

POPULATIONS THAT WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE TOO MANY OF

In 1980 the Supreme Court issued a decision that said, “yes, you have a right to abortion, no, the government does not have to pay for it.” Ruth Bader Ginsburg was not on the Court at the time, but later when she was on the Court she commented on the case, she told the New York Times:

“Yes, the ruling about that surprised me. [Harris v. McRae – in 1980 the court upheld the Hyde Amendment, which forbids the use of Medicaid for abortions.] Frankly I had thought that at the time Roe was decided there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that *we don't want to have too many of*. So that Roe was going to be then set up for Medicaid funding for abortion. Which some people felt would risk coercing women into having abortions when they didn't really want them. But when the court decided McRae, the case came out the other way. And then I realized that my perception of it had been altogether wrong”

Nothing about reproductive autonomy. Nothing about women's empowerment. It was about keeping down the populations “we don't want too many of.”

Having lost in the Supreme Court, lawyers for the abortionist then brought a series of suits in state court claiming that the states' constitutions not only contained a right to abortion but also required the state government to pay for them. In 1993 they brought such a suit in Minnesota. The suit was an obvious sham. The Attorney General said we want to talk to the plaintiff to see if her claim is true. The attorneys for the abortionists said you can't talk to her because she has disappeared. No plaintiff, no case. The Attorney General said, that's all right. We believe everything she said even if we don't know whether she exists. The Attorney General wrote to the abortionist and said you don't have to bother arguing that there is a right to abortion in the Minnesota Constitution because we agree with you, so we will go hand in hand to the Court and tell them they can just agree too. The Court complied and now Minnesota is paying millions of dollars to abort the children of the population we don't want too many of.

In subsequent newsletters, I will analyze the Minnesota case in detail and then go over in chronological order each of the other cases brought in state court.

Why does this matter? We are facing the possibility that Roe v. Wade may be overturned. The Court could say there is no right to abortion in the U.S. Constitution and that the 14th Amendment protects the life of the child in the womb. Or they could say there is no right to abortion in the Constitution and the states can or cannot protect the unborn. In the latter case what happens in the state legislatures and courts is vital and it will be necessary to overturn state court decisions creating a state right to abortion. The following newsletters will show a pattern of fraud and collusion in the state courts.