecsha)) "Pfizer's 'COVID-19 Vaccine' is an experimental gene therapy" FALSE This cherry picking of convenient single points of data without context, omission of relevant details, sprinkled with a couple of well chosen false statements, pushed into letterboxes as some kind of awful misguided health advice, during a global pandemic, will result in poor health outcomes for anyone lacking the critical thinking skills to dissect, compare and contrast with other sources, match with fuller facts and details, and recognise it for the nonsense it is. These people are spreading dangerous propaganda under the guise of health advice and if it's not illegal it damn well should be.

### **Complaint 33**

These have been distributed around our area in postboxes, including those marked no circulars. They are misleading, and also quote a complaint decision made supposedly by the ASA, but does not give details that can be traced. These leaflets are anti vaccine and anti

mask and could be taken at face value. Although lots of quotes are made, again there's no way to check that info.

#### **Complaint 34**

These have been distributed around our area in postboxes, including those marked no circulars. They are misleading, and also quote a complaint decision made supposedly by the ASA, but does not give details that can be traced. These leaflets are anti vaccine and anti mask and could be taken at face value. Although lots of quotes are made, again there's no way to check that info.

#### **Complaint 35**

This is from the Voices for Freedom pamphlets that you have given the standards tick  they are one of the worst spreaders of COVID-19 disinformation in Aotearoa.

#### **Complaint 36**

I have a 'no junk mail' sign on my mailbox, yet this group have still gone ahead and left two leaflets containing 'information' promoting their website along with misinformation about the pfizer vaccine and covid-19. They are using highly emotive images and language (a photo of a small child and the words 'you can't take it back . . . once they're jabbed') along with a list of 'facts' about the vaccine and covid-19. I will email the two images of the second leaflet separately

#### **Complaint 37**

Dangerous disinformation placed in my mailbox 8/12/2021. Ignored my No Junk Mail sign as well. This has been posted all over the neighbourhood.

#### **Complaint 38**

In my letter box tonight was the information attached the first one which had your name on the front and the government logo on the back. The other page was tucked in behind the first saying you can't take it back with a lot of false claims. How dare they scare parents in this manner looking official when I am sure the second page was not approved by the ASA. I find this offensive with false information to scare people

#### **Complaint 39**

Making false accusations about vaccination and calling the covid19 jab 'experimental gene therapy'.

#### **Complaint 40**

We and others received this brochure on Friday. It seems to be very misleading and intended to create fear and serious doubt amongst parents trying to make the correct decision for their kids. We have already heard some young parents being more fearful and doubtful after this pamphlet. Expressing concerns that they weren't before. It seems very one sided and missing relevant balancing information eg, yes there is a risk of myocarditis from the vaccine. But it is minimal and way less occurrence than from Covid infection Yes adverse reactions from vaccines may occur and may have serious long term effects but there is more chance of these if infected by Covid. Or death! Etc, etc It makes our blood boil that the science is twisted and taken out of proper context

#### **Complaint 41**

Flier containers information to deliberately mislead. Point 4 is objectively false mostly due to the work "common" being used

#### **Complaint 42**

Covid Misinformation being distributed, promotion misinformation and factually inaccurate details.

**Complaint 43**

Misleading medical misinformation This is especially nasty as they are concentrating on children Also they misspelled - Freedumb"

**Complaint 44**

Mailbox drop. Flyer delivered to our house, no junk mail sign on box. Misinformation in flyer against COVID vaccine for children.

**Complaint 45**

The voices for freedom brochure about the COVID vaccine for children was put in my letterbox (and many others) during a late night distribution in the neighbourhood. The things that are written in it are blatant scaremongering and absolutely disgusting to distribute to parents. Although many of the points made are generally accurate they are taken wildly out of context or cherry picked to support an anti vaccination argument. For example voices for freedom claim that the vaccine does not stop a person contracting or spreading COVID which is true however what the brochure neglects to mention is that the vaccine dramatically reduces the chance of getting and spreading COVID and also results in significantly less symptoms and a better short and long term prognosis if infected. The points made on the brochure are sensationalised to spread fear and misinformation and at best is lying by omission and at worse intentionally misleading the public and creating a health and safety risk.

**Appendix 2****RESPONSE FROM ADVERTISER, VOICES FOR FREEDOM**

**RE: Voices For Freedom – Complaint 21/540**

**[www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids)**

1. We understand the Advertising Standards Association ("**the ASA**") has received certain complaints concerning our flyer entitled "You Can't Take It Back" ("**the Covid Kids Flyer**").
2. We further understand that the complaints have been accepted for consideration by the Advertising Standards Complaints Board ("**the Board**") and that the Board will make a decision on the complaint with reference to your Advertising Standards Code ("**the Code**").
3. We have been directed that the following sections of the Code are relevant to this complaint: Principle 1, Principle 2 – namely Rule 1(c), Rule 1(g), Rule 1(h), Rule 2(b) and Rule 2(e) and Rule 2(f).

**OVERVIEW**

4. Voices for Freedom is an independent, not-for-profit, grassroots organisation founded in December 2020 and stands for honesty, sound science, true government transparency, a proper health response and the freedom for New Zealanders to choose what is right. We are particularly concerned with defending basic human rights, including medical freedom and freedom of speech.

5. The Covid Kids Flyer is an educational publication. Its publication and distribution provide a service to the public, assisting them as it does as part of their informed consent decision-making process by providing information they probably did not know as indicated by subtitle “Did They Tell You?”.
6. Over 1,000,000 Covid Kids Flyers have been printed and distributed throughout New Zealand at the time of writing. In this context, the number of complaints received to date is minimal.
7. Every claim set out on the Covid Kids Flyer is backed up by information available to the public and which representative information is available through statements or via links on our website at [www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz](http://www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz) and more specifically at [www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz/Kids](http://www.VoicesForFreedom.co.nz/Kids).
8. The Covid Kids Flyer does not constitute a breach of the Code for above reasons and for reasons further elaborated upon below.

## SUMMARY OF OUR RESPONSE

9. For ease of reference, we set out here a summary of our responses as grouped, according to the various parts of the Code that you have advised are relevant.
  - a. **The Covid Kids Flyer does not contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule. [Principle 1: Rule 1(c)].** The Covid Kids Flyer is designed to engage readers to think more deeply about having children injected with the Pfizer vaccine with information for their consideration and asking them to consider Common Questions including: “How Serious Is Covid-19 For Children?” “How Safe Is The Vaccine For Children?” “Can Vaccinated Children Pass On The Virus To Adults, And Vice Versa?” “What Are The Health Risks Associated With The Jab?”
  - b. The Covid Kids Flyer provides certain statements, and each statement is backed up, as referenced in detail below. Individuals are encouraged to make informed decisions about potential risks to their children’s health and well-being.
  - c. **The Covid Kids Flyer does not cause fear or distress without justification. [Principle 1: Rule 1(g)].** Again, the Covid Kids Flyer is designed to engage readers to think more deeply about the Covid-19 vaccination with particular reference to children with a list of statements for consideration that they probably haven't heard before under the headings “Did They Tell You?” and “Common Questions”. Any feelings as referenced are justified given the importance of ensuring that people are fully informed and educated to make a fully informed decision about an irreversible medical procedure.

- d. **Our Covid Kids Flyer does not undermine the health and wellbeing of individuals. [Principle 1: Rule 1(h)]** On the contrary, the Covid Kids Flyer ensures that individuals are armed with more information required for informed consent. Full knowledge of the pros and cons of the jab enables parents and caregivers to decide what risks they wish to expose their children to and the best health outcome for them. And when dealing with a medical procedure intended for healthy children this is particularly important.
- e. **The Covid Kids Flyer does not mislead, nor is it likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, nor abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. [Principle 2: Rule 2(b)]** It is not an objective of the Covid Kids Flyer to provide a "balanced reporting overview of the pros and cons of the Covid-19 vaccine". As clearly inferred from flyer heading "Did They Tell You?". The Covid Kids Flyer does not have space to print every single URL to references for claims made, and nor would this be a satisfactory solution in any case. Instead, the Flyer features clear website links front and back.  
See [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids) - which likewise takes the reader to the reference materials.
- f. **We stand by the validity of the references we have provided.** In addition we draw your attention to the blog post<sup>2</sup> [www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong](http://www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong) one of many blog posts written independently of Voices for Freedom responding to claims to have "debunked" our previous flyers to the extent that the earlier claims/decisions have any impact on the current materials under consideration.
- g. **Our identity and position has been clearly stated on the Covid Kids Flyer along with our contact details. [Principle 2: Rule 2(e)].** The flyer contains a series of statements, and all facts are substantiated as set out in this letter.
- h. **The Covid Kids Flyer does not contain or refer to any personal testimonial and nor does it claim endorsement by any independent agency. [Principle 2: Rule 2(f)].** As such there is no further consideration given to this Rule.

#### PRINCIPLE 1: RULE 1(c)

10. Principle 1: Rule 1(c) states that:

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong>

**Advertisements must not contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule.**

11. The Covid Kids Flyer does not (for the reasons set out in this section and elsewhere in this letter) contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule.
12. It is designed to engage readers to think more deeply about having this medical procedure and/or getting their children to have it. It provides education to the public about known and possible risks associated with the jab with a list of facts for consideration under the heading "Did You Know?".
13. We recognise that that the information may be challenging for some people. To the extent that any reader alleges they themselves have taken serious offence to the flyer, then the importance of ensuring that people are fully informed and educated to make a truly informed decision about an important medical procedure would justify these emotions.
14. (We certainly do not accept that the Covid Kids Flyer is giving rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule *against* others. To the extent that any readers themselves are expressing feelings of hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule towards Voices For Freedom as a result of the flyers then again, we consider such emotions to be justified by the importance of ensuring the public is fully informed.)

#### **PRINCIPLE 1: RULE 1(g)**

15. Principle 1: Rule 1(g) states that:  
  
***Advertisements must not cause fear or distress without justification.***
16. The Covid Kids Flyer does not cause fear or distress without justification for the reasons set out in this section and elsewhere in this letter.
17. It is designed to engage readers to think more deeply about having this medical procedure and/or getting their children to have it. It provides education to the public about known and possible risks associated with the jab with a list of facts for consideration under the heading "Did You Know?".
18. Again, we recognise that that the information may be challenging for some people. However, were the emotions referenced in the Rule attributed to the Covid Kids Flyer, the importance of ensuring that people are fully informed and educated to make a fully informed decision about an important medical procedure would justify these emotions.
19. To emphasis this point, the Covid Kids Flyer asks for consideration of the risks because "You Can't Take It Back" (i.e. it asks parents and caregivers to consider

all the facts before the children are jabbed) because informed consent cannot be given retrospectively. And to state the obvious: one cannot be un-jabbed after being jabbed.

#### PRINCIPLE 1: RULE 1(h)

20. Principle 1: Rule 1(h) states that:

***Advertisements must not undermine the health and wellbeing of individuals.***

21. Our Covid Kids Flyer does **not** undermine the health and wellbeing of individuals.

22. On the contrary, full knowledge of the pros and cons of the jab enables parents and caregivers to decide what risks they wish to expose their children to and the best health outcome for them. And when dealing with a medical procedure intended for the healthy children this is particularly important.

23. This is particularly important when dealing with a medical procedure that is being proposed to be rolled out to the entire population including nearly half a million healthy Kiwi kids aged 5-11 years. .

24. There has been an enormous quantity of information provided over a sustained period from both the Media and the Government claiming positive reasons for vaccination. Essential information about the risks involved (both the real risk of sickness from Covid-19 and the risk of side effects et al. from the vaccination) has been sparse to non-existent.

25. Our Covid Kids Flyer is designed to address the current imbalance, thus providing the best chance for individuals to demonstrate self-responsibility regarding their well-being.

#### PRINCIPLE 2: RULE 2 (b)

26. Principle 2: Rule 2(b) states that:

***Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise. Obvious hyperbole identifiable as such is not considered to be misleading.***

27. The Covid Kids Flyer does **not** mislead, nor is it likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, nor abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge.

28. It is not an objective of the Covid Kids Flyer to provide a “balanced reporting overview of the pros and cons of the Covid-19 vaccine”. As set out on the flyer it’s about providing information the reader information he or she hasn’t be told.
29. Thus, there is no omission or false representation. There is plenty of information publicly available that is covered in the media or promoted through government agencies. However, that information does not include what is included in the Covid Kids Flyer. The purpose of the Covid Kids Flyer is to provide just that balance.
30. The Covid Kids Flyer does not have space to print every single URL to references for claims made and nor would this be a satisfactory solution in any case as the links to the information in many cases are long and complex. The only practical way to provide access to them is online.
31. To this end, we made every effort to make it as easy as possible to view those references by including a prominent URL on both front and back of the flyer which takes the reader to the source of the claims made: [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz) and [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids).
32. This is all very reasonable and follows the usual practice in terms of making references easily accessible.
33. Thus, it is clear there is no intention to mislead, deceive or confuse the public, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge.

#### COVID KIDS FLYER – REFERENCES IN SUPPORT

34. Please refer to our website for working links to all references. We will annex to this response a PDF of the same. [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids). But for working links please visit our website.

#### Additional References:

35. **Dr Peter McCullough<sup>3</sup>** is one of the pre-eminent voices in his field and one of the most published doctors in the U.S. with over 1,000 publications, and over 600 citations in the library of medicine:

---

<sup>3</sup> **Dr Peter McCullough – MD, MPH, FACC, FACP, FAHA, FASN, FNKF, FNLA, FCRSA** is an Internist, Cardiologist and Epidemiologist. He is Board Certified in internal medicine and cardiovascular disease and holds additional certification in clinical lipidology, and previously echocardiography. He practises internal medicine and clinical cardiology as well as teaches and conducts research. He is an active scholar in medicine with roles as author, editor-in-chief of one peer-reviewed journal, editorialist and review of dozens of major medical journals and textbooks. He has led clinical, education, research, and program operations at major academic centers. Dr McCullough is one of the pre-eminent voices in his field, for he's one of the most published doctors in the U.S., with over 1,000 publications, and over 600 citations in the library of medicine, and was the chief of cardiovascular research at Baylor University Health Care System. More recently, he is the principle author of the first paper on early Covid 19 outpatient treatment involving multi-drug regimens

- a. Voices For Freedom NZ Webinar (over 100,000 views of this interview): <https://odysee.com/@voicesforfreedom:6/Dr-Peter-McCullough:b>
  - b. Voices For Freedom Webinar extract of the above: <https://odysee.com/@voicesforfreedom:6/Under-No-Circumstances-Should-Anyone-Under-30-Consider-The-Covid-19-Vaccine:5>
  - c. The Joe Rogan Experience - #1747 – December 2021 – which we understand has been viewed by over 40 million people since last month: <https://open.spotify.com/episode/0aZte37vtFTkYT7b0b04Qz>
36. **Dr Robert Malone, MD<sup>4</sup>** is a scientist and physician and the original inventor of mRNA vaccination as a technology, DNA vaccination, and multiple non-viral DNA and RNA/mRNA platform delivery technologies having approximately 100 scientific peer- reviewed publications with over 12,000 citations of his work:
- a. The Joe Rogan Experience - #1757 – January 2021 – Dr Robert Malone – which we understand has been viewed by over 50 million people since it aired two weeks ago. <https://open.spotify.com/episode/3SCsueX2bZdbEzRtKOCeYt>
  - b. Before your child is injected, Dr Malone’s statement on child COVID vaccinations - December 202: <https://globalcovids Summit.org/news/live-stream-event-physicians-alerting-parents>
37. **Geert Vanden Bossche - (DVM, PhD)<sup>5</sup>** has held adjunct faculty appointments at universities in Belgium and Germany. After a career in academia, Geert joined several vaccine companies (GSK Biologicals, Novartis Vaccines, Solvay Biologicals) to serve various roles in vaccine R&D as well as in late vaccine development.

---

<sup>4</sup> **Dr Robert Malone MD** is a scientist and physician and the original inventor of mRNA vaccination as a technology, DNA vaccination, and multiple non-viral DNA and RNA/mRNA platform delivery technologies. He holds numerous fundamental domestic and foreign patents in the fields of gene delivery, delivery formulations, and vaccines: including for fundamental DNA and RNA/mRNA vaccine technologies. He has approximately 100 scientific peer- reviewed publications with over 12,000 citations of his work.

<sup>5</sup> **Geert Vanden Bossche - (DVM, PhD)** received his DVM from the University of Ghent, Belgium, and his PhD degree in Virology from the University of Hohenheim, Germany. He held adjunct faculty appointments at universities in Belgium and Germany. After his career in Academia, Geert joined several vaccine companies (GSK Biologicals, Novartis Vaccines, Solvay Biologicals) to serve various roles in vaccine R&D as well as in late vaccine development.

- a. *Voices for Freedom – excerpt – October 2021:*  
<https://odysee.com/@voicesforfreedom:6/geert-vanden-bosche-mass-vaccination-and-vaccinating-kids:8>
- b. *Dana Radio LIVE 12 January 2022 – Approx. 1-hour 32-mins into the show*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=891l6eeZbz4>
- c. *Second all to WHO: please don't vaccinate against Omicron:*  
<https://www.voiceforscienceandsolidarity.org/videos-and-interviews/second-call-to-who-please-dont-vaccinate-against-omicron>
- d. *Why is Covid-19 Vaccination of Children An Unforgivable Sin?*  
<https://www.voiceforscienceandsolidarity.org/videos-and-interviews/why-is-covid-19-vaccination-of-children-an-unforgivable-sin>

### FACT-CHECKING THE DEBUNKING – FURTHER NOTE

38. In addition to the facts contained in the Covid Kids Flyer, we consider it pertinent to reproduce here the link to a debunking of an attempt by Dr Helen Petousis-Harris in Newsroom<sup>6</sup> to “debunk dangerous misinformation”.
39. We stand by the validity of the references we provided previously and in addition had drawn attention to the blog post<sup>7</sup> [www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong](http://www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong). This is but one of many blog posts made independently of Voices for Freedom which have responded to Dr Petousis-Harris.
40. Another website to refer for information concerning jabs and children is: [www.thehoodnz.com](http://www.thehoodnz.com).

### PRINCIPLE 2: RULE 2(e)

41. Principle 2: Rule 2(e) states that:  
  
***“Advocacy advertising must clearly state the identity and position of the advertiser. Opinion in support of the advertiser’s position must be clearly distinguishable from factual information. Factual information must be able to be substantiated.”***
42. Our identity and position has been clearly stated on the Covid Kids Flyer along with our contact details.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2021/04/coronavirus-every-claim-about-covid-19-made-by-anti-lockdown-group-voices-for-freedom-debunked-by-scientists.html>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.covidreferenceguide.com/why-helen-petousis-harris-is-wrong>

43. There are no “opinions” on the Covid Kids Flyer. A series of factual statements are provided and all facts are substantiated as set out above in this document and more specifically as provided for under each point on our website under [www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids](http://www.voicesforfreedom.co.nz/kids).

## CONCLUSION

44. The information we provide is never in the New Zealand news, media or government promotions. The public is not exposed to a balanced conversation, pros and cons, the big picture of risks, potential risks, or any other vaccine limitations.
45. There is no full and transparent information from the authorities or media to ensure a genuine informed consent process. We consider it an indictment on the system that a grassroots movement such as Voices for Freedom has had to take up that charge independently.
46. It is clear from the complaints that receiving this information has been new and challenging for some recipients. We note that complainants say that they believe the information is false, unsubstantiated, misleading etc. Yet, every statement in the flyers is backed up. In many cases, directly from government sources, including the NZ government.
47. At Voices for Freedom, we welcome rigorous debate and respectful, bold conversations. Only when information about all of the potential risks is widely available can we have an open discussion about the Covid vaccine. Many people have rushed to take it without access to all the information. Now this is set to repeat with our healthy children being lined up. It simply isn't right. There is no benefit for children or their families to jab healthy children against the small risks of a virus, given the known risks of the Pfizer jab<sup>8</sup>. NZ law requires that individuals are provided with the information they need to make a fully informed choice.<sup>9</sup> Without more knowledge, that cannot happen.
48. Finally, we acknowledge that there have been complaints stating that Covid Kids Flyers have been delivered to "no circular" or similarly marked letterboxes. Our instructions are not to place the Covid Kids Flyer in those boxes, and we will continue to stress this point.
49. We are aware of instances where these flyers have been collected (by those seeking to bring ill-will to us) and then deliberately dropped into letterboxes marked in this way. That said, sometimes genuine mistakes are made by those delivering, and in that respect, we apologise for any inconvenience caused.

---

<sup>8</sup> See the videos referenced above by esteemed medical doctors – Dr Peter McCullough and Dr Robert Malone in particular.

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.hdc.org.nz/your-rights/about-the-code/code-of-health-and-disability-services-consumers-rights/>

We particularly recommend these videos

<https://odysee.com/@voicesforfreedom:6/allrisk-zerobenefit:a7>

<https://odysee.com/@voicesforfreedom:6/Aseem-Malhota-Heart-Disease-Link-To-mRNA-Covid-Vaccine:6>