

The Rise of Utilitarian Extremism, and How to Recognize It

M articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2021/05/10/the-rise-of-utilitarian-extremism.aspx

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#) [Fact Checked](#)

May 10, 2021

[Previous](#)

[Next](#)



Story at-a-glance

- Proof of vaccination requirements for travel are rare, and limited to travel to certain destinations where the risk of contracting a disease and bringing it back to a population with nonexistent immunity against it is high
- The U.S. government's job is to protect the Constitutional rights of all Americans. Allowing or encouraging businesses to create a two-tier society where unvaccinated people are barred from participating in civic society is unconstitutional
- Proof of vaccination against COVID-19 will not ensure safety. It won't even promote it, as the so-called vaccines are designed to merely reduce symptoms of the infection
- Utilitarianism, which is now being increasingly promoted, is a discredited pseudo-ethic that has repeatedly been used to justify horrific human rights abuses. It is based on a mathematical equation that some individuals can be sacrificed for the greater good of the majority
- Utilitarianism appears to be at work already. The European Union's vaccine injury reporting system had logged 330,2018 adverse event reports, including 7,766 deaths, as of April 17, 2021, and the U.S. reporting system had logged 118,902 adverse event reports as of April 23, including 3,544 deaths and 12,618 serious injuries, yet all of these injuries and deaths are simply ignored and people are told to get the shot, no matter what

In an April 29, 2021, opinion piece published by *Newsday*,¹ Arthur Caplan and Dorit Reiss, Ph.D., argue for the implementation of vaccine passports as a strategy to regain our freedom to travel and the “safe” reopening of schools and businesses.

Caplan is the director of medical ethics at NYU Grossman School of Medicine and Reiss is a law professor at UC Hastings College of the Law and a member² of the Parent Advisory Board of Voices of Vaccines.

Caplan is also co-chair of the Vaccines Working Group on Ethics and Policy, a group formed specifically to address “key policy challenges associated with the testing and distribution of vaccines intended to prevent COVID-19 transmission in the United States,” and Reiss is a member of the board.³

Part of their argument is that vaccinations have “always” been “necessary for travel,” which is patently false. Proof of vaccination requirements are rare, and strictly limited to travel to certain destinations where the risk of contracting a disease and bringing it back to a population with nonexistent immunity against it is high. You’ve never had to show proof of vaccination when flying to Paris, France, for example.

Arguing for Unconstitutional Practices

Caplan and Reiss also argue that prohibiting businesses from requiring vaccine passports, which some state governors are now doing, is “unusual and irrational,” as private businesses have the right to make their business more attractive by increasing the safety for its staff and patrons.

The problem with that argument is that it is the government’s job to protect the Constitutional rights of all Americans. Allowing or encouraging businesses to create a two-tier society where unvaccinated people are barred from participating in civic society is unconstitutional on its face.

What’s more, proof of vaccination against COVID-19 will not ensure safety. It won’t even remotely promote it, as the so-called vaccines are designed to merely reduce symptoms of the infection. They don’t make you immune. You can still contract the virus and spread it to others. The only one who might benefit from the jab is the one getting it.

Of course, Caplan and Reiss make no mention of this crucial point, but since the vaccinated person is the only one getting any protection, no one needs to know your vaccination status, as it doesn’t affect them either way. A COVID-19 vaccinated individual poses the same risk to the community as an unvaccinated one.

So, the only reason for a vaccine passport is a control-related one, and Reiss and Caplan are keeping busy, trying to convince you otherwise. In a February 2021 *Barron’s* article,⁴ they argued for letting employers mandate vaccines for their employees, using the same lame arguments.

What's happening here is that the U.S. federal government recognizes that it cannot legally mandate vaccine passports. It would be unconstitutional, as it would create a two-tier society built on medical discrimination. So, government is depending on private businesses to push through this measure. Reiss and Caplan's efforts are part of this strategic subversion of Constitutional rights.

Caplan and Reiss also paired up for an opinion piece published April 27, 2021, by The Hour,⁵ in which they sank to typical propagandist lows, bashing parents of vaccine damaged children who fought against the removal of religious exemption to vaccination in Connecticut.⁶

The Threat of Utilitarianism

Caplan's and Reiss' one-sided obsession with utilitarianism, where risks to the individual are ignored and the idea of self-determination and personal choice is ridiculed, is clearly spelled out in an article published in the January/June 2020 issue of the Journal of Law and the Biosciences:⁷

“There is a large literature about school mandates, and a somewhat more limited literature on adult mandates, but there is less principled discussion of when is it appropriate to mandate a specific vaccine. Field and Caplan suggested an ethical framework to consider when school mandates ought to apply ...

Their framework explains that autonomy, beneficence, utilitarianism, justice, and non-maleficence are the values affected by immunization mandates. Applying the framework here provides important insights on the suitability of a COVID-19 vaccine mandate ...

[U]tilitarianism — acting for the benefit of the greatest number for society as a whole — supports a COVID-19 mandate, as it supports other vaccine mandates ... The current pandemic is causing harms in lives and suffering, and also economic harms as preventing loss of more life requires measures like sheltering at home, closing businesses, and the closing of public spaces. Preventing these staggering costs is a huge social benefit.

Once a vaccine is available, the justification for measures like shelter at home will decrease, but preventing harms will depend on vaccine use. A mandate will increase use, boost herd immunity and reduce costs. The only caveat is that the balance of costs and benefits depends on the safety of the vaccine.”

Utilitarianism is a discredited pseudo-ethic that has repeatedly been used to justify horrific human rights abuses. By now, we can accurately predict what the outcome will be if we allow it to be used to justify vaccine passports and mandatory COVID vaccinations.

In short, utilitarianism is based on a mathematical equation that some individuals can be sacrificed for the greater good of the majority. In other words, if some people are harmed by vaccines, it's an acceptable loss because society as a whole may or will reap gains.

Caplan and Reiss express this as “acting for the benefit of the greatest number.” The flip-side is that a smaller number — it could be 49 out of 100 — may be harmed and that’s acceptable, because the people harmed is still a smaller number than the majority.

More Than 11,000 COVID Vaccine Deaths Logged

The latest data on [COVID-19 vaccine side effects](#) suggest governments are already operating under this horrific utilitarian ideology.

How else do you explain the fact that the European Union’s vaccine injury reporting system had logged 330,2018 adverse event reports, including 7,766 deaths, as of April 17, 2021,⁸ and the U.S. reporting system had logged 118,902 adverse event reports as of April 23, including 3,544 deaths and 12,618 serious injuries,⁹ yet all of these injuries and deaths are simply ignored and the call for everyone to get their jab continues unabated — all while bashing vaccine hesitancy as a mental illness, intellectual deficit or act of domestic terrorism?!

In a utilitarian system, you cease to be an individual with rights to autonomous decision-making and become a tool of the government, and that’s exactly what we’re seeing here. Government has apparently decided that some people — quite a few people, apparently — are expendable, which is the exact converse of what they’re telling us publicly.

Although we may disagree about the quality and quantity of the scientific evidence used by doctors and governments to declare COVID-19 “vaccines” safe, at our peril do we fail to agree that, while government may have the power, it does not have the moral authority to dictate that individuals born with certain genes and biological susceptibilities give up their lives without their consent for what the ruling majority deems is the greater good.

They say we all must get vaccinated to save lives, especially the elderly. Yet lives are being taken, and these are not people who already have one foot in the grave. While COVID-19 kills the elderly and the seriously ill, these [gene therapy](#) injections are stealing the lives of younger, healthy individuals who are in the prime of their lives. How can you even compare those two scenarios and come to the conclusion that mass vaccination is the greater good?

While utilitarianism was a popular ideology in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it went out of fashion in the mid-20th century, after the Third Reich employed the utilitarian rationale as an excuse to demonize and eliminate minorities judged to be a threat to the health, security and well-being of the State.¹⁰ Its abhorrent and unethical nature was clearly recognized and clarified during the Nuremberg trials.

Although we may disagree about the quality and quantity of the scientific evidence used by doctors and governments to declare COVID-19 “vaccines” safe, at our peril do we fail to agree that, while government may have the power, it does not have the moral authority to dictate that individuals born with certain genes and biological susceptibilities give up their lives without their consent for what the ruling majority deems is the greater good.

Having everyone conform to a normal weight and not having insulin resistance issues would be for the greater good of society. Does that mean government should have the power to send everyone above a certain BMI to a forced internment camp where they are exercised and underfed until they no longer pose an increased health care cost risk?

We really ought to think long and hard before we jump on the utilitarian wagon and start pumping our fists in the air in endorsement of the “greater good” narrative.

Most people in the U.S. are engaging in lifestyle practices that put them at a seriously increased risk of being a financial burden on society and the health care system, so don't fall for the baseless idea that unvaccinated people, specifically, will end up costing more because they'll end up with more serious cases of COVID-19. There's no data at all to back that up.

Conspiracies Blamed for Growing Sensibility

As more and more people are starting to realize the perilous road we're on and where it's taking us, the mainstream propagandists are turning up the heat, blaming vaccine hesitancy on one “conspiracy theory” after another. They simply refuse to admit that people can, and most want, to make their own decisions.

Rising anti-vaccination sentiment is being blamed on everything from Russian bots and trolls spreading misinformation online and making a tiny minority appear larger than what it actually is,¹¹ to rebranding “harmful anti-vaccine views” as a civil liberties issue or a part of some other conspiracy theory involving the drug industry or Bill Gates.¹²

The fact is, the vaccine mandate pushers have nothing but foul language and mockery at their disposal. They have no facts with which to prove that COVID-19 vaccines are safe and effective, or that mass vaccination will save lives. They cannot disprove the financial incentives and ties that exist between Gates, the World Health Organization, vaccine makers and government.

Gates is one of the largest funders of the WHO, which has been responsible for the global response to the pandemic, while simultaneously being heavily invested in COVID-19 vaccines and funding censorship of vaccine information.¹³

The WHO is also promoting global censorship of vaccine information, in part through its “Stop the Spread” campaign¹⁴ aimed at stopping the spread of COVID-19 “misinformation,” and a coalition of groups is calling on the Biden Administration to put together a disinformation task force.¹⁵

Showing just how ludicrous this suggestion is, the task force would “explore ways to crack down on deliberate disinformation campaigns in ways that don't unduly limit free expression.” In other words, they're to figure out how to censor people without making it a clear breach of the First Amendment.

Well, we already know one way in which they're doing that, and that is by calling on private companies like Twitter and Facebook to censor for them. It's still a violation of the First Amendment, though; it's just harder to see.

Vaccine mandate pushers also cannot disprove that the pandemic is being used to roll out the Great Reset and global "build back better" plans that will decimate the U.S. Constitution and rob the working class of its wealth and autonomy. In short, they have no counter-arguments. All they can do is paint people who question their flimsy utilitarian narrative as crackpots of one sort or another.

If the vaccines were truly fantastic, word of their miraculous nature would spread like wildfire, just as reports of horrendous vaccine side effects now are, and people would flock to get them even in the absence of advertising and celebrity promotion.

The fact that name-calling and smear tactics are employed en masse to paint dissenters as crackpots and terrorists rather than presenting actual data and evidence that supports their pro-vaccine stance is proof positive that there's something strange afoot.

Utilitarian Extremism Is on the Rise

I've previously written about the sudden influence wielded by a group called Center for Countering Digital Hate (CCDH) — a progressive cancel-culture leader with extensive ties to government and global think tanks that recently labeled people questioning the COVID-19 vaccine as a national security threat.

The CCDH has published two reports^{16,17} naming me as one of the top 12 individuals responsible for 65% of vaccine "disinformation" on social media, and in true utilitarian fashion, CCDH founder Imran Ahmed is calling on all platforms to silence me for the public good.

Ahmed has also published an article¹⁸ in the journal Nature Medicine, calling for the "dismantling" of the entire "anti-vaccine industry." In it, he repeats the lie that he "attended and recorded a private, three-day meeting of the world's most prominent anti-vaxxers," when, in fact, what he's referring to was a public online conference open to an international audience.

All attendants have access to the recordings as part of their attendance fee, so unless he illegally hacked his way into the conference, he didn't have to record a thing. We gave it to him. When you lie about something that stupid, it really puts your credibility about larger issues in question.

The CCDH is partnered with Anti-Vax Watch, which held a demonstration outside the halls of Congress in this bizarre getup. While the CCDH claims to be fighting the good fight against dangerous crackpots and extremists, they work with people who look like they epitomize those terms.¹⁹

This is hardly the look of people standing on higher moral and ethical ground. This is pure theatre, which makes sense, seeing how they don't have facts and data with which to make their point.



Gates-Funded Doctor Demands Terrorist Experts Attack Me

Dr. Peter Hotez, president of the Sabin Vaccine Institute,²⁰ recently cited the CCDH in a Nature article in which he goes so far as to call for cyberwarfare experts to be enlisted in the war against vaccine safety advocates and people who are “vaccine hesitant.”

“Accurate, targeted counter-messaging from the global health community is important but insufficient, as is public pressure on social-media companies,” Hotez writes.²¹

“The United Nations and the highest levels of government must take direct, even confrontational, approaches with Russia, and move to dismantle anti-vaccine groups in the United States.

Efforts must expand into the realm of cyber security, law enforcement, public education and international relations. A high-level inter-agency task force reporting to the UN secretary-general could assess the full impact of anti-vaccine aggression, and propose tough, balanced measures.

The task force should include experts who have tackled complex global threats such as terrorism, cyber attacks and nuclear armament, because anti-science is now approaching similar levels of peril. It is becoming increasingly clear that advancing immunization requires a counteroffensive.”

This appears to be part of the campaign to pressure the White House administration into creating an information warfare task force, as mentioned earlier. Not surprisingly, the Sabin Vaccine Institute has received tens of millions of dollars from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.^{22,23,24,25} Most recently, funds from the Gates foundation were used to create a report called “Meeting the Challenge of Vaccine Hesitancy.”^{26,27}

A Well-Informed Humanity United Is the Answer

Even while censorship and utilitarian-driven extremism heats up, we must never stop seeking out and sharing information that impacts our health and freedom. Informed consent demands transparency of the bad along with the good. Right now, all people are given free access to is the supposed benefit, while all potential harms are whitewashed and scrubbed from the internet.

Nothing good can come of this. As noted in Kennedy’s October 24, 2020, online speech,²⁸ “International Message of Hope for Humanity” — which kicked off a day of protest against the coup d’état by the technocratic elite — we must shed our imaginary fears, reject media fearmongering, insist on freedom of speech and engage in the democratic process.

“The only way we can win it is with democracy,” he said. “We need to fight to get our democracy back, to reclaim our democracy from these villains who are stealing it from us. Notice the people who are getting richest from this quarantine are the same people who are censoring criticism of the quarantine.”

The same is true for vaccines and vaccine passports. Kennedy also stressed another crucial point, namely the need to unify. We must put aside our quibbles over nonessential things like race, religion and political affiliations, and stay laser-focused on the real enemy.

“What the Big Tech villains ... want us to do is fight with each other. They want Blacks fighting against Whites. They want republicans fighting against democrats. They want everybody polarized. They want everybody fragmented because they know that if we all get together, we’re going to start asking questions and those are questions they can’t answer ...

Stop identifying yourself. The enemy is Big Tech, Big Data, Big Oil, Big Pharma, the medical cartel, the government totalitarian elements that are trying to oppress us, that are trying to rob us of our liberties, of our democracy, of our freedom of thought, of our freedom of expression, of our freedom of assembly and all of the freedoms that give dignity to humanity ...

The free-flow of information, the cauldron of debate, is the only thing that allows governments to develop rational policies in which self-governance will actually work and triumph.

You are on the front lines of the most important battle in history — the battle to save democracy, freedom, human liberty and human dignity from this totalitarian cartel that is trying to rob us, simultaneously, in every nation in the world, of the rights that every human being is born with ...

And I pledge to you: I will go down dying with my boots on, fighting side-by-side with all of you to make sure that we return these rights and preserve them for our children.”

I too will continue fighting for human rights, free speech and medical freedom. Without these, what are we? What is life reduced to? What’s the point of preventing a few COVID-19 cases and deaths if the entire global population — including the billions who are at no risk from this virus — must gamble their health in the process?