

# The Hypocrisy Behind the Vaccines

By [Martin Armstrong](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

Global Research, December 27, 2022

[Armstrong Economics](#) 13 December 2022


All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate Website** button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

\*\*\*

*Look, the real problem is the media. We no longer have media organizations willing to actually report the truth on any of these political issues or ever do any serious investigation. Gates held a secret gathering to sell his agenda to reduce the world's population. The Guardian reported that they are known as the "Good Club" which seems to be the same marketing ploy used for ensuring your death which they call life insurance. Fire, theft, and accident insurance are called by their proper name.*



**Ruth Bader Ginsburg and a question of eugenics**

Here's what Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said in Sunday's New York Times Magazine: "Frankly I had thought that at the time (Roe v. Wade) was decided," Ginsburg told her interviewer, Emily Bazelon, "there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

The comment, which bizarrely elicited no follow-up from Bazelon or any further coverage from the New York Times — or any other major news outlet — was in the context of Medicaid funding for abortion. Ginsburg was surprised when the Supreme Court in 1980 barred taxpayer support for abortions for poor women. After all, if poverty partly described the population you had "too many of," you would want to subsidize it in order to expedite the reduction of unwanted populations.

Left unclear is whether Ginsburg endorses the eugenic motivation she ascribed to the passage of Roe v. Wade or whether she was merely objectively describing it. One senses that if Antonin Scalia had offered such a comment, a Times interviewer would have sought more clarity, particularly on the racial characteristics of these supposedly unwanted populations.

Regardless, Ginsburg's certainly right that abortion has deep roots in the historic effort to "weed out" undesired groups. For instance, Margaret Sanger, the revered feminist and founder of Planned Parenthood, was a racist eugenicist of the first order. Even more perplexing: She's become a champion of "reproductive freedom" even though she proposed a "Code to Stop Overproduction of Children," under which "no woman shall have a legal right to bear a child without a permit." (Poor blacks would have had a particularly hard time getting such licenses from Sanger.)

If Ginsburg does see eugenic culling as a compelling state interest, she'd be in fine company on the court. Oliver Wendell Holmes was a passionate believer in such things. In 1915, Holmes wrote in the Illinois Law Review that the "starting point for an ideal for the law" should be the "coordinated human effort ... to build a race."

In 1927, he wrote a letter to his friend, Harold Laski, telling him, "I ... delivered an opinion upholding the constitutionality of a state law for sterilizing imbeciles the other day — and felt that I was getting near the first principle of real reform." That was the year he wrote the majority opinion in Buck v. Bell (joined by Louis Brandeis) holding that forcibly sterilizing lower-class women was constitutional.

In recent years, openly discussing the notion of eugenic aspects of abortion has become taboo. But as Ginsburg's comments suggest, the taboo hasn't eliminated the idea; it's merely sent it underground.

To be sure, some heterodox liberals speak up. The writer Nicholas von Hoffman has written: "Free, cheap abortion is a policy of social defense. To save ourselves from being murdered in our beds and raped on the streets, we should do everything possible to encourage pregnant women who don't want the baby and will not take care of it to get rid of the thing before it turns into a monster ..."

In 1992, Ron Wedington, co-counsel in the Roe v. Wade case, wrote a letter to President-elect Clinton, imploring him to push RU-486 — a.k.a. "the abortion pill" — to market as quickly as possible.

"You can start immediately to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy and poor segment of our country," Wedington insisted. All the president had to do was make abortion cheap and easy for the populations we don't want. "It's what we all know is true, but we only whisper it ... Think of all the poverty, crime and misery ... and then add 30 million unwanted babies to the scenario. We lost a lot of ground during the Reagan-Bush religious orgy. We don't have a lot of time left."

Wedington offered a clue about who, in particular, he had in mind: "For every Jesse Jackson who has fought his way out of the poverty of a large family, there are millions mired in poverty, drugs and crime." Ah, right, Jesse Jackson. Got it.

Unlike Bazelon, I for one would like to know whether Ginsburg believes there were — or are — some populations in need of shrinking through abortion and whether she thinks such considerations have any place at the Supreme Court.


And while we're at it, it would be interesting to know what Supreme Court nominee, Sonia Sotomayor thinks about such things.

**Jonah Goldberg is a Tribune Media Services columnist.**

They could never sell “**Death insurance**” so they inverted the name by calling it life insurance and then everyone was willing to buy it. They have done the same thing with **ABORTION**. They flipped it from the extermination of a child arguing it has no human right until it is born, and they championed it as a Woman’s Right to decide her own body. Justice Ginsberg made it clear that it was **NEVER** about woman’s rights, it was all about reducing the population of minorities that Gates’ father championed Planned Parenthood and stuck his clinics in minority areas.

Here, they market themselves as the “**Good Club**” which can only mean one thing – this is the evil meeting that is more akin to a war room. The Guardian wrote:

The names of some of the members are familiar figures: Bill Gates, George Soros, Warren Buffett, Oprah Winfrey, David Rockefeller and Ted Turner. But there are others, too, like business giants Eli and Edythe Broad, who are equally wealthy but less well known. All told, its members are worth \$125bn. The meeting – called by Gates, Buffett and Rockefeller – was held in response to the global economic downturn and the numerous health and environmental crises that are plaguing the globe. It was, in some ways, a summit to save the world.



It was at this meeting that Gates sought to get others to join him and his real goal of reducing the population using the 2007-2009 financial crisis as an excuse to get together despite the fact it was caused by overleveraged mortgages. Instead, Gates cleverly steered the meeting to his real objective global health issues such he blended with overpopulation and disease.

I find it unimaginable how you can be so obsessed with overpopulation and then want to create vaccines to increase the population. Worst still, not a single mainstream media has the guts to ever be a real media organization anymore.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*All images in this article are from the author*

The original source of this article is [Armstrong Economics](#)  
Copyright © [Martin Armstrong](#), [Armstrong Economics](#), 2022

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Martin  
Armstrong](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)