

Where Does the Sick Depopulation Fantasy Come From?

Analysis by [Tessa Lena](#)

October 13, 2023

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › It is not a big secret that at least some of the maniacs ruling us want to depopulate
- › They run away from being a part of the whole – and create a synthetic world in which they are “in control”
- › Some of the popular theories created by the managerial class can be explained by the vanity and incoherence in “learned men”
- › From Malthus to the Club of Rome and a whole slew of eugenicists that came along the way, there is no lack of people who believe that it’s their business to “regulate” other people’s reproductive trends
- › It is time to realize the absurdity of living under a crazy mob; it’s been too long

The story is about depopulation and the absurdity of living under a mob.

The Mindset Behind the Desire to Depopulate

It is not a big secret that at least some of the aspiring masters want to depopulate. They’ve been vocal about it for decades, not shy. Furthermore, all talking aside, human history has seen many gruesome genocides, organized by power-hungry individuals to further increase their power. There is a lot of evidence showing that oftentimes, power-hungry individuals pick mass murder as their primary instrument to achieve their goal of having maximum power.

Does it mean that every single crazy maniac in power wants to depopulate? I suspect that this is not the case. I suspect that some of the maniacs think that depopulation is necessary for them to have the highest power, while other might prefer the strategy of breeding obedient slaves – at least for now.

After all, all the hype about wonderful robots notwithstanding, robots are still “half-baked,” and replacing people with robots on a massive scale is still a pipe dream (a sociopath’s pipe dream but a pipe dream none the less).

Whether the maniacs are dreaming to depopulate or to breed obedient slaves, there is a common denominator, which is a total lack of respect for any of us – and a willingness to throw us under the bus. People with the psychological and spiritual inclination to view themselves as “owners of everything” have zero respect for us, and even less love. They are disconnected from love.

As a result of being disconnected from love, they are scared of losing power. They are paranoid and suspicious of everyone. They are constantly looking for a high. And of course, experiencing power over others is a high.

Down the Rabbit Hole

Even the most intellectually developed maniacs are outrageously bonkers – and so to them, the act of breaking foundational spiritual laws is a drug. The more they bend the natural laws with what feels to them like impunity, the more “powerful” they feel. They are in denial of the fact that everything in this universe eventually comes to balance, and even the darkest paths eventually lead to light (not without paying the price though, not without paying the price).

See, if they embraced the fact that they are a part of the creation, a part of the whole, a part of love, they would have to accept that they are only in control of their own free will but not of the grand scheme of “how things in the universe work.” Because they desire to be in charge of the grand scheme of things, they are running away from being a part of

the whole and finding short-term solace in synthetic fantasies about a synthetic world in which they are “in control.”

Sadly, in order to reenact their synthetic fantasy and make it feel “real” to themselves, they pull a lot of people into their game – and one of the easiest ways for them to make the people accept the game as “real” is to abuse the people and make them feel great pain. The feeling of pain is hard to neglect. The existence of pain and feeling of being the boot make the entire game of control “real.”

And so, the entire centuries-old structure, eloquently dubbed by Steven Newcomb as the **System of Domination**, is a synthetic construct, a simulation that exists as a pain reliever for the people who choose to be on the dark side and feel the pain as a result of being disconnected from love. And so, as a matter of theft, they create the pain in other people in order to not feel theirs.

The Power of Repeating Gibberish

And then there are the mid-level managers and clever consultants. When it comes to various popular theories put forth by the managerial and academic class (such as the Malthusian theory), let us not underestimate the power of vanity and incoherence in “learned” men. There is no lack of very arrogant “learned” men who feel smart simply because they get praised.

Chasing vanity, they often come up with fancy-sounding theories that have nothing to do with how things actually work – and if their theories happen to help the “owners,” they get elevated and promoted, and then the innocent children end up learning nonsense and repeating nonsense all day, sincerely so.

Population Concerns

A number of individuals are famous for their population theories and concerns. Here are just a **few of them**. **Thomas Malthus** (1766 – 1834) was an English economist who is

known today for his theory on population growth. His famous work was called “[An Essay on the Principle of Population](#).”

“While it was not the first book on population, Malthus's book fuelled debate about the size of the population in Britain and contributed to the passing of the [Census Act 1800](#). This Act enabled the holding of a national census in England, Wales and Scotland, starting in 1801 and continuing every ten years to the present. The book's 6th edition (1826) was independently cited as a key influence by both [Charles Darwin](#) and [Alfred Russel Wallace](#) in developing the theory of natural selection.”¹

Malthus believed that population growth would inevitably outpace the food supply and that the betterment of humankind is impossible without imposing stern limits on reproduction. This sort of thinking is commonly referred to as Malthusianism.

[Paul Ralph Ehrlich](#), (born 1932) is an American biologist and educator who in 1990 shared Sweden's Crafoord Prize, awarded by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, with biologist [E.O. Wilson](#).

“Though much of his research was in the field of entomology, Ehrlich's overriding concern became unchecked population growth. He was concerned that humanity treat Earth as a spaceship with limited resources and a heavily burdened life-support system; otherwise, he feared, ‘mankind will breed itself into oblivion.’ He published a distillation of his many articles and lectures on the subject in *The Population Bomb* (1968) and wrote hundreds of papers and articles on the subject.”²

The Club of Rome

The Club of Rome is an ambitious globalist think tank, founded in 1968. The group is known for their 1972 report called “[The Limits to Growth](#)” that discussed the possibility of exponential economic and population growth with finite supply of resources, studied by computer simulation. The study used an MIT World3 computer model to simulate the consequence of interactions between the earth and human systems. (A computer model, I see!)

Their follow-up book from 1991, "[The First Global Revolution](#)," contains a passage entitled "The common enemy of humanity is Man," which states the following:

"In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together.

*But in designating these dangers as the enemy, we fall into the trap, which we have already warned readers about, namely mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself."*³

And here is a presentation about the 2022 sequel by the Club of Rome, "[Limits and Beyond](#)."

"Behavioral Sink"

"Behavioral sink" is a term that was coined by ethologist John Calhoun to describe a collapse in behavior that could result from overcrowding. Calhoun's concept was based on a series of experiments he conducted on rodents between the late 1950s and the early 1970s. In the experiments, Calhoun and his team created a series of "utopias" for rodents – enclosed spaces in which they were given unlimited access to food and water, enabling unfettered population growth.

Calhoun's work was used as an animal model of societal collapse, and his study is considered a touchstone of urban sociology and psychology in general.⁴ The most famous one of Calhoun's experiments was "Universe 25," an experiment he did in 1968.

According to this Substack [article](#), "Universe 25 attempted to understand the impact of overpopulation on behaviour and societal structures, using colonies of mice as his subjects, in a rodent Garden of Eden. Universe 25 was a carefully designed enclosure

measuring 9 feet square with 4.5-foot-high sides. Within this space, Calhoun created what was essentially a mouse utopia.

The enclosure was divided into four equal sections, each with a central nesting area connected by ramps to multiple food and water dispensers. There were no predators in this world, and disease was minimized due to regular cleaning. With an unlimited supply of food and water, the mice were provided everything they needed to flourish. But, on day 600 in this mouse paradise, the last baby was born. By day 920 the last remaining mouse died.”

A few thoughts. This experiment is usually viewed in terms of “population” and “space” but was it really about just that?

Was it maybe about the inevitable nosedive that synthetic reality experience in the long term? Can a fenced-off indoor area be considered a paradise? Wasn't it, after all, an artificial situation imposed on the mice by the “learned men”? Isn't overcoming the challenges in the wild a part of life's fun – and did the lack of natural challenges lead to the degradation of their senses and their resulting demise? Lots of food for thought!

Kissinger Report

National Security Study Memorandum 200, also known as “[Kissinger Report](#),” is one of the most well-known documents on [population control](#). [Wikipedia](#) offers an interesting interpretation of it, as if to write it off as a set of policies that has nothing to do with today:

“National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests (NSSM200), also known as the “Kissinger Report”, was a national security directive completed on December 10, 1974 by the United States National Security Council under the direction of Henry Kissinger following initial orders from President of the United States Richard Nixon.

NSSM200 was reworked and adopted as official United States policy through NSDM 314 by President Gerald Ford on November 26, 1975. It was initially classified for over a decade but was obtained by researchers in the early 1990s.

The memorandum and subsequent policies developed from the report were observed as a way the United States could use human population control to limit the political power of undeveloped nations, ensure the easy extraction of foreign natural resources, prevent young anti-establishment individuals from being born and to protect American businesses abroad from interference from nations seeking to support their growing populations.”

How Intellectual Trends Are Born

How did depopulation ideology take hold? In the same way other “brilliant” ideas did. Let us say, the superwealthy maniacs – or some of them, at least – believe that in their “controlled environment,” they are in charge of population trends. Let us say, they become concerned about the breeding peasants, and want to peasants to hold their horses and stop having many (or any) kids.

What happens next? They set up “think tanks” and elevate the “thought leaders” who promote their goals. Sadly, in our broken world, there is no lack of traumatized or wobbly-hearted people to eagerly help them with that! The more broken the people are, the smaller the chance that they will think deep, original thoughts. And so we end up with glorified parrots spewing fancy-sounding gibberish – and a tough competition for the glorified parrots’ spots!

“Kids Are Bad for Earth”

As an illustration, here is a clumsy NBC News [story](#) titled, “Science proves kids are bad for Earth. Morality suggests we stop having them.” The piece was authored by, you guessed it, a bioethicist. And the editors at NBC News even picked the strangest pictures of children that make them look lifeless. My God!

“Although culturally controversial, the scientific half of this position is fairly well-established. Several years ago, scientists **showed** that having a child, especially for the world’s wealthy, is one of the worst things you can do for the environment,” the author says.

Eugenics?

Eugenics was once an established scientific discipline aimed at “bettering” the human race. “Eugenics practitioners coercively sterilized some 60,000 Americans, barred the marriage of thousands, forcibly segregated thousands in ‘colonies,’ and persecuted untold numbers in ways we are just learning. Before World War II, nearly half of coercive sterilizations were done in California, and even after the war, the state accounted for a third of all such surgeries.”

“Eugenics would have been so much bizarre parlor talk had it not been for extensive financing by corporate philanthropies, specifically the Carnegie Institution, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Harriman railroad fortune. They were all in league with some of America’s most respected scientists from such prestigious universities as Stanford, Yale, Harvard and Princeton.

*These academicians espoused race theory and race science, **and then faked and twisted data to serve eugenics’ racist aims [don’t you say].”***

The formal “father” of eugenics (and “**normality**”) was **Francis Galton**, Charles Darwin’s cousin. “Galton was an anthropologist and the founder of eugenics known for his “pioneering” (per Encyclopedia Britannica) studies of human intelligence. He started out as a doctor and then left medicine for the budding field of statistics. He was knighted in 1909.”

Starting in 1904, the Carnegie Institution (a privately-funded scientific research organization founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1902) “funded the **Station for Experimental Evolution** at Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, that hosted the federally funded Eugenics

Record Office. With the Carnegie's financial support, the ERO quickly became the most important center for eugenics research in America.”⁵ And here some lesser known facts:

In **Sweden**, up to 63,000 people, mostly women, were force-sterilized under a racial purity program approved by the state and running between 1935 and 1976.

In **Britain**, “eugenics is the dirty little secret of the British left. The names of the first champions read like a roll call of British socialism’s best and brightest: Sidney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, Harold Laski, John Maynard Keynes, Marie Stopes, the New Statesman even ... the Manchester Guardian.”

“The revered pacifist, disarmer and philosophical titan, Bertrand Russell, dreamed up a wheeze that would have made even Nazi Germany’s eugenicists blush. He suggested the state issue colour-coded ‘procreation tickets.’ Those who dared breed with holders of a different-coloured ticket would face a heavy fine. That way the high-calibre gene pool of the elite would not be muddied by any proletarian or worse, foreign, muck.

Leading lights of British socialism had no patience for equality. The communist and one-time editor of the Daily Worker, JBS Haldane, considered equality a ‘curious dogma ... we are not born equal, far from it.’ Many on the left were members of the upper middle-class or lower aristocracy, convinced their higher intellectual capacities had to be preserved from proletarian infection.

One popular idea of the time was to encourage artificial insemination – not to help the infertile, but to impregnate working-class women with the sperm of men with high IQs ... In this context, there was only contempt for ordinary people, who were regarded as ‘sub-men’ to be tended and looked after – via the welfare state – like a bovine herd.”

Sigh, seems like both “capitalists” and “socialists” quite excel at eugenics, and “population control” is just another expression of the domination mindset. Only a person who believes himself to be entitled to rule over others against their will would even fantasize about such things!

Is Population Growth a Threat?

My view is that the problem of "societal decay" has to do with the fact that we live under a mob, in a synthetic world, and everything is upside down. Furthermore, it's not that there is too much breeding happening at the moment but that there is not enough. In the developed world, the ratio of older people to younger people is already very tilted in an unnatural way, and it seems like even the "developing" world is quickly catching up (or rather, catching down).⁶

And in any case, Earth has plenty of "resources" for everyone ... if only a handful of very greedy and very crazy individuals didn't seek to sit on top of most "resources" and command the rest of us!

In addition to that, the amount of chronic disease is skyrocketing – including among the people of working age – which means that as time goes by, **fewer and fewer people will be able to work**. Meanwhile, their robots are nowhere close to being ready to replace us peasants on a massive scale! Not happening! No! The masters must be so high on their depopulation fantasy that they forgot to compare their "models" to the real world!

And even the "science" begins to agree. For instance, this 2020 [study](#) published in The Lancet titled, "Fertility, mortality, migration, and population scenarios for 195 countries and territories from 2017 to 2100: a forecasting analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study" (ironically funded by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation) concludes that the real demographic trend is population decline. It says:

"In the reference scenario, the global population was projected to peak in 2064 at 9.73 billion (8.84–10.9) people and decline to 8.79 billion (6.83–11.8) in 2100 ... China was forecasted to become the largest economy by 2035 but in the reference scenario, the USA was forecasted to once again become the largest economy in 2098.

Our alternative scenarios suggest that meeting the Sustainable Development Goals targets for education and contraceptive met need would result in a global

population of 6.29 billion (4.82–8.73) in 2100 and a population of 6.88 billion (5.27–9.51) when assuming 99th percentile rates of change in these drivers.

Our findings suggest that continued trends in female educational attainment and access to contraception will hasten declines in fertility and slow population growth.

A sustained TFR [total fertility rate] lower than the replacement level in many countries, including China and India, would have economic, social, environmental, and geopolitical consequences. Policy options to adapt to continued low fertility, while sustaining and enhancing female reproductive health, will be crucial in the years to come [emphasis mine]

Vox, 2017:

*“One simple question is how many people can the United States feed? Well, our net agricultural exports account for **about 25 percent** of the physical volume of agricultural production, which suggests that if we redirected those exports internally, the US could probably support approximately 25 percent more people.*

That’s assuming current technology and current diets and current land use. In short, we could feed more than 400 million people, total, merely by consuming locally what we now export.”

And this 2019 Wired [article](#) titled, “The World Might Actually Run Out of People,” talks about “Empty Planet: The Shock of Global Population Decline,” the book by John Ibbitson and Darrell Bricker. The point of the book is that global population is in decline, and that the “developing” countries are catching up with the “developed” countries in the trend to have fewer and fewer kids.

The Importance of Spiritual Strength

I believe that a part of the tricksters’ game is to make us betray ourselves so that they can make a case before the Creator and say, “But they agreed to this! They betrayed

themselves!” It’s a very tough game for the people, really. It is hard to be strong when you are being bullied. But that is how our unique personal blend of wisdom and fearlessness gets born!

And it seems to me that the only way to tilt the balance in favor of harmony in the long term is to protect ourselves, to stand up for our dignity, to absolutely refuse to betray ourselves or friends – and simultaneously learn to not be afraid of the monsters but generate so much love and put in so much love into this world that they get touched by it, too. And, slowly, slowly start melting into remembering that they, too, a part of the whole.

About the Author

To find more of Tessa Lena's work, be sure to check out her bio, [Tessa Fights Robots](#).

Sources and References

- ¹ [Wikipedia, An Essay on the Principle of Population](#)
- ² [Britannica, Paul R. Ehrlich](#)
- ³ [Wikipedia, The First Global Revolution](#)
- ⁴ [Wikipedia, Behavioral sink](#)
- ⁵ [Substack, Rockefeller Medicine: A Poisonous Illusion?](#)
- ⁶ [Wired, Science Feb 4, 2019](#)