

Added to that, was an alleged quantification of six basic areas of human consumption which are denounced as “pressuring” the environment: grain, marine fish, wood, freshwater, cement (as a “proxy” for land consumption), and carbon dioxide emissions. Among the blunter conclusions of that first report, was that meat and dairy consumption must be cut, especially in Europe and North America.

The statistical sleight-of-hand used to justify their demand that the world’s population and living standards be drastically reduced, was sexed up in later reports by adoption of the so-called “ecological footprint,” a measure so absurd that it insults the intelligence of any normal person. The hoax starts from the fact that the calculations used to assert that world water, energy, and food resources are all used up, making strife and death inevitable, are premised on “presently existing technology.”

The Living Planet crowd demands that its so-called “Ecological Footprint” and “National Footprint Accounts” be adopted as part of the Millennium Development Goals, thus making their targets for lower living standards and reduced population, conditionalities for loans or foreign aid.

Culling by Global Dictatorship

The WWF-associated “Global Footprint Network” founded by the two nuts who invented the “footprint” fraud, is made up of some of the world’s most rabid Malthusian genocidalists, the Paul Ehrlichs and *Limits to Growth* authors you can read about in the accompanying article on “The New Environmentalist Eugenics.”

One partner in that network bears singling out: the British “charity,” named the Optimum Population Trust. The OPT campaigns openly for a reduction of the world’s population by *two-thirds*, to between 2 and 3 billion people. No one has a “right” to have children, it asserts. In a July 2007 report, titled “Youthquake,” comparing the births of human beings to the devastation of an earthquakes, they suggest “compulsory limits on births may become unavoidable.”

There is only a “slim chance” such measures can be avoided, the OPT writes, and adds, “Might humanity have to suffer the kind of death-dictated control to achieve stabilisation, or reduction by a population crash—a massive cull through violence, disease, starvation or natural disasters—which biology dictates for all other species when their numbers exceed the limits of their environments carrying capacity?”

AFRICOM and Control Over Africa’s Resources

General Kip Ward, commander of President Bush’s newly created United States Africa Command (AFRICOM), speaking to the International Peace Operations Association in Washington, D.C. on Oct. 27, defined the command’s mission as, “in concert with other U.S. government agencies and international partners, [to conduct] sustained security engagements through military-to-military programs, military-sponsored activities, and other military operations as directed to promote a stable and secure African environment in support of U.S. foreign policy.” However, what General Ward would not discuss, is one of the “key strategic interests which drives American policy in Africa,” according to a paper circulated at the event by J. Peter Pham, an expert in Africa defense policy.

In addition to fighting terrorism, disease, and “dictatorships,” Pham lists the objective of “protecting access to hydrocarbons and other strategic resources which Africa has in abundance ... a task which includes *ensuring against the vulnerability of those natural riches and ensuring that no other interested third parties, such as China, India, Japan, or Russia, obtain monopolies or preferential treatment*” (emphasis added).

Pham’s formulation echoes that of Henry Kissinger’s 1974 National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM-200), which, as far as this news service knows, has never been repudiated by the U.S. government. This memorandum stated that U.S. requirements for “large and increasing amounts of raw materials” gave it an “enhanced interest” in ensuring “stability” in the supplying countries, including through decreased population growth.

EIR asked General Ward about this attempt to control Africa’s raw materials, reading from Pham’s article about AFRICOM’s mission to “protect” Africa’s resources from other foreign nations. Ward would not respond to that issue.

—Lawrence Freeman