

Too Many Humans? Forget That. There's Too Many Animals.

[Too Many Humans? Forget That. There's Too Many Animals.](#)

by [Joseph P. Farrell](#), [Giza Death Star](#)

March 29, 2024

The Malthusian madness that's been gripping the "elite" of the west ever since the Most Serene Republic of Venice first proposed the idea of "maximum carrying capacity" of human population (long before Malthus popularized the notion) has taken a step toward the truly insane, according to this PDF document that was shared by "D.J." (no, not Dark Journalist):

[AVMA Guidelines for the Depopulation of Animals: 2019 Edition](#)

Now, I readily admit that I'm still wading through this monstrosity, but I thought I'd share just a few quotations illustrative of how insane, diabolical, and anti-life the so-called experts of the West truly are.

Take a gander of the table of contents alone, and you get the idea: under various headings of types of animals, from "Companion" animals to "Laboratory animals" to "Aquaculture" and along the way dragging in "bovine", "swine" and "equids" in its train, these sections all contain a subsection titled "Events Necessitating Depopulation."

Under the heading of Companion Animals, which incidentally, heads the list of animal populations to be "depopulated", we read the following about the "Events Necessitating Depopulation" on page 19:

Emergency events that may necessitate the consideration of depopulation of companion animals may include the

widespread loss of essential survival resources during natural disasters such as earthquakes or floods; non-natural disasters such as incidents involving terrorism, bioterrorism, conventional or nuclear attack or accidents, or toxic chemical spills; contamination of food and water supplies; zoonotic or pandemic disease that threatens public health and the food supply; and contagious veterinary disease in a single locality or species. Public perceptions, political and legal interventions, logistic difficulties, and compliance issues are likely to complicate depopulation efforts directed at companion animals, as was seen with the euthanasia of an Ebola virus victim's pet dog in Spain in 2014.

Think of all of this as a kind of "template for action": claim that there is a planscandemic deadly to humans and transmitted through your pet cat, dog, turtle, bird, or whatever, and voila, one might be able to rid whole areas of the pesky fur-, feather-, or shell-bearing useless eaters. The reason that companion animals may be heading this bizarre list might have something to do with what is said under the "Bovine" offering of the document, again under the sub-header of events requiring depopulation (from pages 29-31):

Fortunately, animal health incidents that require the use of depopulation methods to eradicate or prevent disease, protect public health, or maintain a secure food supply are rare. Every animal health situation involving depopulation as part of the response is unique and should be evaluated individually to determine optimal response methods.

Whew! What a relief! I thought for a minute there we were out of the woods, with only companion animals being the number one concern. But no, there's always "agro-terrorism":

Agroterrorism may be defined "as the deliberate introduction of an animal or plant disease with the goal of generating fear, causing economic losses, and/or

undermining social stability.”¹³ Lists of potential agroterrorism pathogens by species^{14,15} may be found on the Center for Food Security and Public Health website along with an overview of potential bioterrorism diseases’ effects on humans and animals.¹⁶

Now so far, I’ll bet the reader is thinking, “Well, yea, but there is nothing here that really could nor should be taken as diabolical. Granted, the ‘elite’ often uses or sponsors such emergency planning studies in ways they did not inform their hired experts about when they commissioned the study.” For the hired experts, such studies are just that, contingency planning in case of an emergency, not a template for widespread action. And that argument is indeed true and often the case.

But I suspect that may not be the case here, when one considers what is said about “animal depopulation” under the “aquatic” section (page 66); note the language and terminology:

There are a number of potential situations that could result in a decision to depopulate a captive population of aquatic animals. Depopulation of captive aquatic animals may be necessary for disease control, for alleviating animal suffering, for biosafety and human safety issues, or any combination of these. Additionally, *depopulation may be necessary for food safety issues or elimination of undesirable species*. The method of depopulation should also take into consideration the containment of infectious materials, the zoonotic risk of the pathogen involved, and carcass disposal options. On the basis of these considerations, the type of depopulation chosen may be a preferred method, a method allowable in constrained circumstances, or a method that is not recommended. Examples of particular situations follow to demonstrate general scenarios, but are not intended to represent a comprehensive list of all potential rationales for

depopulation. (Emphasis added)

What I found intriguing with this passage (particularly in the context of Wednesday's blog about undersea mining), is the language about "elimination of undesirable species," which species are, of course, unspecified. Under such a broad umbrella, and notwithstanding all the subsequent speculations and caveats in the article, this is alarming. What, exactly, constitutes undesirable?

There is a hidden and implicit premise here and it is the same implicit and hidden premise that haunts – yes my choice of words is deliberate – all such Malthusian arguments, and which the few attempts to exorcise have proven to be unsuccessful, and that is the premise of "staticness", particularly of the staticness of science and technology. Consider: what may be an "undesirable species" today may subsequently come to be understood by science to be a key component of the ecosystem supporting human life, or indeed, all life, such as to eliminate it would be to ultimately doom mankind to a death by "cascading consequences" of the "depopulation" (unless of course one managed so keep DNA samples of such species in an ark, for cloning and "resurrection" in case we "guess wrongly", and, cross your fingers, we're able to clone enough to avert the catastrophe in time). Indeed, I have pointed out that when the Venetian Republic's banksters first proposed the idea of a maximum human population carrying capacity for the planet, their "learned and scientific estimation" was one billion people. True enough, with the agricultural and medicinal science of their day, that estimate may have been accurate. But the trouble is, science and technology do not stand still. There may indeed be maximum carrying capacities, but we do not have a sufficiently developed science of dynamic change in complex macrosystems to know what it is, and I strongly suggest that anyone claiming to know what an "undesirable species" is, is subject to the same problems of the implicit staticness and hence falsity of all such

Malthusian proposals.

And that, I submit, is why we're not looking simply at "emergency contingency planning" with this document. We're looking at some sick individuals' template and plan of action.

See you on the flip side...

[Connect with Joseph P. Farrell](#)

Cover images credit: [JoeBreuer](#) & [Joenomias](#)