

# Do Authoritarians 'Care' About You?

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

September 16, 2022

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › The basis for forcing an experimental gene therapy on everyone was that it would end the COVID pandemic by preventing infection and spread. Real-world reality has since proven this to be a false justification
- › Authoritarian rulers claim to act from deep concern for public health and the greater good of society. Historically, however, invoking "the greater good" principle has always been about disenfranchising citizens in order to consolidate and concentrate power
- › Throughout the pandemic, governments, employers, NGOs and media have argued that the social responsibility to "protect others" is so paramount that it negates all other considerations
- › But unless everyone has bodily autonomy, no one has bodily autonomy, and without it, everyone, including the most vulnerable, are put at risk. Hence, the rationale to "protect the vulnerable" falls apart unless everyone is allowed to make their own decisions
- › When everyone has to sacrifice themselves for others, then everyone's autonomy is violated – including that of the most vulnerable. The COVID vaccination campaign is a glaring example of this. Many who got the shots are still getting sick, many have been injured or died from the side effects, while those who refused to comply lost their jobs and, in some areas, can't even enter a store. Everyone has lost protection rather than gained it

Government officials, public health officials, media and a whole host of other talking heads that parrot official talking points have repeatedly lied to us. We knew this, but now

— without apology — they're all starting to "admit" it by subtly changing the narrative.

As noted by comedian Jimmy Dore in the August 3, 2022, episode of "The Jimmy Dore Show" (video above):

*"This story is very close to my heart, because it exonerates me. They've been lying about COVID, they've been lying about the vaccines, they've been lying about herd immunity, they've been lying about natural immunity, they've been lying about masks.*

*They've been lying about children — they've been lying about everything! Who'd have thunk the government and Big Pharma would lie to us? For profit? I am flummoxed. I am beside myself with slack-jawedness."*

## **Now, They're Eating Their Own Words**

He goes on to review specific examples, such as President Biden claiming "You're not going to get COVID if you have these vaccinations." Or Dr. Anthony Fauci, who said "When they are vaccinated, they can feel safe they are not going to get infected."

Or Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, who stated, "If you've done the right thing and gotten vaccinated, you deserve the freedom to be safe from COVID-19." (Word salad aside — can you "deserve freedom to be safe" from an infection? — nevertheless, he makes the point that you supposedly won't get COVID if you got the jab.)

Vice President Kamala Harris said, "If you are vaccinated, you are protected." Daniel Andrews, premier in Victoria, Canada, claimed that with three doses, you would be "prevented not only from serious illness, but from getting this virus, this Omicron variant, and therefore giving it to others."

Victoria chief health officer professor Brett Sutton, who got the AstraZeneca jab, insisted it was a "very effective vaccine" that reduced "risk of transmission." Every one of these officials has now contracted COVID, some two or three times.

## We Knew the Shots Were Leaky

A primary objection to vaccine mandates was, as Dore points out, that a leaky "vaccine" — one that doesn't actually prevent infection and spread — cannot protect anyone other than the one getting the shot. So, the argument that COVID jab refusers were killing people was false. The notion that getting the jab would protect people around you was rubbish.

"These were lies," Dore says, "they were not making a mistake. They were lying." What's the incentive for lying about an injection that clearly cannot do what you say it can? Dore suggests they were lying on behalf of their donors — Pfizer, Moderna, et. al. Of course, the National Institutes of Health,<sup>1,2</sup> for example, also owns patents related to these jabs, so they make money from them directly.

So, with the truth now being self-evident, why aren't media asking why Fauci, Biden, Harris, Trudeau and the rest were spreading misinformation? Where's the follow-up? And where are the apologies? Rachel Maddow, would you like to revise this proven-untrue statement, made on "The Rachel Maddow Show?"

*"Instead of the virus being able to hop from person to person to person, spreading and spreading ... now we KNOW that the vaccines work well enough; that the virus STOPS with every vaccinated person.*

*A vaccinated person gets exposed to the virus, the virus does not infect them, the virus can then not use that person to go anywhere else. It cannot use a vaccination person as a host to get more people. That means the vaccines will get us to the end of this."*

This propaganda did not age well, and that's putting it mildly. Now, they're trying to sidestep the landmines of truth — real-world realities — and claim that the shots were never intended to prevent infection, it was always about preventing serious illness and keeping you out of the hospital. But the statements quoted above, which is just a small sampling, prove otherwise.

The very basis and justification for forcing an experimental gene therapy on everyone was that it would end the pandemic by preventing infection and spread. People lost their jobs over that fraudulent justification. Friendships have been lost and family ties broken because people believed the propaganda that said if you don't get the shot, you don't care about others. Your very presence could be lethal to them. So, if you care about others, you will get the shot.

## **Do Authoritarians Care About You?**

That brings us to a more important question, and that is, do these authoritarians actually care about any of us? They claim the reason for their actions is their deep concern for public health and the good of society. But is that really the case? Or is it just a PR strategy?

After all, coming out and saying you want to **reduce the population** by some percentage, or eliminate the financial drain by the elderly and the handicapped, isn't going to encourage compliance with the strategies intended to bring about those effects, is it. It would make more sense to tell people to comply "for their own good, and the good of others." Then, the intended effect — depopulation — is brought about by voluntary sacrifice.

## **Totalitarianism as 'Care'**

In "Totalitarianism as 'Care,'"<sup>3</sup> political commentator Elena Louisa Lange dissects the biomedical regime's moral imperative to "protect the vulnerable," which in 2020, for the first time, came to mean that everyone, regardless of personal risk, had to isolate, wear a mask and get an experimental gene therapy, "regardless of the price in bodily integrity and autonomy."

“ The left's pretense of 'protecting the vulnerable' is not only politically and socially corrosive. It also rests, philosophically, on

## **an indefensible and authoritarian rationale. ~ Elena Louisa Lange”**

In a show of solidarity never before seen, hundreds of companies changed their logos and brand slogans to promote the COVID jabs. Political parties, schools, media, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) also told us to just get the jab — or else. The following extract from Lange's article is a bit longer than usual, but the expanded context is what makes Lange's point clear. Beyond this, I recommend reading her article in its entirety:<sup>4</sup>

*"The rhetoric of 'vulnerability' and 'care' bullied the masses into accepting a string of human- and civil-rights violations, such as being imprisoned in our own homes, the oxymoronic 'social distancing,' masking, and, above all, mandated vaccinations unprecedented in their severity and global scale.*

*Yet the left's pretense of 'protecting the vulnerable' is not only politically and socially corrosive. It also rests, philosophically, on an indefensible and authoritarian rationale.*

*The exclusive attention given to the abstract framework of 'vulnerability' and 'solidarity,' 'community' and 'care' — always 'for others,' never for oneself — served to disguise the loss of income and psychological damage caused by large-scale civil-rights suspensions ...*

*The idea of vulnerability as a guiding political principle of the left goes back to the birth of social-democratic and labor parties in the early 20th century. It was the working class that needed protection from the cruel vicissitudes of the market ...*

*But since the emergence of the neoliberal consensus in the 1970s, a remarkable shift has taken place ... It is no longer the working class ... but specific identity groups, the racially marginalized and the sexually excluded, who became 'vulnerable subjects' ...*

*What really cemented the PMC [professional-managerial class] left's rise to power, however, was a more fundamental epistemic shift. The left ... usually busy declaring everything to be a 'social construct,' suddenly proclaimed the novel coronavirus to be a 'natural phenomenon,' a 'challenge by uncontrollable natural forces' ... the virus was to be seen as a self-acting agent with its own subjective intent, motives, even political agenda.*

*This fetishistic inversion — ascribing autonomous powers to a lifeless thing — legitimated technocratic solutions like lockdowns and the feverishly promoted mass vaccinations, no matter the social costs. Moreover, turning the virus into an intentional agent shifted the blame for suicides and domestic violence, the loss of income, and extreme police violence against protesters, away from the politicians and bureaucrats, and onto 'nature.'*

*A pathogen ... is only as severe as the social response to it. If the response, justified as an 'objective constraint' of the virus, is more lethal than the cause, then we are dealing with a disastrous fallacy ...*

*'[V]ulnerability' in the PMC's imagination had to be shifted from vulnerable groups in the precise sense (the elderly, children, precarious service workers, etc.) to an undifferentiated whole under constant attack from the enemies of civil society, which happened to be the professionals' own political enemies.*

*This move conveniently enabled the identification of the 'fight against the virus' with the 'fight against fascism,' conflating questions of medical hygiene with those of 'social hygiene.'*

*The vocal denunciation of critics of the biopolitical security state as 'right-wingers,' conspiracy theorists, anti-vaxxers, and so on was only legible, and consequential, against the backdrop of this conflation, for it put the question of the defeat of the virus on par with the victory of the left."*

## **Transhistorical Rationale of Civil-Rights Violations**

How are "vulnerable" people "protected" by the destruction of lives and livelihoods, and the removal of basic civil rights and Constitutional freedoms? Our authoritarian leaders have yet to explain this self-defeating rationale. All we get is Orwellian double-speak, where war is peace and slavery is freedom.

Lange points out that once you go beyond political motives, the argument against forced vaccinations tells us a lot about the transhistorical rationale of civil-rights violations by the state.

Throughout history, the driving objective of power-hungry elites is the disenfranchisement of ordinary citizens. And how do you disenfranchise people? By taking away basic rights, such as the right to drink a cup of coffee or eat a meal you're willing and able to pay for in a restaurant, lest you first submit to medical experimentation.

And how do you get people to submit to medical experimentation? By shaming them as egotists who care nothing for society. In a fiery speech, 23-year-old Green Member of the German Bundestag, Emilia Fester (quoted in full by Lange), argued that:

*"It is not mandated vaccination that is the imposition, but no mandated vaccination — an imposition for the solidarity-based majority ... Getting vaccinated can no longer be an individual decision!"<sup>5</sup>*

## **Violation of Physical Boundaries Protects No One**

Throughout the pandemic, governments, employers, NGOs and media have argued that the social responsibility to "protect others" is so paramount that it negates all other considerations. According to them, one individual's freedom and bodily autonomy ends where the freedom and autonomy of another begins.

Rather than being sovereign individuals who make decisions for ourselves, we are to view ourselves as links in a never-ending chain, where every decision you make will impact the people around you, and if your decision has even so much as the potential to

restrict their freedom and autonomy — such as, for example, if you make them sick so they can't work or socialize — then you "don't have the right" to make that decision.

As noted by Lange, the moral imposition can be summarized as: "Give up your bodily integrity to protect the bodily integrity of others." But rather than protecting others, the end result is the opposite, because it creates "infinite regress."

In other words, if I give up my bodily integrity for you, then you have to give up yours for others, who also have to give up theirs, and so on. So, in the end, no one has the right to, ever, say no to anything, even if what's asked might cause injury or death.

Since there's no backstop, and everyone has to sacrifice themselves for others, no one is actually protected. Instead, everyone's at risk. Everyone's autonomy has been violated — including that of the most vulnerable. The COVID vaccination campaign is a glaring example of this.

Many who got the shots are still getting sick, many have been injured or died from the side effects, while those who refused to comply lost their jobs and, in some areas, can't even enter a store. Everyone has lost rather than gained, and in more ways than one.

## **Bodily Integrity for All Is the Best Protection**

Not only does the demand of self-sacrifice for others put the most vulnerable at risk of injury and death, since they too must roll the dice with risky medical interventions in order to "protect others," but it also eliminates our moral ability to defend and protect the physical autonomy of others. If we cannot defend our own boundaries, how can we defend the boundaries of others?

Sadly, we now have real-world examples of where this all leads. Children and adults in need of organ transplants, for example, are being denied life-saving procedures for lack of COVID injection, even though the shot is more likely to kill them than protect anyone around them (supposedly the already COVID-jabbed and boosted hospital staff). We've entered a state of such massive moral degradation that it hardly seems human anymore.

The only way to actually protect people and minimize harm is by allowing everyone to do what they think is best for themselves. As noted by Lange:<sup>6</sup>

*"In consequence, either there is general physical autonomy for each and every single individual, implying mutual respect for one's physical boundaries, or there is none. The violation of physical boundaries ... is never in the interest of the 'vulnerable,' because the protection of bodily integrity itself is already the best guarantee for the protection of 'others,' as well as oneself: It is, in fact, the only guarantee of physical protection for everyone.*

*This becomes even more apparent in the COVID case when we consider that the vaccinated can be infected and can infect others, and, therefore, potentially hurt them. In this sense, the logical framework for COVID mass vaccinations in the name of 'vulnerability' is self-defeating."*

## **'Social Care' Narrative Is About Consolidation of Power**

One of the key take-home messages in Lange's article is that this "social care" and "responsibility for others" paradigm is a ploy used to consolidate power. In her words:<sup>7</sup>

*"In sum, the claim to 'protect the vulnerable' is the more or less direct demand to yield to political disenfranchisement under the guise of the honorable project of care ... The left's political project of 'protecting the vulnerable' is nothing short of window-dressing authoritarianism."*

The authoritarians don't actually care about people and their health. Anyone can realize this simply by analyzing their actions, rather than their words. They care about controlling people as a means to gain more power. Of course, the more power they get, the more they need to control you, lest you rise up and strip them of that power.

The hallmark call of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes is to "serve the greater good" by sacrificing selfhood. Everything is about the collective. There's no room for individuality. In my interview with psychologist Mattias Desmet, he explains [the](#)

[psychology of totalitarianism](#), and the conditions that precede the rise of totalitarian systems.

The same "care" narrative is also being used to prop up the "climate emergency." We're now told we have to sacrifice our standard of living because we have a responsibility for others and for the earth. We have to rein in our personal carbon footprint because pollution is deadly, and if you don't, you're — again — responsible for widespread death.

While pollution is a reality that needs to be addressed, the solutions the totalitarian cabal is offering is a gigantic scam designed to disempower and control everyone but the ones at [the very top of the power pyramid](#), while accomplishing little in terms of producing a cleaner environment.

[Login](#) or [Join](#) to comment on this article