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In the previous chapter I arrived at the conclusion that the best way to rescue human civilization from self-destruction and collapse is to open the borders, create a parallel and global civilization that is sustainable and nurture it until it grows strong enough and sufficiently attractive to absorb all other people within its fold.

By starting from scratch there will be no structural obstacles to overcome and by separating the new from the old the existing social structures will remain relatively undisturbed and capable of sustaining the emerging global community of Cities of Opportunity, which in turn will serve as the world’s lifeline and escape pods.

In this chapter, I will attempt to find an answer as to how we can bring human civilization back within the fold of nature. This means that the new global civilization that the process of free migration will make possible needs to be nature-friendly to be able to act as the lifeboat of the existing societies when they need to abandon ship and gradually evacuate to the Cities of Opportunity.

The most obvious and immediate thought is that all talk about environmental conservation that does not involve depopulation is futile. For it is people who pollute, pump CO2 into the atmosphere and triggered global warming, denude the forests, exhaust fish stocks, poison the soil and the groundwater with fertilizers and pesticides, displace all other species and drive them to extinction, and take over ever more land from nature for our sole use and abuse, all of which have diminished the planet’s life support systems and have placed in peril all life on earth.

Sustainability cannot be accomplished with the current population, and certainly not until our numbers have peaked, simply because there are too many of us, we consume too much, and have long outgrown the limits of the planet. With this in mind, and to demonstrate the urgency of our situation, I will contemplate two possible scenarios: the **‘Bitter Pill’** and the **‘Final Solution’** that could bring civilization back within nature, as established by OM Principle twelve:

|  |
| --- |
| PRINCIPLE 12**CIVILIZATION WITHIN NATURE**The natural balance has been destroyed by human civilization and needs to be restored at all costs because the future of mankind depends on it. Technological innovation, energy savings, individual and corporate reductions in the carbon footprint, and emissions trading will not bring down greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level necessary to prevent let alone reverse climate change. Nor will any of these measures free the space now occupied by industrial and agricultural activity back to nature so that ecosystems can regenerate and corridors of life can be created that are large enough to allow nature to take its course. Only by reducing our numbers will we be able to restore the natural balance and to ensure that human civilization continues to evolve within nature’s limits. To reach equilibrium between civilization and nature our numbers will have to decrease by half and this can only occur if the next three generations adopt a one child policy. Without the will and the wisdom to reduce our numbers humanity will self-destruct.  |

Both scenarios will by necessity have three vital components. Our Planetary Security depends on our ability to address these three global security prerogatives, the imperatives on which our very lives and future depend and that are the foundation of Planetary Harmony:

**BIOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE**

We can never again go back to large families and we must forever restrict ourselves to two children per couple.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPERATIVE**

We can never again disturb the natural harmony and must learn to live within the regenerative capacity of Mother Earth.

**MATERIALISTIC IMPERATIVE**

We can never again use natural resources as though they were infinite and we must therefore switch to renewable resources and share them equitably.

To live by these imperatives requires that we transform our way of life and our thinking, our social structures and our economic and political systems; that we change in every respect and that we expand our values and norms to consider the earth and all life on earth as sacred and therefore beyond our right to use and abuse.

The two scenarios that could possibly accomplish the imperatives on which Planetary Harmony depend are equally difficult but for different reasons.

The **Final Solution** is the scenario the military-industrial complex has prepared for and stands by to execute if the international community, led by the United Nations, does not succeed to stabilize the global situation with the soft and cooperative means it currently pursues under the name Millennium Development Goals that constitute the Bitter Pill scenario.

Conversely, the **Bitter Pill** scenario is the ongoing civilian effort delegated by the United Nations to achieve the eight Millennium Development Goals before it becomes absolutely necessary to engage the Final Solution because all humane attempts to stabilize the world will have failed.

The length to which the international community has gone in order to motivate the world in common purpose and enlist the peaceful and willing cooperation of all nation states to tackle disarmament and poverty before the system collapses – and which has necessitated the staged tragedies of 9/11, 7/7 and the Madrid train bombings – shows the desperation of policy makers and their resolve to ensure that the Bitter Pill scenario succeeds and the Final Solution can be averted.

To describe the Final Solution requires that I have the guts to go into the heart of darkness and that you have the stomach to follow me there. Conversely, to describe the Bitter Pill requires that I have the heart to find the light and that you are willing to follow me there. For what it boils down to is this. The Final Solution lets evil solve our problems while the Bitter Pill lets good solve our problems. The choice is entirely ours and the outcome will be determined by how many of us choose to walk into the light or hide in the shadows. If a majority choose the latter then the Final Solution will be inevitable. Conversely, if a majority chooses the former then the Bitter Pill will be sufficient. If we do not swallow the Bitter Pill, the Final Solution will be shoved down our throats as surely as the sun will rise again and rightfully so because the international community is sufficiently organized and determined to commit no more and no fewer crimes than absolutely necessary to preempt greater tragedy. In other words, if the situation on the ground becomes so desperate and their predictive models and simulations are so compelling that they justify brutal preemptive action as preferable to inaction they will do it to keep control of the situation and to hopefully break out of the downward spiral towards world hunger, environmental catastrophe and nuclear annihilation.

As a gross generalization, the Final Solution is left to demons with guns, germs and bombs who believe humanity to be fundamentally evil; while the Bitter Pill is left to angels with ideals, ideas and hope who believe humanity to be fundamentally good. What we believe and how we behave as individuals will determine the future. But none of us should think even for a second that our individual decisions and behavior do not matter in the grand scheme of things because they do. In fact it is the only thing that does matter. The outcome will be determined by 7 billion individuals who may also believe to be insignificant but who are as significant as any and all other 6.999.999.999 souls. Therefore, any one of us tips the scale of good and evil towards its final resting point with equal weight and is therefore equally responsible for the outcome.

Three threats circle humanity like vultures: mass starvation, environmental devastation, and nuclear annihilation. They are inextricably linked, one leading to another. The actions taken by the international community with respect to poverty reduction, sustainable development, and peaceful disarmament converge to form a desperate attempt to prevent the world from the event horizon, or point of no return, of mass starvation, environmental devastation and nuclear annihilation. And every one of these three threats has required and continues to require population control.

Let us now look at the two options.

**BITTER PILL**

Humanity became a force of nature and a threat to nature when we exceeded 3 billion, developed nuclear weapons and energy, and became dependent on science and technology for our survival. For the sake of clarity let us identify that point in time as the decade from 1950 to 1960. By 1970 it was generally recognized that we are increasing in numbers too fast and are chasing our own tails. By 1980 it dawned on us that our science- and technology-fueled industrial activity damages the planet’s life support systems and that we have become utterly dependent on this toxic life style. By 1990 it became clear that development and environment are inseparable and that unless we find ways to live without damaging the environment, thus to develop sustainably, we are doomed. And by the year 2000 the political will and elite consensus were reached to see humanity as an infestation and treat it as such, at which point governments became separate and apart from the people.

The United Nations is the crucial organization with the data gathering and analysis capacity to enable this evolution in our understanding and to coordinate a plan of action. Long before the environment became an issue due to human activity, population growth was the focus of the international community and combatting it the primary function of the United Nations. To this day, it remains so, because it is only by combatting population growth that nations can live within their means and need not invade other nations and start wars to access vital resources.

A [Background Document on the Population Programme of the United Nations](http://www.un.org/popin/icpd/conference/bkg/unpop.html), published in 1994 by the Secretariat of the International Conference on Population and Development, reveals that *“since its inception* [in 1945]*, the United Nations has been involved in the field of population”* and that the United Nations Population Commission *“was established by the Economic and Social Council in 1946, as a subsidiary body, to arrange for studies and advise the Council on the size, structure and changes in the world population and on the* ***policies designed to influence population variables****, as well as on the interactions between demographic, social and economic factors.”* At the date of publication in 1994, *“more than 20 units, bodies and organizations of the United Nations system are currently involved in population activities that range from data collection, research and analysis, training, dissemination of information, provision of technical cooperation and financial assistance, monitoring and evaluation of* ***population projects and programmes****, and provision of secretariat services to intergovernmental bodies.”*

The document boasts that *“population is one of the fields where the United Nations has been successful”* and that *“in spite of the highly sensitive and controversial character of population issues, the United Nations has served as a neutral forum to debate openly such issues and to negotiate common strategies”* and that *“until now, population has been one of the areas where effective coordination has been demonstrated within the United Nations system.”*

Without mentioning how, this document admits that the United Nations has interfered with natural population growth since 1945 and has successfully coordinated a global effort to achieve desired demographic objectives. What it also fails to mention is how it was possible to interfere with natural population growth and achieve desired demographic objectives without violating the [United Nations Genocide Convention](http://www.hrweb.org/legal/genocide.html) which states unequivocally in Article 2 (d) that *“imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group”* constitutes genocide.

What it does mention is that *“two major entities in the United Nations system are entirely devoted to population activities: the* [*Population Division of the Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis*](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/index.shtml) *and the* [*United Nations Fund for Population Activities*](http://www.unfpa.org/public/)*”.* The former organization is led by a Chinese national, [Dr. Pingfan Hong](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/organigramme/od.shtml)[[1]](#endnote-1), an [expert in biotechnology](http://www.tecan.com/platform/content/element/6684/PDF_TecanSymposium2010PingfanRaoBiography_082010.pdf), the science by which the developing world is being poisoned into infertility through the use of GMOs. And the latter organization is led by Nigerian national [Dr. Babatunde Osotimehin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Babatunde_Osotimehin)[[2]](#endnote-2), an [expert in endocrinology](https://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/news/2010/babatunde_shortbio.pdf), the science by which the developed world is being poisoned into infertility (through the use of endocrine disruptors such as fluoride, bisphenol A, and artificial sweeteners), and who, until his appointment at the UN, was Nigeria’s senior administrator of the nation’s HIV/AIDS institutions, managing the man-made virus that is decimating Africa’s population and that was injected into the bloodstream of innocent Africans by the World Health Organization’s smallpox immunization program in the late 1970s, as I have described in my book [Chemical and Biological Depopulation](http://real-agenda.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/CHEMICAL_AND_BIOLOGICAL_DEPOPULATION.pdf).

The [United Nations Conference on the Human Environment](http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=97), also known as the Stockholm Conference, was convened in 1972 at the initiative of the Government of Sweden and exemplifies the international community’s determination to address population growth as part and parcel of solving environmental issues. To my knowledge, the [Declaration](http://www.unep.org/Documents.multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=97&ArticleID=1503) issued at the Conference is the first UN document to openly state, as a point of principle and with characteristic hypocrisy, the need for governments to plan their population:

*Demographic policies which are without prejudice to basic human rights and which are deemed appropriate by Governments concerned should be applied in those regions where the rate of population growth or excessive population concentrations are likely to have adverse effects on the environment of the human environment and impede development.* (Principle 16)

The Stockholm Conference openly recognizes that the environment is victim to human foibles and failures and that it can only be rescued if we make it our life’s work, which is clearly stated in the Conference’s summary of the general debate:

*The Conference was launching a new liberation movement to free men from the threat of their thralldom to environmental perils of their own making. The movement could succeed only if there was a new commitment to liberation from the destructive forces of mass poverty, racial prejudice, economic injustice, and the technologies of modern warfare. Mankind's whole work and dedication must be towards the ideal of a peaceful, habitable and just planet.*

What was never stated at the Stockholm Conference by either of the only two speakers – Swedish Prime Minster Olaf Palme, the host of the conference, or Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi – but inferred by the subsequent actions of Indira Gandhi, who soon after embarked on a program of forced surgical sterilization in India, and by the assassination of Olaf Palme[[3]](#endnote-3), who may have been gunned down by conservative elements as a result of his support of covert chemical sterilization, is that select leaders within the international community had decided to get serious about population control and to impose it on any and all countries in the developing world who did not voluntarily implement population control measures. They did this because they arrived at the conclusion that the only way to protect the environment is to fight poverty and the only way to fight poverty is to stop population growth. The first two thoughts in this chain of cause and effect were explicitly stated by Indira Gandhi in her [seminal speech](http://lasulawsenvironmental.blogspot.de/2012/07/indira-gandhis-speech-at-stockholm.html) at the conference, but the third thought she kept to herself, as did all other leaders before and since.

In beautiful prose and with clear understanding, Prime Minister Gandhi described in her conference speech the dilemma of her developing country:

*Even though our industrial development is in its infancy, and at its most difficult stage, we are taking various steps to deal with incipient environmental imbalances. The more so because of our concern for the human being - a species which is also imperiled. In poverty he is threatened by malnutrition and disease, in weakness by war, in richness by the pollution brought about by his own prosperity…*

*Many of the advanced countries of today have reached their present affluence by their domination over other races and countries, the exploitation of their own natural resources. They got a head start through sheer ruthlessness, undisturbed by feelings of compassion or by abstract theories of freedom, equality or justice. The stirrings of demands for the political rights of citizens, and the economic rights of the toiler came after considerable advance had been made. The riches and the labour of the colonized countries played no small part in the industrialization and prosperity of the West. Now, as we struggle to create a better life for our people, it is in vastly different circumstances, for obviously in today's eagle-eyed watchfulness we cannot indulge in such practices even for a worthwhile purpose. We are bound by our own ideals. We owe allegiance to the principles of the rights of workers and the norms enshrined in the charters of international organizations. Above all we are answerable to the millions of politically awakened citizens in our countries. All these make progress costlier and more complicated.*

*On the one hand the rich look askance at our continuing poverty - on the other, they warn us against their own methods. We do not wish to impoverish the environment any further and yet we cannot for a moment forget the grim poverty of large numbers of people. Are not poverty and need the greatest polluters? For instance, unless we are in a position to provide employment and purchasing power for the daily necessities of the tribal people and those who live in or around our jungles, we cannot prevent them from combing the forest for food and livelihood; from poaching and from despoiling the vegetation. When they themselves feel deprived, how can we urge the preservation of animals? How can we speak to those who live in villages and in slums about keeping the oceans, the rivers and the air clean when their own lives are contaminated at the source? The environment cannot be improved in conditions of poverty. Nor can poverty be eradicated without the use of science and technology.*

In Gandhi’s 1972 speech we already find the essential truth that to fight poverty, which forces struggling people to destroy the environment, you need to develop and to develop you need science and technology which come at a heavy cost to the environment. What Gandhi describes is the vicious circle of poverty and want that has trapped humanity since times immemorial and is so very difficult to escape. And the developing world, unlike the developed world, has to find a way to escape the circle of poverty without exploiting others and without destroying the environment, as the West has done, which may be an impossible task.

To help the developing world escape this vicious circle, given the difficult constraints of respect for the environment and for human rights, political leaders and scientists came together a few years later to find ways to develop sustainably and realized that the developed world must help the developing world with capital and knowhow to build its own industrial base but also to control its population, the latter being an unavoidable and unspoken prerequisite to prosperity. They also realized that the people of the developed world needed to find the political will to lower their consumption and minimize the damage they do the environment, which is far greater both nominally and proportionally than the damage done to the environment by people in poor countries.

In Gandhi’s inimitable words:

*It is an over-simplification to blame all the world's problems on increasing population. Countries with but a small fraction of the world population consume the bulk of the world's production of minerals, fossil fuels and so on. Thus we see that when it comes to the depletion of natural resources and environmental pollution, the increase of one inhabitant in an affluent country, at his level of living, is equivalent to an increase of many Asian, Africans or Latin Americans at their current material levels of living.*

*The inherent conflict is not between conservation and development, but between environment and reckless exploitation of man and earth in the name of efficiency. Historians tell us that the modern age began with the will to freedom of the individual. And the individual came to believe that he had rights with no corresponding obligations. The man who got ahead was the one who commanded admiration. No questions were asked as to the methods employed or the price which others had to pay. The industrial civilization has promoted the concept of the efficient man, he whose entire energies are concentrated on producing more in a given unit of time and from a given unit of manpower. Groups or individuals who are less competitive and according to this test, less efficient are regarded as lesser breeds – for example the older civilizations, the black and brown peoples, women and certain professions. Obsolescence is built into production, and efficiency is based on the creation of goods which are not really needed and which cannot be disposed of when discarded. What price such efficiency now, and is not recklessness a more appropriate term for such a behaviour?*

It was realized that both values and priorities must change if the poor are to be saved from poverty, the rich are to be saved from excess, and nature is to be saved from man:

*All the `isms' of the modern age – even those which in theory disown the private profit principle – assume that man's cardinal interest is acquisition. The profit motive, individual or collectives, seems to overshadow all else. This overriding concern with self and Today is the basic cause of the ecological crisis.*

*Pollution is not a technical problem. The fault lies not in science and technology as such but in the sense of values of the contemporary world which ignores the rights of others and is oblivious of the longer perspective.*

More than anything, it was realized that all nations must work together to save the one world we all inhabit and endanger, some through our destructive poverty and others through our excessive wealth:

*Life is one and the world is one, and all these questions are inter-linked. The population explosion; poverty; ignorance and disease, the pollution of our surroundings, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and biological and chemical agents of destruction are all parts of a vicious circle. Each is important and urgent but dealing with them one by one would be wasted effort.*

*It serves little purpose to dwell on the past or to apportion blame, no one of us is blameless. If some are able to dominate over others, it is at least partially due to the weakness, the lack of unity and the temptation of gaining some advantage on the part of those who submit. If the prosperous have been exploiting the needy, can we honestly claim that in our own societies people do not take advantage of the weaker sections? We must re-evaluate the fundamentals on which our respective civic societies are based and the ideals by which they are sustained. If there is to be a change of heart, a change of direction and methods of functioning, it is not an organization or a country-no matter how well intentioned--which can achieve it. While each country must deal with that aspect of the problem which is most relevant to it, it is obvious that all countries must unite in an overall endeavour. There is no alternative to a cooperative approach on a global scale to the entire spectrum of our problems.*

Most importantly, it was realized that our technical and scientific evolution must be matched by a revolution in social thinking if man is to reestablish his connection with nature:

*We do not want to put the clock back or resign ourselves to a simplistic natural state. We want new directions in the wiser use of the knowledge and tools with which science has equipped us. And this cannot be just one upsurge but a continuous search into cause and effect and an unending effort to match technology with higher levels of thinking. We must concern ourselves not only with the kind of world we want but also with what kind of man should inhabit it. Surely we do not desire a society divided into those who condition and those who are conditioned. We want thinking people capable of spontaneous self-directed activity, people who are interested and interesting, and who are imbued with compassion and concern for others.*

*It will not be easy for large societies to change their style of living. They cannot be coerced to do so, nor can governmental action suffice. People can be motivated and urged to participate in better alternatives.*

*Modern man must re-establish an unbroken link with nature and with life. He must again learn to invoke the energy of growing things and to recognize, as did the ancients in India centuries ago, that one can take from the Earth and the atmosphere only so much as one puts back into them.*

The defining official document that identifies development and environment as inseparable and that triggered concerted global action with respect to [sustainable development](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable_development) is the [Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development](http://conspect.nl/pdf/Our_Common_Future-Brundtland_Report_1987.pdf), also called the Brundtland Report, which was released in 1987 after a five-year long consultative process conducted by the Brundtland Commission once it was tasked by the UN Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, in 1983, to address the rapid deterioration of the environment and the depletion of natural resources.

Since then, the architects of the international community have embarked on a massive effort to make development aid offered by the World Bank and debt repayment packages administered by the International Monetary Fund conditional on concrete measures to halt population growth, without which prosperity will always be an unreachable dream, especially if it is to be accomplished with minimal damage to the environment and without exploiting others.

As the world continued to struggle with its enduring problems of poverty and conflict the human impact on earth’s fragile biosphere became increasingly self-evident and the need to take drastic action added new impetus to the fight against population, which evolved from only a silent war on human fertility to a wider war on human consumption, the family, and on human longevity.

The [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development](http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html) (UNCED), also known as the ‘Rio Summit’ or the ‘Earth Summit’, was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992, and focused on reducing poverty and promoting employment, clean energy and more fair and sustainable use of resources, which in time and behind the scenes has translated into a war on consumption and longevity in the developed world.

Out of 172 participating nations, 116 sent their heads of state or government to signal the importance accorded to this global gathering. The politicians were joined at the Summit by 2,400 representatives of non-governmental organizations and an additional 17,000 members of civil society attended a parallel Global Forum and were given consultative status, in a clear effort to engage all sections of society in the fight to rescue the earth from human destruction.

The Rio Summit is preceded by two international conferences on population – Bucharest in 1974 and Mexico City in 1984, which sought to commit the developing world to limit fertility and to force every nation to draw binding policy documents concerning targets of population – and succeeded by yet another conference on population held in Cairo in 1994.

In Bucharest, in 1974, a [World Population Plan of Action](http://www.un.org/popin/icpd/conference/bkg/wppa.html) was agreed upon whose goal is fertility control, takes into account the relationship of population and development, and calls on nations to promote birth control by abortion, contraception and sterilization. In its text we find faint allusions to the existence and effects of covert methods of population control:

*In many parts of the world, poor economic conditions, social norms, inadequate knowledge of effective methods of family regulation and the unavailability of contraceptive services result in a situation in which couples have more children than they desire or feel they can properly care for. In certain countries, on the other hand, because of economic or biological factors, problems of* ***involuntary sterility and of subfecundity exist,******with the result that many couples have fewer children than they desire****.*

We also find equally faint suggestions that individual rights need to give way to social interests:

*Individual reproductive behaviour and the needs and aspirations of society should be reconciled.*

More than anything, we find clear language on the primary aim and general objectives of the World Population Plan of Action:

*…the primary aim of this Plan of Action is* ***to expand and deepen the capacities of countries to deal effectively with their national and subnational population problems*** *and to promote an appropriate international response to their needs by increasing international activity in research, the exchange of information, and the provision of assistance on request.*

***To promote socio-economic measures and programmes whose aim is to affect, inter alia, population growth****, morbidity and mortality,* ***reproduction and family formation****, population distribution and internal migration, international* ***migration and, consequently, demographic structures****.*

In Mexico City, in 1984, the World Population Plan of Action adopted a decade earlier was expanded and intensified to achieve greater efficiency in subverting human fertility, increasing abortion and undermining the family structure so as to keep families few and small.

And in Cairo, in 1994, a new [Programme of Action](http://www.un.org/popin/icpd/conference/offeng/poa.html) was adopted showing greater commitment and determination to fight population growth within the context of sustainable development while hiding increasingly brutal methods of population control behind euphemistic terms such as ‘reproductive health’, ‘family planning’, ‘women’s education’ and ‘gender equality’.

A Culture of Death has evolved from the opposition of pro-life and pro-abortion forces who could only agree behind closed doors on preventing the moment of conception by covert chemical and biological means and who in public forums continue to deceive the world with meaningless and false promises to address population problems with full consideration for people’s right to choose the size of their families and hypocritical declarations to proceed with full respect for the rule of law and human rights. As I have shown in my book, [Killing Us Softly: The Global Depopulation Policy](http://www.progressivepress.com/book-listing/killing-us-softly), nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that international acceptance for the Culture of Death that made abortion and sterilization commonplace was born in Bucharest, reached puberty in Mexico City, and adulthood in Cairo and that with each decade the Culture of Death that animates the world’s elites has eroded increasingly more checks and balances within national democracies and has perverted beyond recognition the rule of law to the point where the three branches of government – the judiciary, the legislative and the executive – have become the handmaidens of genocide, second only to science and medicine.

The truth is that the more caring and politically correct the language and tone of the population conferences and the binding documents they issued, the more brutal, inescapable and destructive the methods of combatting population growth and achieving demographic objectives became behind the scenes, and the more inextricably linked to the concept of sustainable development, so much so that every time the term is mentioned in policy documents it is safe to assume that it also means covert depopulation in equal measure.

The truth is that the more ambitious the environmental goals, the more constrained people have become in how they can use the land and how they are allowed to live, which has brought universal hardship and has increased disregard and sown disdain for human life at governmental, intergovernmental and corporate levels; all of which have found it profitable to corner man in ever tighter economic and social spaces while the elites who man these national and international institutions enjoy an ever greater share of the wealth generated by the labor of the very men and women whom they have declared a silent and perverse war on and who are not sheltered by well-paying and secure public sector jobs, professional monopolies, or stratospheric corporate incomes; and who most certainly are not being told that they are at the receiving end of chemical and biological warfare and have therefore no way of protecting themselves or their offspring from engineered extinction.

The truth is that the issues addressed at the Rio Summit in 1992 (and at subsequent summits) – such as lead in gasoline, alternative sources of energy, water scarcity, lower vehicle emissions – have all contributed to higher costs for individuals and have squeezed the last remaining disposable income from the already strapped pockets of people in the low socio-economic segments of society while NGOs have proliferated like mushrooms after the rain and corporations have benefitted like never before.

The truth is that much has been done to protect the planet in the ensuing decades, and admirably so, but that nothing that has been done to protect the planet has not been to the sole detriment of the common man and to the primary benefit of the elites.

The truth is also that nobody meant it to be that way, but that once the world’s national and international, governmental and non-governmental, corporate and public entities were all harnessed to the same horse, the United Nations, driven by the same whip, that of the Culture of Death, and in the same direction, sustainable development, without the people’s knowledge and consent, in an environment of desperation, in an economy where short-term greed blinds long-term action, within a world divided into religious and secular camps who could only agree on covertly preventing the moment of conception through mass poisoning because that is the path of least resistance, each intent on preserving their own petty interests and willing to lie and cheat the people of the truth to promote solely their perspective, catastrophic abuse and mass atrocities have become the order of the day. The result is a lose-lose situation where nature benefits insufficiently and man suffers unnecessarily and where neither the world’s demographic nor the planet’s environmental objectives have been realized or could possibly be realized.

Good things have come from the Rio Summit: the [Rio Declaration on Environment and Development](http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm), to guide sustainable development around the world; the [Statement of Forest Principles](http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-3annex3.htm), to manage and conserve forests; and [Agenda 21](http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=52), a global action plan for all the world’s social and economic ills – three non-binding documents that show the way forward and invite all nations to participate voluntarily in a global and coordinated effort to protect the environment and eradicate poverty.

Important legally binding agreements were also opened for signature at the Rio Summit: the [Convention on Biological Diversity](http://www.cbd.int/convention/text/default.shtml), to conserve biological diversity and use it sustainably and fairly as a source of genetic resources; the [Framework Convention on Climate Change](http://unfccc.int/not_assigned/b/items/1417.php), to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere (and which blossomed into the [Kyoto Protocol](http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php) a few years later); and the [UN Convention to Combat Desertification](http://www.unccd.int/en/about-the-convention/Pages/About-the-Convention.aspx); to stop desertification and mitigate the effects of drought.

Ten years after Rio, thus in 2002, the world came together again, this time in Johannesburg, South Africa, for the [World Summit on Sustainable Development](http://www.earthsummit2002.org/) (WSSD), also known as the Earth Summit, to discuss implementation of earlier non-binding agreements on sustainable development; in other words to get serious about fulfilling the promises made a decade earlier.

The outcome of the Earth Summit was the [Johannesburg Declaration](http://www.un-documents.net/jburgdec.htm), which commits the nations of the world to sustainable development and multilateralism and urges them to focus on such concrete things as:

*…targets, timetables and partnerships, to speedily increase access to such basic requirements as clean water, sanitation, adequate shelter, energy, health care, food security and the protection of biodiversity. At the same time, we will work together to help one another gain access to financial resources, benefit from the opening of markets, ensure capacity- building, use modern technology to bring about development and make sure that there is technology transfer, human resource development, education and training to banish underdevelopment forever.* (Article 18)

*…the worldwide conditions that pose severe threats to the sustainable development of our people, which include: chronic hunger; malnutrition; foreign occupation; armed conflict; illicit drug problems; organized crime; corruption; natural disasters; illicit arms trafficking; trafficking in persons; terrorism; intolerance and incitement to racial, ethnic, religious and other hatreds; xenophobia; and endemic, communicable and chronic diseases, in particular HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis*. (Article 19)

The Earth Summit also lays out the [Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development](http://www.un-documents.net/jburgpln.htm), which brings the voluntary goals of Agenda 21 one step closer to their mandatory implementation as the Millennium Development Goals, the eight international development goals that were established at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations in 2000 and constitute the plan of all plans and that were laid down in the [Millennium Declaration](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm), the promise of all promises.

The Earth Summit was followed in 2009 by the [United Nations Climate Change Conference](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2009_United_Nations_Climate_Change_Conference), also known as the Copenhagen Summit; a failed attempt to reach a binding agreement on reducing CO2 emissions after 2012, when the Kyoto Protocol expired.

Starting in 1997 with the Kyoto Protocol, which committed its signatories to binding emission reduction targets to bring [carbon dioxide (CO2)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbon_dioxide) levels down, the struggle for environmental preservation had found a common denominator, global warming, which refers to surface temperature increases due to greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel combustion, which trap the sun’s heat in the atmosphere and is thought to be a factor, if not the primary factor, in climate change, itself a much-disputed phenomenon.

The concepts of global warming and climate change are subject to bitter scientific disputes and even more bitter political battles because countries in the developed world are being asked to mitigate for the damage their industrial activity and life style have caused to the planet over the past century and to lower their emissions, which can only be done by reducing their carbon footprint and their dependence on fossil fuels and by adopting expensive renewable energy sources.

But whether global warming and climate change are real or imagined, is not as important as the fact that we need a common foe, real or imagined, and global warming is a perfect common foe to unite us in the fight to preserve our planet, which is actually a fight for self-preservation. The rationale is this: to prevent climate change we need to fight global warming and to fight global warming we need concerted global action whereby the developed world lowers its greenhouse gas emissions by switching to renewable energy sources and the developing world finds ways to develop a green economy from start. Unlike pollution, which can be localized, the warming of the atmosphere cannot. So whether global warming and its consequence climate change are real or imagined, or more imagined than real, is largely irrelevant. What is relevant is that we have an environmental common denominator around which we can coalesce because it threatens us all in equal measure and forces us to change our ways before it is too late and we all choke on our own pollution and exhaust non-renewable resources in the process, resources that future generations will also need and that we must therefore use sparingly and responsibly.

Just as we needed a common foe to unite us militarily and politically so we can pursue global disarmament and prevent war, and that common foe was conjured up from the controlled demolition of the Twin Towers at the World Trade Center and given the name ‘Islamic Fundamentalism’, so we also needed a common foe to unite us socially and economically so we can pursue global prosperity and environmental protection to prevent world hunger and the destruction of all life on earth, and this foe has been conjured up from the controlled selection and careful assembly of scientific data and given the name ‘Global Warming’.

To what extent Islamic Fundamentalism and Global Warming are real is of little or no importance, as long as these real or imagined threats help us come together and motivate us to make sacrifices for the common good and for future generations.

For the reality is this: man is lazy and indifferent and his governments and institutions are even more lazy and indifferent than he is. Only a crisis situation could compel man and his governments to act. It is therefore better to cause a fictitious crisis and force change in a controlled environment then to fall victim to a real crisis and be forced to struggle for life in an environment of chaos.

To date, we have succeeded neither in building a green economy nor in fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals, as the [United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development](http://www.uncsd2012.org/about.html) (UNCSD), held in Rio in 2012, and the [Millennium Development Goals Report 2014](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2014%20MDG%20report/MDG%202014%20English%20web.pdf) regretfully attest. And because of these failures we have come yet a step closer towards the Final Solution. All we have managed to do is to buy us a little time. But time is running out.

What has not failed or stalled, but has proceeded with clockwork precision and military dispassion, is the seven-decade-old process to defuse the population bomb. The summits and conferences on sustainable development and poverty reduction that I have described above have served mostly as sideshows and public distractions to the covert effort to halt population growth and complete the demographic transition, which is the only way humanity can escape poverty and protect the environment.

The main value of these environmental and social efforts lies in the fact that they have endowed people and governments with the necessary knowledge, motivation and compassion to be able to trigger a change in values that will hopefully make possible the replacement of the Culture of Death with a Culture of Responsibility. For this reason we must continue to pursue them as though or lives depended on them…because they do.

**FINAL SOLUTION**

What becomes painfully obvious at the beginning of the 21st century is that no progress can be made on any front without coordinated action on all fronts and without global participation. In other words, without a multidisciplinary approach conducted multilaterally we are going nowhere except downhill. Unfortunately, we have neither the organizational capacity and political will nor the institutional infrastructure and popular consensus necessary to carry out multidisciplinary and multilateral plans of action. In fact, all our national and international systems are ill-suited if not utterly inadequate to do what we need to do. This being the case, and given our dire situation, all obstacles to multidisciplinary and multilateral action must be circumvented and all resistance points destroyed, be they of a nationalist, economic, religious or political kind before we fall victim to our dire existential problems, which are environmental and materialistic in nature and trump all other considerations, cultural sensibilities and religious values included. And this is a very dangerous point to be at because every action can be justified and every crime rationalized, even mass murder, which is exactly what is happening.

The math is simple and frightening: **the 7 billion people alive today will double to 14 billion by 2040 and double again to 28 billion by 2070 and double again to 56 billion by 2100 in the absence of population control measures. Anyone who wants to believe that the planet can support 14 billion, let alone 28 or 56 billion, and achieve sustainable development, is a daydreamer whose wishful thinking would lead the world to peril. But because natural birth rates have been covertly interfered with since 1945 the population is expected to peak at 10 billion by 2050, at which point half the world’s people will be chronically ill and sterile, and the intellectual and genetic endowment of the human species will be degraded to such an extent as to render half the world’s people completely dysfunctional. This degradation will be the inevitable result of the cumulative side effects caused by the existing methods by which humanity is being chronically poisoned into sterility by the very people and institutions we entrust with the defense of our rights and liberties, with the protection of our health and wellbeing, and with the preservation of our values and norms – in other words by our elites.**

There is no such thing as clean energy and there is no such thing as clean industry…and there never will be. Every form of energy known to man has an environmental cost. The best we can do and perhaps we will ever be able to do is develop cleaner energy and cleaner industry, but our energy and industry will always have a negative impact on the environment.

The gains we are making through the use of renewable energy sources, the application of environmentally friendly technologies, and by lowering our consumption and the environmental impact of our industrial processes are rendered null and void twice over by our growing population. And this will continue to be the case until such time as the global population decreases to a number low enough to allow Mother Nature to repair the damage we cause and that we will always cause because we have long divorced ourselves from nature and have placed ourselves above and beyond the natural order of things, which is symbiotic coexistence.

The only way to live in harmony with nature, to live symbiotically, is to go back to the short, brutish and nasty lives of hunting and gathering. And if we decided to do that, which is highly unlikely, the world could only support at best 250 million people. Absent that, the best we can do is to ensure that the environmental damage we cause and that we will always cause is small enough for nature to absorb and repair within a very short time so that we are not leaving behind a degraded environment to future generations. If we succeed to switch to renewable energy sources – biofuels, geothermal, hydropower, solar and wind – within the next two to three decades, which is highly questionable, some 2 billion people may be able to live sustainably on earth. But what about the remaining 8 billion people who will inhabit the earth by 2050? The only answer to this disturbing question is that they will die one way or another over the course of the 21st century if sustainability is to become possible.

As the latest [Millennium Ecosystem Assessment](http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/pdf/ma_board_final_statement.pdf) warns us:

*“Human activity is putting such strain on the natural functions of Earth that the ability of the planet’s ecosystems to sustain future generations can no longer be taken for granted. The provision of food, fresh water, energy, and materials to a growing population has come at considerable cost to the complex systems of plants, animals, and biological processes that make the planet habitable. As human demands increase in coming decades, these systems will face even greater pressures—and the risk of further weakening the natural infrastructure on which all societies depend. Protecting and improving our future well-being requires wiser and less destructive use of natural assets. This in turn involves major changes in the way we make and implement decisions.”*

What could be done to prevent the birth of new people has been done through aggressive covert chemical and biological methods since 1945 and continues to be done to this day, which is why the birth of circa 5 billion children will have been prevented by 2050 and why the global population is expected to peak at 10 billion by 2050. Since the year 1995, however, the elites have also embarked on an equally aggressive plan to shorten lives, to ensure that people die faster than nature intended them to and then modern medicine enables them to live, which is what chemtrails, staged nuclear accidents and vaccines are meant for. These new methods, which are continuously enhanced and augmented, will see to it that billions will die prematurely by 2050, because elements of the Final Solution scenario are already underway.

The only way to stop the population from growing without causing irreversible damage to the human species is by legislating family size across the globe, which will allow people to take responsibility for the size of their families, as China has done. There is no reason why the rest of the world cannot follow China’s example, given the alternative. But how do you hurry the death of 8 billion people through legislation? Even if it could be done, by say mandating euthanasia at age 65, we could not lower the global population down to 2 billion by the middle of the 21st century. We might be able to do it by the year 2200 but by then the earth will be a wasteland and we would all be choking on our own pollution.

Since the world has been incapable of legislating family size, which requires merely that couples restrict themselves to no more than one child, can we really hope to legislate lifespan, which would require that we terminate our own lives at age 65 or even earlier? Not a chance in hell, which is why, among other things, deadly poisons are being sprayed down on us from high flying planes and why the incidence of cancer and neurodegenerative illnesses have been steadily increasing and will soon reach epidemic proportions.

The most optimistic population projections – which undoubtedly presuppose the continuation of the covert chemical, biological, psychosocial and economic methods of birth prevention well into the future, and that may also presuppose the expansion of chemtrails and other death promotion measures – show that the best we can hope for is a global population of 7 billion by the year 2100 and of 2 billion by 2200.

But what is the point of continuing with the existing covert methods of population control, as they lead to universal ill-health, sterility, genetic devolution, and mental retardation, in addition to certain environmental ruin? What would there be left worth having, both environmentally and genetically, at the end of this gradual and controlled process of population decline?

The [Millennium Ecosystem Assessment](http://www.unep.org/maweb/en/Global.aspx) does not paint a bright picture of the state of our ecology and of our consequent way of life in the future irrespective of which scenario, proactive or reactive, is proven right:

*Given projected increases in human population and the slow rate of change of many human behaviors, it seems increasingly likely that human impacts on ecosystem services will affect the quality of life of the majority of the human population within the next 50 years*. ([Chapter 3, Ecology in Global Scenarios, p.48](http://www.unep.org/maweb/documents/document.327.aspx.pdf))

Moreover, our scientific knowledge is not sufficient to predict what will happen to the earth’s life support systems if we continue to undermine biodiversity:

*Making detailed projections of the consequences of human impacts on biodiversity is difficult in its own right, and we are far from being able to make similar projections about the impacts of biodiversity loss on ecosystem services.* ([Chapter 3, Ecology in Global Scenarios, p. 64](http://www.unep.org/maweb/documents/document.327.aspx.pdf))

This means that we are taking an extraordinary and perhaps lethal risk by waiting for conclusive environmental, ecological and climatic data before we take resolute action to limit our impact on nature, which necessitates first and foremost that we limit our numbers.

It also means that the longer we deliberate and procrastinate the greater the losses and the more difficult life will be for our children:

*Nearly two thirds of the services provided by nature to humankind are found to be in decline worldwide. In effect, the benefits reaped from our engineering of the planet have been achieved by running down natural capital assets.* ([Living Beyond Our Means: Natural Assets And Human Well-Being](http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/pdf/ma_board_final_statement.pdf), Statement from the Board of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, March 2005)

Decision-makers are now faced with the unenviable task of choosing between short-term economic or societal gains and long-term ecosystem health; of choosing, in other words, between the wellbeing of man and the wellbeing of nature. Since it is not nature who depends on man but vice-versa the only safe choice is to give precedence to nature.

Given the overwhelming military superiority the United States maintains, the illusory nature of western democracies, the oligarchic nature of global governance, the de facto suspension of the rule of law in matters concerning international security prerogatives, the white man’s delusions of genetic and cultural superiority and his historical readiness to exploit and to murder others, the continuing intractability of religious authorities with respect to contraceptive use, the growing criminality within the United Nations and its agencies, America’s militarization and its refusal to abide by the [Biological Weapons Convention](http://www.opbw.org/convention/conv.html), the beefing up of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and its executive orders, as well as the extensive and growing network of government and corporate bunkers, it is safe to assume that a Final Solution is clearly defined and ready to be implemented as soon as the global elite decide to save themselves by murdering the rest of us.

When or if that decision is made, and the last act of the Final Solution will be played out, the agent of death will be a man-made virus, released simultaneously in all corners of the world and followed by the immediate retreat of the global elite to their underground bunkers until such time as the rest of us are all dead.

It is a very small step from the genocide encouraged and carried out by the United Nations and western governments since 1945 in the name of the Global Depopulation Policy and the all-out mass murder envisioned by America’s military-industrial complex and radical elements within the UN system.

I urge the world’s people to speak up now and to take responsibility before our voices will forever be silenced and those who will silence us will write a new chapter in history and describe themselves as the saviors of the planet while bulldozing our germ-infested and cancer-ridden corpses into mass graves.

1. Dr. Pingfan Hong, Director, Development Policy and Analysis Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat S-2522, New York, NY 10017, Tel: (212) 963 4701, Fax: (212) 963 1061, email: hong@un.org. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. *“Prior to his appointment at UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, Dr. Babatunde Osotimehin served as the Minister of Health of Nigeria. Before that, Dr. Osotimehin was the Director-General of the Nigerian National Agency for the Control of AIDS, an agency that coordinates all HIV and AIDS work in a country with more than 150 million people. As chairman of the National Action Committee on AIDS (NACA) he oversaw the development of systems that, today, manage more than US$1billion. During his tenure as Project Manager for the World-Bank assisted HIV/AIDS Programme Development Project from 2002–2008, he achieved great success. Dr. Ostotimehin's interests include youth and gender, within the context of reproductive health and rights. Young people will be his special focus at UNFPA.”* (From Wikipedia article on Dr. Osotimehin) [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Nothing shows more clearly how dangerously contentious the issue of population control is than the number of high profile victims on both sides of the divide. For while American President John F. Kennedy (d. 1963) and his brother, Robert (d. 1968), Chilean President Salvador Allende (d. 1973), Polish President Lech Kaczyński (d. 2010), and Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu (d. 1989) were assassinated for opposing the regime of covert depopulation, Olaf Palme of Sweden may have been assassinated for the absolute opposite reason. Most bizarrely, Pope John Paul II survived assassination attempts for both reasons, though the first attempt, carried out on 13 May 1981 by Turkish gunman Mehmet Ali Ağca, was staged, while the second, carried out on 12 May 1982 by [Traditionalist Catholic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Traditionalist_Catholic) Spanish priest [Juan María Fernández y Krohn](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Juan_Mar%C3%ADa_Fern%C3%A1ndez_y_Krohn), was not. The first attempt was staged because the Church needed a plausible interpretation for the last of the [Three Secrets of Fatima](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_Secrets_of_F%C3%A1tima), which foretells the end of the Catholic Church and the execution of the Pope and cardinals by people and soldiers in retribution for an evil done by the Church, which can only be its complicity in and responsibility for crimes against humanity once it agreed to go along with and to sanction covert depopulation measures by chemical poisoning, which is evident in the encyclical letter [Humanae Vitae](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html) from 1969. The Church had delayed the release of the third vision of Fatima by 20 years because it needed time to fabricate a false interpretation and because it needed an event to base it on. To make the false assassination attempt more credible it was planned to take place on the anniversary of Fatima’s vision, at the exact date and hour. To give it even more credence, Pope John Paul II stated upon his recovery that it was Our Lady of Fatima that helped keep him alive, and a few years later, in 2005, he reiterated his false assertion, so as to dispel all doubts and suspicions:*“ Could I forget that the event in St. Peter's Square took place on the day and at the hour when the first appearance of the Mother of Christ to the poor little peasants has been remembered for over sixty years at Fátima, Portugal? For in everything that happened to me on that very day, I felt that extraordinary motherly protection and care, which turned out to be stronger than the deadly bullet.”* That the assassination was staged is also intimated by the fact that Pope John Paul II pardoned the gunman two years later, in December 1983, after visiting him in prison and then declaring, rather enigmatically, that: *"What we talked about will have to remain a secret between him and me. I spoke to him as a brother whom I have pardoned and who has my complete trust.″* The second assassination attempt also happened on the exact date and hour of the anniversary of Fatima’s vision, but one year later, and was committed by Conservative elements within the Church who opposed the Vatican’s complicity in depopulation and took issue with its attempt, through the Second Vatican Council, to reform the Church’s policy with respect to contraception and other teachings. It was a slap in the face of the Vatican and a public statement that the Vatican’s machinations to falsify history and change divine prophesy did not go unnoticed by the last remaining traditionalists within the Church who refused to go along with the liberalization and modernization of Church doctrine so as to allow the use of contraceptives. Father [Juan María Fernández y Krohn](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Juan_Mar%C3%ADa_Fern%C3%A1ndez_y_Krohn) served a three-year sentence after which he was expelled from Portugal and became a solicitor in Belgium, one of two remaining religious strongholds in Europe opposing population control (the other being Ireland). I have great sympathy for the Vatican and even greater sympathy for Pope John Paul II, who made a terrible sacrifice by taking a bullet to save the Church from the inevitable and foreordained demise caused by its obsolescence and by the fact that the Church cares more about its power and influence than about its people and the truth. It is nevertheless reluctantly and with a heavy heart that I invalidate their efforts. The truth, however, is the truth and it must be told, for only the truth can set us free.

 [↑](#endnote-ref-3)