

Eugenics And Margaret Sanger

Category: Science Gone Wrong: the ramifications

Food for Thought

“This is precisely the aim of Eugenics. Its first object is to check the birth rate of the unfit, instead of allowing them to come into being, though doomed in large numbers to perish prematurely. The second object is the improvement of the race by furthering the productivity of the fit by early marriages and healthful rearing of their children. Natural selection rests upon excessive production and wholesale destruction... Eugenics on bringing no more individuals into the world that can be properly cared for, and those only of the best stock.”

Francis Galton

Now you have met the founder of Eugenics, Francis Galton. His cousin, Charles Darwin, published On the Origin of Species by Natural Selection in 1859. In 1883, Galton coined the term “Eugenics”, and he published his observations and conclusions and promoted his Darwinist, Atheist, and elitist propaganda in his book, Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development. Galton quickly and obviously evidenced himself as a Godless ideologue.

Look, when you conceive of yourself and others as mammals, mammals without souls, you are bound to bring that bias into any scientific inquiry you might undertake.

Eugenics has more victims than you can imagine. As I trudge through the thought and history of Eugenics, I will attempt to restrain my contempt for both Galton and Eugenics. It will not be easy. Here is Galton’s definition of Eugenics. “The study of all agencies under human control which can improve or impair the racial quality of future generations.”

Is that definition confusing? It should be. Perhaps taking a closer look at the quote that opened this article will shed some light on Galton’s definition.

Eugenics sought and seeks to check the birth rate of the unfit. Who are the unfit? Will the “inferior” do? No? Then I will be plain. The “unfit to reproduce” will turn

out to be people with lower I.Q.'s, those with physical disabilities, criminals, deviants, and members of minority groups that are not in favor.

Yes, this movement will be racist. Yes, it will crush the handicapped. Yes, it will also crush the children of criminals and prostitutes. Hang on Bill, I understand the racism angle, and I can comprehend why the physically and mentally handicapped might fall prey to eugenicist thinking, but why the children of criminals and prostitutes?

Our "enlightened", elitist, Atheist, Darwinist scientists concluded, supposedly scientifically, that your prostitute mother would pass along her prostitute genes to you. This is science gone wrong in spades.

What is the flip side? Those deemed "fit" are encouraged to reproduce, early and often.

Godless folk are arrogant enough to assume that they alone can determine who is fit to reproduce and fit to live.

Sterilization, abortion, and euthanasia are the tools employed to bring the Eugenicist's vision of the world into being.

This theory, Eugenics, is a natural follow-up to Darwin's theory of natural selection – this is plant and animal evolutionary theory applied to humans. In fairness, Atheism teaches that you and I are bodies, bodies only, bodies without souls, and bodies without consciousness. So, if a better breed of cattle is good, why not a better breed of human? See where true Atheism takes one. Most "pretend Atheists" have never reasoned through this, and, at the same time, they are ignorant about history, especially the history of Eugenics. I am covering this topic so you can slip it into a conversation/discussion when the opportunity arises.

I do believe that Darwin himself was opposed to this elaboration of his theory. He was wise to fear this expansion of his theory. His theory would prove deadly when coupled with "**genetic determinism,**" **the notion that human character is entirely or nearly entirely caused by genes, unaffected by education or environment in the home. That is how they determined earlier that your prostitute mother would pass along her prostitution gene to you.**

Okay, should we proceed to the ramifications of scientific ideas gone wrong? I think so. First Eugenics became a discipline at many colleges. The idea was to

alter thinking about parenting (think nature vs. nurture). The American Eugenics Society was formed in 1922, 14 years after the Brits had formed their society. Madison Grant, an American zoologist and attorney, published his awful book titled, The Passing of the Great Race in 1916. While in prison in 1924, Adolph Hitler imbibed this nonsense, and he soon put hands and feet to it and began killing the physically and mentally handicapped, Gypsies, and Jews. Ideas do have ramifications. Again, Hitler called Madison Grant's book, "my bible". On both sides of the Atlantic these Atheist elitists were putting the tenets of this "scientific theory" into practice. On the U.S. side, sterilization of the "feeble minded" and the criminal element began in earnest. Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, made it her mission to eradicate the "weeds"; most of her weeds were Black. Her strategy was to secretly set up abortion clinics in predominantly Black neighborhoods. I will take Margaret the murderess up as my next topic.

Politically, the movement advocated sterilization laws. Its moral dimension was what you might expect from Atheists, Eugenics rejected the idea that all human beings are created equal and redefined moral values solely in terms of genetic fitness. It will quickly come to the conclusion that the Nordic race, the Aryan genetic pool, was superior and was to be promoted. Conversely, the eventual elimination of the "unfit" races was conceived. Heaven forbid a nice Aryan boy should fall in love with a nice Black girl. That would contaminate the favored gene pool!

By the mid 1920's, Eugenics was promoted by governments and "brights" around the globe. The deaf, blind, mentally slow, mentally ill, promiscuous women, homosexuals, and so on were sterilized, institutionalized, euthanized, and mass murdered. Older and ill hospital patients were regularly euthanized as well. What was its demise? The aforementioned Adolph Hitler. Nazi horrors sent Eugenicists into silence. The world saw Eugenics applied.

Today, time has gone by, memories have dimmed, history has ceased to be taught, and there is a resurgence of interest in Eugenics. Our man, Richard Dawkins, the brashest of our snake oil salesmen, chimed in on Eugenics with this tweet:

"It's one thing to deplore eugenics on ideological, political, and moral grounds. It's quite another to conclude that it wouldn't work in practice. Of course it would – it works for cows, horses, pigs, dogs and roses. Why on earth wouldn't it work for humans? Facts ignore ideology."

After the criticism cascaded down, Dawkins, predictably, soft-pedaled what he'd said. Men like Dawkins have a career-preservation gene and an arrogance governor that acts like a governor on a car does. When one goes too fast, the arrogance governor kicks in. His arrogance prohibits them from ever truly being repentant about any statement they've ever uttered.

But, Dawkins is trying to deceive you when he acts like he is against Eugenics in the real world. Here is another Twitter exchange.

Questioner: *I don't know what I would do if I were pregnant with a kid with Down's syndrome. Real ethical dilemma.*

Dawkins: Abort it and try again. It would be immoral to bring it into the world if you had the choice.

Aiden M: *994 human beings with Down's syndrome deliberately killed before birth in England and Wales in 2012. Is that civilized?*

Dawkins: Yes, it is very civilized. They are fetuses diagnosed before they have human feelings.

It grieves and angers me to hear such blather. Millions of parents have happy families with Down's Syndrome children in them. This man has so little regard for life, life God created. We have become desensitized to such wicked talk. Dawkins inanely states that it would be "immoral" to bring the child into the world if you had a choice? Immoral? This is an Atheist who claims morality is never absolute, then, you'll notice, he plays God and determines what is immoral. He is such a pitiful excuse for an Atheist. He knows the tenets of Atheism, and he constantly ignores or violates them. In the end Dawkins is simply a pompous snake oil salesman and nothing more. If only Atheism had a better team of representatives. If they did, Dawkins would be dismissed from the list of prominent snake oil salesmen.

In closing, I want to warn you that Eugenics could become the elitists' favorite hobbyhorse again. Such a movement finds fertile ground in academia, politics, and government. TODAY IT HAS EVOLVED INTO THE SOCIETY FOR BIODEMOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL BIOLOGY. BEWARE.

Here are some of the prominent people who championed eugenics in the 1920's: (to name a few)

- Alexander Graham Bell
- Winston Churchill
- W.E.B Du Bois
- Helen Keller
- Margaret Sanger
- Theodore Roosevelt
- John Maynard Keynes



Winston Churchill Margaret Sanger

By 1936, when America's scientific community finally spoke up, after watching Hitler grasp these hideous concepts, over 60,000 forced sterilizations had been performed in the U.S. – mostly on people in mental hospitals, prisons, and people in poverty (think Black people) during the 1920's and 1930's. Forced sterilizations in the South were jokingly referred to as "Mississippi Appendectomies".

The American Eugenics Society had hoped to sterilize one-tenth of the U.S.

When in a group, this topic, once brought up, will command the room. You do well to learn these facts so you'll be prepared for such a discussion. Once educated, folks despise Dawkins, and his influence on them is forever vanquished.

Margaret Sanger



The founder of Planned Parenthood had all the who's-who of the academic, scientific, and governmental world on her side in the 1920's. Eugenics was the rage among the elites. So, she was both confident and brazen in her communications. I will let her speak for herself.

"The emergency problem of segregation and sterilization must be faced immediately. Every feeble-minded girl or woman of the hereditary type,

especially of the moron class, should be segregated during the reproductive period. We prefer the policy of immediate sterilization... making sure that parenthood is absolutely prohibited to the feeble-minded."

"The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

"Every woman should be an absolute mistress of her own body."

"The most merciful thing that a large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it."

"Birth control must ultimately lead to a cleaner race."

"We want fewer and better children who can be reared up to their possibilities in unencumbered homes, and we cannot make the social-life and world peace we are determined to make, with the ill-bred, ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens that you inflict upon us."

"Covertly invest in non-White areas. Invest in ghetto abortion clinics! Help to raise money for free abortions, in primarily non-White areas. Perhaps abortion clinic syndicates throughout North America, that primarily operate in non-White areas and receive tax support, should be promoted."

"Eugenic sterilization is an urgent need... we must prevent multiplication of this bad stock."

"Colored people are like human weeds and are to be exterminated."

"Slavs, Latins, and Hebrew immigrants are human weeds... a dead weight of human waste. Blacks, soldiers, and Jews are a menace to the race."

"I accepted an invitation to talk to the women's branch of the Ku Klux Klan... I saw through the door dim figures parading with banners and illuminated crosses... I was escorted to the platform, was introduced, and began to speak... In the end, through simple illustrations I believe I had accomplished my purpose. A dozen invitations to speak to similar groups were proffered."

Could Ms. Sanger's feelings about non-White people be clearer? To use the verb

exterminate when speaking of beings made in God's image is unfathomable, until you realize that this godless paragon of arrogance has no fear of God.

"Colored people are like human weeds and are to be exterminated."

"Covertly invest in non-White areas. Invest in ghetto abortion clinics. Help to raise money for free abortions, in primarily non-White areas..."

Ms. Sanger has succeeded hasn't she? In 2016, Black women accounted for 13% of the female population. They accounted for 38% of all abortions tracked by The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

In 2018, 912 African-American babies were aborted each day. Think of that. 912 Black babies lost their lives each day.

Per 1,000 births, black women have, year after year, aborted their babies at a rate just under 4 to 1 when compared to white women.

Ms. Sanger's darling, Planned Parenthood is, of course, America's chief supplier of abortions. Ms. Sanger's "covert strategy" was successful.

I recently read a Kanye West quote, which made me realize that some Black leaders do understand the strategy Ms. Sanger set in motion. West said that Planned Parenthood abortion vendors have, "been placed inside cities by White supremacists to do the Devil's work."

In New York City, more black babies are aborted each year than are born alive.

Sanger was just your run-of-the-mill White supremacist. She certainly wasn't brilliant, nor was she wise. She was wily and had a hatred for black people that was the wind in her wings. Yet, she is celebrated as a heroine by black women and white women; the same women who decry racism everywhere else. May God be merciful to us. As a believer, remain silent no longer. Your voice matters, and your voice honors God.

Sanger once wrote,

"Given birth control, the unfit will voluntarily eliminate their kind."

I cannot find a word she has said or written that doesn't fill me with righteous anger. I pray that others will simply read her own words. Sanger's defenders claim that

Eugenics And Margaret Sanger

Category: Science Gone Wrong: the ramifications

Food for Thought

“This is precisely the aim of Eugenics. Its first object is to check the birth rate of the unfit, instead of allowing them to come into being, though doomed in large numbers to perish prematurely. The second object is the improvement of the race by furthering the productivity of the fit by early marriages and healthful rearing of their children. Natural selection rests upon excessive production and wholesale destruction... Eugenics on bringing no more individuals into the world that can be properly cared for, and those only of the best stock.”

Francis Galton

Now you have met the founder of Eugenics, Francis Galton. His cousin, Charles Darwin, published On the Origin of Species by Natural Selection in 1859. In 1883, Galton coined the term “Eugenics”, and he published his observations and conclusions and promoted his Darwinist, Atheist, and elitist propaganda in his book, Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development. Galton quickly and obviously evidenced himself as a Godless ideologue.

Look, when you conceive of yourself and others as mammals, mammals without souls, you are bound to bring that bias into any scientific inquiry you might undertake.

Eugenics has more victims than you can imagine. As I trudge through the thought and history of Eugenics, I will attempt to restrain my contempt for both Galton and Eugenics. It will not be easy. Here is Galton's definition of Eugenics. “The study of all agencies under human control which can improve or impair the racial quality of future generations.”

Is that definition confusing? It should be. Perhaps taking a closer look at the quote that opened this article will shed some light on Galton's definition.

Eugenics sought and seeks to check the birth rate of the unfit. Who are the unfit? Will the “inferior” do? No? Then I will be plain. The “unfit to reproduce” will turn