

# **Bill Gates – population reduction and zero CO2 (same thing)**

July 5, 2010

*Commentary by Alan Mercer*

February, 2010, Bill Gates on energy: Innovating to zero, [www.ted.com](http://www.ted.com)

(Interactive transcript to the right of the video). Gates starts off by pushing the scientifically discredited propaganda about climate change and how it's going to lead to disaster.

Then he complains about how energy has become too cheap, so there needs to be a new constraint because of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, which is alleged to be emitted in unnatural amounts by human activities, and to be trapping heat in the earth's atmosphere.

But actually it's essential for plant life and is emitted when we breath and when we burn necessary fuel to keep our lives, homes and businesses running, and it's necessary for the manufacture of the products we use to stay alive and healthy – all of them.

The idea is that supposedly human beings emit too much CO<sub>2</sub>, but there is no way that we emit more than the volcanoes, oceans, forests and decaying plant and animal life on this planet.

Some people – besides the perps – actually know the real reason for the “humans cause climate change” agenda. This whole idea is just a tool of globalist revolutionaries who work for the international banks. It is fabricated as a way to reach the end goal of a controlled world society, controlled through the imposition of energy credits or carbon credits so that we have to pay just to be alive.

***The First Global Revolution* by the Club of Rome spells out the reason for why the globalists use fears such as climate change, food shortages etc. They want a common “enemy” to “unite” mankind under a single system of control. And they decided that the enemy is “humanity itself”. So we are told over and over that normal human activity is a threat, not out of control war-mongering governments and resource-stealing corporations, but normal behavior. And all they have to do is make us believe that our fellow human beings are an incredible danger to our survival, and we will all fall into line under the sway of a bunch of elitist scam artists, and do whatever we are told to do, and stomp on each others’ rights and freedoms.**

**Gates then explains how “the scientists” told him emissions needed to be cut to zero.**

**Then he talks about how each person on the planet puts out about an average of five tons of carbon dioxide per year, with a total of 26 billion tons. So what? Actually, that’s 26 billion tons of normal plant-sustaining non-toxic, life enhancing gas he’s so concerned about, that every creature lives with every second of their life.**

**Then he describes his equation, so I’ll paraphrase:**

**Amount of CO<sub>2</sub>. He wants to get that down to ZERO!!!!**

**And that’s dependent on the population or NUMBER OF PEOPLE getting closer to ZERO.**

**OR it’s dependent on the “services” each person uses on average getting closer to ZERO. “Services”, you know like food, water pumps, transportation, clothing, home-building materials, supposedly nasty things like that which consume energy and keep you alive so that you can emit more CO<sub>2</sub>.**

Or it's dependent on the average energy use for each service getting closer to ZERO.

Or it's dependent on the "amount of CO2 put out for each unit of energy" getting closer to ZERO.

Remember that CO2 is not a toxin. CO2 is not big chunks of black graphical soot as in David Attenborough's shameful program. CO2 is not smog contrary to what many have been led to believe by propagandists. CO2 is what you breath out and is a completely invisible clean and odorless product of combustion, just like water vapor. But the ruling class has everyone obsessed over CO2 – carbon dioxide. This is a mind control religion.

The *Great Global Warming Swindle* covers some of the basics. A film that covers other political angles is *Fall of the Republic*. Lord Monckton presents clear arguments. And of course there were the leaked emails that undermined the whole scam publicly.

Then Gates gets into population:

*"First we've got population. Now, the world today has 6.8 billion people. That's headed up to about nine billion. Now, if we do a really great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services, we could lower that by, perhaps, 10 or 15 percent, but there we see an increase of about 1.3.*

"Reproductive health services" obviously means abortion clinics and sterilization procedures ( "family planning"), which governments like the Canadian government have been funding under globalist pressure for years. Taxpayers have been made to pay for institutions that exist to abort the babies of women worldwide and to pay for sterilization procedures worldwide. This is not new.

But recently it came up, because the Canadian Conservative government didn't want to fund foreign abortions. And the government faced the wrath of Hilary

Clinton and UN NGO's. At the G8, it was called "maternal health". This is the disguised terminology for world population management funded by taxpayers. It is portrayed to the public as a "rights" issue, even though it automatically violates the freedom of conscience of many taxpayers. How much the UN and its supporters and hangers-on have violated the rights of women (and others) with *forced sterilization policies*, now THAT is a question not discussed by the supposed "right-thinking", "modern", "forward-looking", "enlightened" and "hip". The don't bother about that.

Here is the G8 Muskoka Declaration (expired) (new link) (2010) where Bill Gates receives prominent attention and definitely illustrates how the power structure is a PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.

*"10. To this end, the G8 undertake to mobilize as of today \$5.0 billion of additional funding for disbursement over the next five years. Support from the G8 is catalytic. We make our commitments with the objective of generating a greater collective effort by bilateral and multilateral donors, developing countries and other stakeholders to accelerate progress on MDGs 4 and 5. We therefore welcome the decisions by other governments and foundations to join the Muskoka Initiative. The Governments of the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain and Switzerland, subject to their respective budgetary processes, and the Bill and Melinda Gates and UN Foundations have now or have recently committed to additional funding of \$2.3 billion to be disbursed over the same period."*

And the footnote answers so many questions:

*"Apart from the G8, the following endorse the Muskoka Initiative: the Governments of Australia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the McCall McBain Foundation, the Packard Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the United Nations Foundation, as well as the group of eight international agencies in the health sector (the World Health*

*Organization, the Global Fund, UNICEF, GAVI, the World Bank, the UNFPA, UNAIDS, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation), the Heads of the Schools of Public Health of 22 universities in the United States and the Micronutrient Initiative based in Canada.”*

The United Nations Foundation mentioned, for example, belongs to UN FUNDER Ted Turner, who has made famous statements about reducing the population. Turner is in the same “overpopulation” billionaires club that Gates belongs to. These guys care a lot about women’s health, and the third world, they say. Maybe I missed it, but they don’t seem to have much to say against the wars and atrocities that are going on against Iraqi and Afghan women, children and men, conducted by key members of the G8, who prepared a whole document about how they care about “maternal health”.

For instance, in Afghanistan, maternal health is really in a terrible state according to this article. So END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN! Why don’t they shut down their wars if they care so much about “maternal health”?

What do they mean by MDG 4 and 5, or Millenium Development Goals? MDG 4 is “reduce child mortality” and MDG 5 is “improve maternal health”. And a big component of this is preventing pregnancy, but the material is written in such a way that it plays it down – because no doubt the UN keeps running into resistance from governments and maybe even their own workers. The overall term is “sustainability”. As long as the “third world” is interfered with and not allowed to develop, there will be poverty and resulting problems with maternal health.

Much of the rhetoric from the UN is aimed at women, and it is cloaked under idealistic terms, that are basically divide and conquer, the implied allegation that all of them are always being abused by men, that they are treated unequally, that whatever society they live in is badly flawed, not because of wars that were stirred up and kept going by “advanced” interventionist nations, but because of their particular religion or cultural attitudes, etc.

So the real policy of re-engineering humanity and its population, formulated by people like Julian Huxley and H.G. Wells, and nowadays John Holdren, is disguised behind offers of loans directed to women, etc. The UN and its associates, basically use every angle to convince women and girls to do other things besides having children. Agenda 21 is full of this focus on women, and children also, and it comes across as very boring, but that's their message to the world that the local "third world" men are no good, that the UN needs to be in charge, that advanced modernist elites need to be showing the world "how it's done"!

They are so high and mighty at the UN! Did you notice that one of the top neocons, Paul Wolfowitz, who promoted the Iraq War was made President of the World Bank, a critical UN agency? Did you notice that Robert McNamara, who ran the Vietnam War, was a past President of the World Bank also? These are the types of people who supposedly show the third world what's "good for them". Of course, they will set the example for everyone of "advanced" "cosmopolitan" policies. Very "modern". Lots of "equality" and sophistication all round. Not "fundamentalist" at all. No ma'am.

So you'll notice their propaganda everywhere if you look for it. Our culture has already been hit hard by it, but it is an ongoing, mostly lop-sided, worldwide war. It's just that most are fooled into thinking it's for our "rights".

Having babies is obviously always a "health problem" in the minds of those who run the UN and International Planned Parenthood, and they have to "fix" that. You get to fund this with your taxes whether you like it or not, even under Harper. We have the "rights" to be slaves and fund agendas we may disagree with. We're so "free". And people want to promote this system we live under to the rest of the world? This system of government domination over our lives, over our currency, over our minds, that calls itself "democracy" and says it promotes "maternal health".

In any case, you can read the old U.S. government policy in black and white here: National Security Study Memorandum 200, April 24, 1974. Subject: “Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests”.

*Nothing* is your own private personal concern in this world, under this system. Nothing.

Diane Francis, for example, establishment Canadian journalist, says we need a planetary one child policy law like in China.

“Too many people” equals a threat to their power structure, their agenda and their control of resources. It’s as simple as that.

Back to Bill Gates:

“Health care” is spoken in the same context of controlling population.

Do you really think that *better* health care leads to less babies? You mean if the baby dies young because of poor health care, the mother will have another baby? Sure, but how does that lead to *more* children? Somehow if we fund or are forced to pay for “health care” systems of the kind he is talking about, there WILL BE LESS PEOPLE. That’s what he says. So, whatever they do to people in such “health care” systems, it results in less people.

The most surprising thing: “New vaccines” is also used in the context of reducing population. How does that work? Well, here is the same paradox. IF his kind of vaccines made a person HEALTHIER, and helped them survive illness, than they logically would be more able to have additional children. If people were injected or sprayed with a “vaccine”, how would that reduce the population? What kind of “vaccine” is that?

**Clear as day, he says “new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services” equals reducing the population by 15%, which is according to his figures, about a billion less people. Some “health care”! Some “vaccines”! A billion less people.**

**But many won't get it or accept it, and others will rationalize it.**

**NOBODY HAS THE RIGHT TO MAKE US PAY FOR ABORTION AND STERILIZATION OR ANYTHING ELSE.**

**NOBODY HAS THE RIGHT TO TELL US HOW MANY CHILDREN WE SHOULD HAVE.**

**Then Gates says that the population figure can't be reduced enough to get the CO2 to zero, the number of services we use can't be reduced enough to get the Co2 to zero, and the energy per service can't be reduced enough, according to him.**

**So he focuses in on the “key” factor, the “amount of CO2 put out for each unit of energy”. Every kind of fuel we are used to, other than nuclear and renewable sources, puts out CO2.**

**As if CO2 is bad! Again, the whole idea of getting people to reduce CO2 emissions, never mind reducing CO2 to zero is INSANE, but here he goes on and on about getting the number to ZERO. We were born emitting CO2.**

**So his magic wand answer to distract people is “energy miracles”.**

**He discusses the idea of storing CO2 (as if that doesn't require CO2 emissions to produce the technology needed to store the CO2). There are people so brainwashed and seduced by this nonsense, that they have governments all over the world seriously talking about paying for carbon sequestration, or pumping CO2 underground, as if that's anything but insane. How does that benefit anyone? It's a religion they get you to believe in so they can control you. The**

more motions they go through, the more they wave their hands, and warn about dangers and chaos, and the more of our money they spend, the more impressed we are.

Then there are the ins and outs of nuclear power. And the drawbacks of wind and solar. And he discusses the limitations of battery storage. Bill Gates mentions that all possibilities should be pursued, and that he is going to back a nuclear approach called “Terrapower”.

So the end result of this discussion for me is that I realize the elites and this club of billionaires are going to make us give up our old technologies that we rely on for survival – by lies, law, and by force – and are going to continue to make us – through government and special taxes – fund their pet technologies.

The old dying system, in other words, is going to provide the sustenance and energy, the money supplied by our labor, to fund the technologies they need for the “bold” new system of the future. So they’ll jump on top of our hunched-over backs, spread their wings and soar off into their low-carbon, – i.e. reduced population – “future”.

He’s claiming this new nuclear technology is “zero emission” (as if it matters), and we’re supposed to just accept that on faith.

Again, people must be wondering what difference does it make what Gates thinks? Gates was at the elitist Bilderberg meeting, in Spain (June, 2010). He hangs out with Rockefeller, etc. discussing population. He’s not an isolated individual. And government is not isolated from the influence of these people, as if public and private are separate things in the power structure. That’s baloney. Gates and his friends and his bosses are running and funding everything, as quoted from the G8 document above.

And Gates spells it out for us:

*“Well, let’s go out to where we really need to get, and then look at the intermediate. For 2050, you’ve heard many people talk about this 80 percent reduction. That really is very important, that we get there. ...*

So he’s saying “we” MUST get to 80 percent CO2 reduction by 2050. So think about the equation again with population, services, energy per service and reducing CO2 per energy unit (“energy miracles”). He’s holding up his “energy miracle” as if it’s real and making you believe it’s going to make that equation work out to zero.

Obviously, the globalists want the population reduced, and they just want us to accept that it needs to be done. They want us to buy in to it. They don’t care about the amount of CO2 emitted. It’s nonsense. That’s for our benefit.

And of course this supposed “capitalist” is using this collectivist term “we”. He is a “solution” pusher like the rest of them, to solve problems that could be easily solved by ending wars and leaving people alone. All this media and public relations and pressure on governments is applied worldwide to push through an agenda, and part of it is to make us all a global society that is interdependent, completely *dependent* in other words.

So Gates insists that they solve the technological problem “at full speed”:

*“If you gave me only one wish for the next 50 years, I could pick who’s president, I could pick a vaccine, which is something I love, or I could pick that this thing that’s half the cost with no CO2 gets invented, this is the wish I would pick....”*

He makes clear the consequences of not going with some “energy miracle” that doesn’t emit CO2:

*“If we don’t get this wish, the division between the people who think short term and long term will be terrible, between the U.S. and China, between poor*

*countries and rich, and most of all the lives of those two billion [the poorest "two billion"] will be far worse...."*

So you heard him. You better get to work on it fast, or else. Remember he said that the 80% reduction in CO2 was a MUST.

He clearly calls for government funding of his technology. This is how public-private works already. With no shame at all, he calls for CO2 TAX (CARBON TAXES):

*"We need to go for more research funding. When countries get together in places like Copenhagen, they shouldn't just discuss the CO2. They should discuss this innovation agenda, and you'd be stunned at the ridiculously low levels of spending on these innovative approaches. We do need the market incentives, CO2 tax, cap and trade, something that gets that price signal out there. We need to get the message out. We need to have this dialogue be a more rational, more understandable dialogue, including the steps that the government takes."*

So in no sense is it a voluntary program. He expects governments to back up what he says.

In the Q&A section, he admits his new nuclear technology will have some waste left in the ground. Why would it be preferable to CO2?

In a response to a question about how long it will take for something like Terrapower to go live, Gates says:

*"Well, we need, for one of these high-scale, electro-generation things that's very cheap, we have 20 years to invent and then 20 years to deploy."*

40 years. So he is emphasizing the mandated target of 80% Co2 reduction by 2050. With the talk about carbon taxes and cap and trade, that gets into the realm of affecting the number of children we can afford to have, the number of services

per person, and the amount of energy per service. So all four factors in the equation are still in play regardless.

Then he makes an incredible statement about “geo-engineering” in response to a question about what to do if the energy technology doesn’t work out. The questioner includes the insane idea being circulated that the temperature of the earth needs to be kept “stable”. Nobody ever heard of the earth’s temperature being stable until these con artists got started with their propaganda. Throughout the earth’s history, temperatures have varied widely, including the medieval warming period. Information to the contrary is just a complete fraud and suppression of facts and intimidation against those who present those facts. Global warming blamed on man is a long-term political POWER agenda as I mentioned.

*“CA: If this doesn’t work, then what? Do we have to start taking emergency measures to try and keep the temperature of the earth stable?”*

*” BG: ... There is a line of research on what’s called geoengineering, which are various techniques that would delay the heating to buy us 20 or 30 years to get our act together. Now, that’s just an insurance policy. ... there’s now the geoengineering discussion about, should that be in the back pocket in case things happen faster, or this innovation goes a lot slower than we expect.”*

We should wonder whether the “geoengineering” and the other “emergency measures” are going on anyway. And if it is happening already, we are supposed to believe that “geoengineering” is meant in good faith, to prevent the earth warming supposedly.

He discusses costs and emphasizes the importance to people of cheap energy – the kind they’re going to get rid of – but hopefully the “miracle” energy technology will be very cheap if it works:

***“I believe we should try more things that have a potential to be far less expensive. If the trade-off you get into is, let’s make energy super expensive, then the rich can afford that. I mean, all of us here could pay five times as much for our energy and not change our lifestyle. The disaster is for that two billion.”***

---

**Excerpt from “Why you should listen to him“:**

***“...the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has now donated staggering sums to HIV/AIDS programs, libraries, agriculture research and disaster relief — and offered vital guidance and creative funding to programs in global health and education. Gates believes his tech-centric strategy for giving will prove the killer app of planet Earth’s next big upgrade.”***

**So it is a technocratic agenda, of always updating and upgrading our world and ourselves.**

**Source: <http://canadianliberty.com/?p=2267>[http://www.ted.com/talks/bill\\_gates](http://www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates)**