How the British Turned Genocide and Race Science “Green”

Reprinted from 2015 Report “‘Global Warming’ Scare is Population Reduction, Not Science”

At the end of World War II, when the world was still learning of the horrors of the Nazi genocide, and the Nuremberg Tribunals were just barely getting underway, the British Monarchy immediately launched a revival of the very same policies of race science and population genocide that had produced the Nazi euthanasia and the death camps.

Sir Julian Huxley, the grandson of “Darwin’s Bulldog” Thomas Huxley, and a leading figure in the British Eugenics Society, used his position as the first Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to help launch the revival. In a 1946 address, launching the new United Nations agency, he declared, “Even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.”

While the British Eugenics Society was never disbanded, the revival was carried out under a new banner: ecology and conservation. Just as Hitler’s Nazi Party had roots in the radical environmentalist “counterculture” movement of 1920s Germany, the British Crown agents of the immediate post-War years created a series of environmentalist organizations, which would form the basis of the New Eugenics Movement. To this day, those same organizations are the leading promoters, worldwide, of a mass genocide, in the name of “preserving nature.”

This was nothing new for the British Crown. Both the Hitler race dogma and population genocide program, and the promotion of preservation of nature over the advancement of mankind, were ideas that were spawned from London in the second half of the Nineteenth Century, through the work of people like Charles Darwin, Sir Thomas Huxley, Sir Francis Galton, Sir Herbert Spencer, and Sir Arthur Tansley, who all led a revival of an extreme form of Malthusian population genocide.

Darwin presented the idea that man had simply evolved from lower species in a strictly quantitative evolution, which he called “natural selection,” rejecting outright the qualitatively distinct, non-biological notion of human creative discovery and science itself. Spencer had adapted Darwin’s fraud to human existence and developed the Social Darwinist idea of “survival of the fittest.” Tansley had first coined the term “ecology,” in advancement of the Malthusian revival, placing the preservation of the ecological system over man-enhanced nature. And Darwin’s first cousin, Galton, had devised eugenics as a “scientific” approach to culling the human herd of those “unfit” to survive.

In every instance, the common objective of all of these insane, anti-human ideas was to provide a rationale for population reduction, as a means of preserving a system of eternal oligarchical power.

The complete title of Darwin’s most famous work, Origin of Species, was On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of the Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life (1859).

The predecessor of this was the 1798 “Essay on the Principle of Population,” by Sir Thomas Malthus (1766-1823). Its revival was the basis for the work of Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Galton and Tansley. Malthus wrote, “All children who are born beyond what would be required to keep up the population to a desired level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the death of grown persons… Therefore… we should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring
to impede, the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which compel nature to use… Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits… but above all we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and restrain those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they are doing a service to mankind by protecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disease."

Dirty Bertie

A century and a half after Malthus, Lord Bertrand Russell, the intimate of the Huxleys, repeated Malthus’s diktat in even more blunt language.

In a 1923 book, Prospects of Industrial Civilization, he advanced the doctrine of race supremacy, using the term “international socialism” as a euphemistic alternative to feudalistic oligarchic world dictatorship: “Socialism, especially international socialism, is only possible as a stable system if the population is stationary or nearly so. A slow increase might be copep with by improvements in agricultural methods, but a rapid increase must in the end reduce the whole population to penury… the white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence… Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.”

In 1951, in his The Impact of Science on Society, which was a discussion of the uses of mass psychology to keep the majority of human beings hopelessly backward and compliant, Russell openly advocated the kind of mass genocide that became the hallmark of the British Royal Consort Prince Philip, as part of his own promotion of “environmentalism.” Russell wrote: “Bad times, you may say, are exceptional, and can be dealt with by exceptional methods. This has been more or less true during the honeymoon period of industrialism, but it will not remain true unless the increase of population can be enormously diminished. At present the population of the world is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued through each of the world wars… War… has hitherto been disappointing in this respect… but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full… The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people’s.”

All of these British high society genocidalists, from the turn-of-the-century British Monarchy onward, were rabid conservationists, preferring unaltered nature to humanity, which they referred to in such terms as “the enemy,” “a cancer” and the like.

‘New Empire’ Ecology

The advancement of the so-called ecology agenda and wildlife protection had another imperial dimension as well. As Britain altered its colonial strategy at the turn of the Twentieth Century, from direct empire to Commonwealth, aiming to establish more indirect control, it became essential to establish firm command over vast swaths of land in Africa. The establishment of game preserves and nature preserves along crucial African borders became a hallmark of the “New Empire” program.

In 1903, the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire was established, under the direct control of the British Crown. The model was the “conservancies” that were established by the British Raj over many parts of India to restrict population access.

In 1904, Sir Arthur Tansley founded the British Vegetation Committee. In 1912, the Society for the Promotion of Natural Reserves was formed. The Committee
identified 273 areas to be set aside from all human activity. A year later, in 1913, the British Ecology Society was established. Tansley was a central figure in all of these various organizations, and his role as one of the British Crown’s chief ecologists continued through and beyond World War II. In the latter phase of his efforts, Tansley worked closely with Sir Julian Huxley and Max Nicholson.

The promotion of conservation and ecology went hand-in-glove with Britain’s active promotion of Fascism throughout Europe. In 1931, Huxley and Nicholson created the Political and Economic Planning (PEP) think tank, which produced a series of policy papers actively promoting the corporatist model that had been first put into practice by Benito Mussolini in Italy. PEP closely collaborated with the British Eugenics Society throughout its existence. In 1937, PEP and the BES co-founded the Population Policy Committee, which led, in 1944, to the creation of the Royal Commission on Population. Even throughout the war period, the British Crown was promoting a long-term program of radical population reduction. In 1955, under the joint leadership of Huxley and Nicholson, the PEP published a landmark global profile of human population and natural resources called *World Population and Resources*. It became the guidebook for both the Eugenics/Malthusian apparatus and the so-called “Conservationists” worldwide.

In 1945, Huxley, Tansley, and Nicholson founded the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee, which came to be known as the Huxley Committee, after its chairman. As the result of the Committee’s studies on the need for a broad ecology and conservation agenda, the same people shortly founded the British Nature Conservancy, which was to operate directly under the Privy Council, the actual governing body over the British Empire under the Royal Household. Conveniently, from 1945-1952 the secretary of the Privy Council was Max Nicholson. He left that post in 1952, to replace Tansley as head of the Nature Conservancy.

In his official capacity as secretary to the Privy Council, Nicholson had tasked Julian Huxley to lead a study on the conservation of nature in England and Wales, which resulted in a July 1947 report, mapping out areas of the United Kingdom to be set aside as nature preserves. By this time, the Nature Conservancy had been classified as a permanent research arm of the Privy Council, and designated as a scientific body, whose pronouncements were given the authority of scientific certainty.

What was being promoted as a British Crown program to revive eugenics and radical Malthusianism, in the immediate wake of the defeat of Hitler, was “taken global” through Sir Julian Huxley’s position as Executive Director of UNESCO. In 1948, Huxley convened a UNESCO-sponsored conference in Fountainebleau, France, where the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) was formally launched as an international organization comprised of both governments and non-governmental private organizations. In his keynote speech to the gathering, Huxley declared that “The spread of man must take second place to the conservation of other species.”

At this point, the worldwide movement for ecology and nature conservancy was a strictly oligarchical operation—and obviously so. It had no base of popular support, and this remained the case for several decades.

**Going ‘Popular’**

In 1960, Sir Julian Huxley, now 73 years old, made a three-month expedition to Africa, after which he wrote a series of articles in *The Observer*, warning that the newly independent African states could not be trusted to preserve nature and protect the endangered species of the continent. Off of the Huxley expedition, at the initiative of Max Nicholson, the IUCN launched a worldwide popular movement to force the creation of nature preserves and game preserves, under independent international control, throughout the African continent.

Nicholson described the process: “After a memorandum (which I had drafted at Easter in the Cotswolds) had been approved by the IUCN Executive Board, the rest of the preparatory work was done in London by an informal group under my chairmanship between May and September. It culminated in the legal constitution at Zurich of an international charitable foundation called the World Wildlife Fund.” The WWF, from its outset, would be housed within the IUCN’s Swiss headquarters. The organization was launched at simultaneous press conferences in London and Tanganyika.

Nicholson and Huxley had no trouble getting Royal Consort Prince Philip, already a rabid Malthusian, to become the head of the British WWF. To avoid the appearance that the organization was purely a creation of

---

1. Fairfield Osborn, Jr., Nicholson’s close friend and a leading eugenicist, had proposed naming the new organization the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, but the imperial connotations of a global natural resource grab were too flagrant and the name was eventually shortened.
the British Crown, the Dutch Royal Consort, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, was named as the first international head of the WWF. His own credentials as a long-time card-carrying member of the Nazi Party presented no complications.

With the launching of WWF, as the first effort at a mass social outreach, the founders, particularly Max Nicholson, acknowledged that they were actually out to force a major cultural paradigm shift, away from the notion of human progress, backwards to a dark age concept of man as the “enemy” of nature. In his 1970 book, The Environmental Revolution: A Guide for the New Masters of the World, Nicholson wrote of the launching of the WWF:

“We should perhaps look back as far as the Reformation and the Renaissance for a comparable general disintegration of long settled values and patterns through the impact of new outlooks and new ideas… The message of ecology… undermines many recent cherished values and beliefs by a kind of seismic upheaval which is bound to leave in its train heaps of intellectual and ethical rubble. Seismic seems the right word because the emotional force and intensity behind the idea of conservation is as important as its intellectual power.”

It is indicative of the true aim of this “seismic change” that Sir Julian Huxley, one of the two genuine architects of the WWF, along with Max Nicholson, was, at the time of WWF’s founding, the president of the British Eugenics Society. In 1962, Huxley published an essay under the blunt title “Too Many People,” which appeared in a volume titled Our Crowded Planet: Essays on the Pressures of Population. Huxley wrote, “Overpopulation is the most serious threat to human happiness and progress in this very critical period in the history of the world. It is not so acute as the threat of atomic warfare, but is graver, since it springs from our own nature… The essential point is that overpopulation is a world problem so serious as to override all other world problems, such as soil erosion, poverty, malnutrition, raw material shortages, illiteracy, even disarmament… If nothing is done about it, in the next hundred years man will cease to have any claims to be the Lord of Creation or the controller of his own destiny, and will have become the cancer of his planet, uselessly devouring its resources and negating his own possibilities in a sate of overmultiplication… for the control of population is, I am quite certain, a prerequisite for any radical improvement in the human lot.”

The WWF was launched at the behest of the British Monarchy at a time when cultural optimism was spreading with the election of John F. Kennedy as President of the United States; the launching of the Apollo program, demonstrating man’s capacity to conquer new scientific horizons and thoroughly redefine the nature of resources; and the spreading belief that the era of colonialism and empire was coming to an end. Kennedy’s launching of the Peace Corps, the prospect of an end to the Cold War with the Soviet Union, initiated in a series of private correspondences between JFK and the Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, and other promising developments, posed a direct threat to the agenda and power of the British Empire.

Mass Mind Control

All of that changed, dramatically, with the assassination of President Kennedy, the ouster of German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, and the attempted assassinations and eventual overthrow of France’s President Charles de Gaulle. With the launching of the U.S. Indochina War, the urban riots, and the assassinations of Robert F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the optimism of the early 1960s turned into a deep cultural pessimism, particularly among young people in the
trans-Atlantic region.

Sir William Sargant, a British military psychiatrist from the Tavistock Institute, who spent over a decade in the United States from the late 1950s to the early 1970s, wrote a 1957 book about the prospects of triggering a mass psychotic breakdown through successive mass social shocks, amplified by the new emerging mass media of television and radio.

In *Battle for the Mind*, which was written while Sargant was an active participant in the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency’s MK-Ultra experimentation in mind control, through psychedelic drugs, manipulation of religious superstitions, etc., Sargant wrote:

“Various types of belief can be implanted in many people, after brain function has been sufficiently disturbed by accidentally or deliberately induced fear, anger or excitement. Of the results caused by such disturbances, the most common one is temporarily impaired judgment and heightened suggestibility. Its various group manifestations are sometimes classed under the heading of ‘herd instinct,’ and appear most spectacularly in wartime, during severe epidemics, and in all similar periods of common danger, which increase anxiety and so individual and mass suggestibility.”

Prior to the shock traumas of the 1960s, most Americans and Europeans would have dismissed the radical Malthusian and eugenicist ideas of the WWF as rubbish. Under conditions of shock, those ideas, along with the other manifestations of the drug, rock, sex counterculture, seemed suddenly “normal.”

While the WWF was first getting off the ground, a much more public propaganda campaign was launched, to begin spreading the gospel of ecology and conservation. In 1962, Rachel Carson wrote *Silent Spring*, a diatribe against DDT and other agricultural chemicals. This was the first of what would be a string of widely publicized scare-stories, devoid of any scientific foundation, that found an ever more willing mass audience.

In 1968, the Club of Rome was founded as an international agency to popularize the myth that population and economic growth inevitably must fall back, because of limited resources. Its founding document was thus titled, “The Predicament of Mankind,” and in 1972, it published the scientifically bogus book, “Limits to Growth,” as a mass propaganda item.

In 1970, Prince Bernhard and his close friend Anton Rupert, the South African tobacco magnate, launched the 1001 Club. The purpose of the Club was to generate a guaranteed financial base for the WWF. The secret Club was made up of 1,001 members, whose identity was to be protected. Each member contributed $10,000 per year, establishing a running war chest of $10 million per annum for the WWF’s mass propaganda outreach.

Although the membership list in the 1001 Club was to be kept secret, some rosters from the late 1980s were leaked out, and the list of participants revealed a Who’s Who of Western and Middle Eastern oligarchs, tycoons and a smattering of outright swindlers and criminals. Thus the 1001 Club included Johannes von Thurn und Taxis of the ancient Venetian oligarchical family, Mossad money launderer Tibor Rosenbaum, arms dealer Adnan Khashoggi, media mogul Conrad Black, and the like. Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield—linked to the assassination of President Kennedy—was a charter member.

Simultaneous to the launching of the 1001 Club, some leading members of the WWF financial arm launched Earth Day in 1970, an international celebration of the arrival of “ecology” as a new global cause.
Canadian Maurice Strong was one of the architects of Earth Day. Two years later, Strong was also a driving figure behind the convening of a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. At that time Strong was named Executive Director of the newly created United Nations Environment Programme. In effect, Strong inherited the UN mantle from Julian Huxley, who would die three years later.

Closely aligned with the launching of the UNEP, in 1974, the United Nations hosted the third World Population Conference in Bucharest, Romania, with 135 nations participating. One of the key organizers of that conference was the American cultural anthropologist Margaret Mead, an advocate of population control. A featured speaker was John D. Rockefeller, III, whose family had funded the pre-WWII eugenicist “population” movement.

But the event’s intended de-population agenda was dramatically blown apart, by the intervention by the Lyndon LaRouche movement, to circulate a $20 billion “Manhattan Project for Fusion Energy Development,” presenting a program for R&D and economic advancement, to create effectively inexhaustible power and agro-industrial resources to support a growing human population for centuries. LaRouche associate Helga Zepp, from Germany, presented this growth program, and shocked the Rockefeller plenary, saying that if, instead, the U.N. “environmentalist” program was imposed on the world, the result would be death “100 times worse than Hitler.” Conference organizers shut down the session. Zepp then confronted Margaret Mead with the same point on mass death, in front of 200 reporters at the leading press event. (see box).

However, following the conference, Mead peddled the de-population message to the media all the harder. In a signed editorial in the publication *Science*, she declared: “The United Nations Population Conference, which concluded on 31 August in Bucharest, passed by acclamation a World Plan of Action that dramatized the growing global concern for the planet’s plight… At Bucharest it was affirmed that continuing, unrestricted worldwide population growth can negate any socio-economic gains and fatally imperil the environment… The earlier extreme views that social and economic justice alone can somehow offset population increase and that the mere provision of contraception can sufficiently reduce population—were defeated… Those governments for which excessive population growth is detrimental to their national purpose are given a target date of 1985 to provide information and methods for implementing these goals.”

**‘Global Warming’ Scare Launched**

The very next year, Mead organized a conference in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, where the hoaxes of “global warming” and “climate change” were launched. At the time of both the Bucharest and Research Triangle Park conferences, Mead was president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

Mead stacked the North Carolina conference with protégés of Paul Ehrlich, the radical Malthusian author of *The Population Bomb*, one of the most rabid propaganda tracts on the need for a total halt in population growth, on the grounds that man posed a threat to the natural ecology of the Earth.

Mead’s keynote at North Carolina launched the
“global warming” assault on science. “Unless the peoples of the world can begin to understand the immense and long-term consequences of what appear to be small immediate choices—to drill a well, open a road, build a large airplane, make a nuclear test, install a liquid fast breeder reactor, release chemicals which diffuse throughout the atmosphere, or discharge waste in concentrated amounts into the sea—the whole planet may become endangered.” Mead demanded a study on “what is presently known about hazards to the atmosphere from man-made interventions, and how scientific knowledge coupled with intelligence social action provide wheat for the Third World.”

Rockefeller himself tried to adapt to this outlook. He called for “a more equitable distribution of resources,” and a new “concept of economic growth.” “We must reorient growth toward human ends, lessen growth of a material kind to improve the lives of people. What is needed is not evaluation on the basis of per capita income, but on social feeling... if famine does occur as a by-product of natural disasters, floods, etc., will people of the industrial countries be willing to cut their food consumption for the starving...?”

Rockefeller’s pitch was made even sharper by French zero-Growther Rene Duemont, who insisted that, to liberate the Third World, North Americans must “cut down on the consumption of meat, energy and industrial production immediately.”

The pitch didn’t work; the conference failed. The “World Population Plan of Action” of the organizers turned into vague platitudes about considering population issues in relation to development goals, and “quality of life.”

The very next year [see main article], the anti-population “witch”, Mead, organized a conference to change strategy: Malthusianism through “climate change.”

The Opposition

In 1982 Helga Zepp herself, now married to Lyndon LaRouche, took a major initiative to organize international forces to defeat the genocide lobby, by proposing the formation of a Club of Life. “The Club of Life views itself as a conscious counterpole to the Club of Rome,” she wrote in her Call for Creating a Club of Life, issued January 1 of that year. It shall “be an instrument for those individuals, who, on the eve of a possible collapse of human society, want to intervene with passionate commitment and political decisiveness in behalf of a new worldwide humanism... The Club commits itself to the idea of technological progress and to the value of human beings, which are inseparable from one another.”
can protect the peoples of the world from dangerous and preventable interference with the atmosphere upon which all life depends.”

Among the Ehrlich-Mead protégés who attended the Research Triangle conference on “The Atmosphere Endangered and Endangering” was John Holdren, currently President Barack Obama’s White House Science Advisor. Holdren co-authored a number of books and articles with population fanatic Ehrlich and was an architect of the call for carbon-dioxide caps and a concerted plan for population reduction.

In his own summary of the 1975 conference, Holdren emphasized in her keynote address, “The Club of Life aims at nothing less than to create worldwide a shift toward cultural optimism, as the precondition for the defense of the right to life. We will show, in numerous studies, that the Club of Rome and other organizations of that ilk are charlatans from a scientific standpoint. We will lay bare the motives of those who dare to contest the inviolability of the right to life. But especially we will design concrete programs for development, and bring those to the public, so that everyone can see the solutions that are at hand, if only the political will to implant them is there.”

Over the next few years, the Club of Life did exactly what Zepp-LaRouche said. It organized international conferences, rallies, and interventions, and produced literature that exposed the genocidalists, especially the financial institutions and courts who were issuing death sentences to nations, and individuals too weak to defend themselves from the accelerating push for euthanasia. The Club also applied for consultative status at the United Nations, where it would have been a unique voice for development policies.

Thanks to the intervention of zero-growth forces, led by the Swedish representatives, the Club’s application was denied.

Today, the thrust of the Club’s work has been taken up by the Schiller Institute, founded in 1984 by Helga Zepp-LaRouche on the same principles.

‘CO₂ Reduction’ is a Mass Murder Policy
ren warned: “We already have reached the scale of human intervention that rivals the scale of natural processes… Furthermore, many of these forms of intervention will lead to observable adverse effects only after time lags, measured in years, decades, or even centuries. By the time the character of the damage is obvious, remedial action will be difficult or impossible. Some kinds of adverse effects may be practically irreversible.”

To deal with the alleged future crisis, the pseudo-scientists at the 1975 conference concluded that they had to launch an international scare campaign, based on the scientifically fraudulent claim that industrialization and other human activities would eventually lead to the destruction of the planet. For example, one of the conference participants, Stephen Schneider, a climate scientist, was outspoken about the scare-mongering involved. He spelled it out to Discover magazine some years later, in 1989: “To capture the public imagination, we have to offer up some scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and little mention of any doubts one might have. Each of us as to decide the right balance between being effective and being honest.”

All of the essential elements of the global warming scheme were, in fact, put on the table at the 1975 event.

**Implementing the Hoax**

What followed was implementation, with the United Nations serving as the venue for intense green propaganda, and ever more coercive pressure for nations to submit to economic destruction in the name of saving the Earth. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) acted officially with the U.N. all the way, under the rubric of “consultative” status, granted under U.N. Resolution 1296, adopted in 1968, under intense IUCN pressure.

In 1982, the U.N. *Charter for Nature* was passed by the U.N. General Assembly. It was prepared by the IUCN. In 1987 the report “Our Common Future” was issued by the World Commission on Environment and Development, mandated in 1983 by U.N. Sec. Gen. Javier Pérez De Cuéllar. The report (known as the “Brundtland Report,” after its chairman, Gro Harlem Brundtland) is noteworthy for putting into common parlance the catch-all phrase, *sustainable* development, to extol retrograde modes of power, agriculture, or any other economic practice—modes not actually sustainable at all.

In 1988, the U.N. commissioned the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which became the loudest voice insisting on reducing human numbers and activity, according to the metric of “sustainable development,” in order to diminish global warming. From 1990 to 2014, the IPCC has published more than 40 reports on different facets of its “sky-is-falling” message. Teams of authors have churned out thousands of pages under three rubrics: 1) “assessment” of climate change—five sets of four reports per set; 2) eleven “special” reports, e.g., “Safeguarding the Ozone Layer” (2005); and 3) ten “methodology” reports, e.g., on how to measure “wetlands” (2013). Part of the IPCC function has been to demoralize scientists into submission to the green hoaxes.
In 1989, GLOBE International (Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment) was formed—a new world entity aimed at corralling parliamentarians committed to “overseeing the implementation of laws in pursuit of sustainable development.” Instigating backers included Tony Blair (UK Prime Minister 1997 to 2007), the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office, and the London Zoological Society. Today, GLOBE claims legislators in 80 nations.

These initiatives were the run-up to the 1992 Rio Summit, officially the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development, in June, in Rio de Janeiro. The conclave of 172 governments, with 116 heads of state, agreed to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (A parallel event called “Global Forum” brought together 17,000 participants from NGOs, which went forward as a green strike force.)

Under this new UNFCCC, an annual Conference of the Parties (COP) has been held for 20 years, to push for compliance on reducing greenhouse gas emissions by specified deadlines in the near term. The first confab, COP 1, was held in Berlin in December 1994. At COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, a text was put forward—known as the “Kyoto Protocol”—for nations to submit to a legally binding agreement, for the goal of collectively reducing global emissions of six greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane and four others) by 5.2% by 2010, compared to 1990. (This represents a cut of over 25%, relative to the trend of expected levels of emissions.) Many nations balked. A series of “commitment periods” was begun, in an attempt to keep the process going, starting with 2005-2012, and then 2012 to 2020 (known as the Doha Amendment period), which was modified at COP20 in Lima, Peru in December 2014. As of July 2015, 36 nations have signed on. Now COP21 is set for December 2015, in Paris, amidst fierce pressure on nations to finally submit en masse.

The continuing mandate, with or without the nicety of treaties, is for nations to devise and implement their own green grab-bag of so-called Earth-saving actions of “for’s and against’s”: for “renewable energy” (bio-mass, solar, wind); for “sustainable” agriculture and industry; against chemicals, against pollution, against fossil fuels, against water “over-use,” and so on. The intent: against people.

‘The Enemy Is Humanity’

The intended result of this process is to kill people. The toll of death and deprivation is measurable, under the various green mandates for curbing necessary activity across the different sectors of the economy—power, water, farming, industry, transportation, and even space.

POLLUTION. One of the foremost scare stories involving protecting Mother Earth from man-made pollution and noxious modern chemicals, is that DDT is dangerous. In 1972, its use was banned in the U.S., as a result of green fascist intervention in Washington, D.C., and DDT usage internationally was drastically diminished over succeeding decades. The result: some 70 million needless deaths from malaria worldwide—mostly in Africa—over the period 1973 to 2014. At present, there are over 200 million needless cases of malaria each year, and over 500,000 deaths. An estimated 3.3 billion people are at risk from malaria today, according to the latest World Health Organization evaluation.

RENEWABLE FUELS. Another deadly green hoax, is that bio-mass fuels—ethanol, gasohol, bio-diesel—are desirable as “renewables.” This means, in fact, that vast areas of land are under cultivation—from U.S. corn fields, to Brazilian cane, to Southeast Asian palm groves—to produce fuels to go up in smoke.

Labor, machinery, seed and chemical inputs are likewise sucked into the process of degradation of agriculture. In 2005, the U.S. passed a “Renewable Fuel Standard” law mandating an annual volume of U.S. biofuel production, used in gasoline (corn ethanol), which over the last decade, has accordingly expanded internationally. The loss of food is immense. As of 2010, a third of the U.S. corn harvest—which itself accounts for more than a third of world corn production—went to ethanol. This quantity of corn would have had the potential to feed 560 million people, had it not been burned.

There are many other blatant examples. Thus, we are seeing the green goal of depopulation in action.

There could be no more explicit statement of this goal, than that by the Club of Rome in its 1991 document, The First Global Revolution: “In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill...But in designating them as the enemy, we fall into the trap of mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by human intervention and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.”
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