

The Blessed Hope!

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;” –(Titus 2:13)

Diamond & Nugget #283

Nothing To See Here: The US Congress Introduced the ‘Disease X Act’ in June of 2023

JAN 15, 2024

By Jessica Rojas

"You better believe this is PRE-PLANNED, and they are working on bringing this SICK plan to fruition. "

WHY was the U.S. Congress involved in creating a bill called the “Disease X Act” back in June of 2023??

That slipped totally UNDER THE RADAR.

Purposefully.

Disease X is the mystery contagion that the World Economic Forum is having a meeting about on January 17th, 2024 that they say ***“could have 20 times more fatalities than COVID”***

The origins of Disease X go ALL the way back to 2018, in an article from the WEF.
NOT. A. COINCIDENCE.

You better believe this is PRE-PLANNED, and they are working on bringing this SICK plan to fruition.

“Disease X’ could cause the next pandemic, according to the WHO—or Ebola, SARS, or Nipah.”

Is this SMOKING GUN PROOF of NEFARIOUS Government COLLUSION with the WEF and the WHO?

Remember, THEY ALWAYS TELL YOU WHAT IS COMING.

It's up to YOU to BELIEVE IT, and PREPARE FOR IT."

See these links for sources:

[H.R.3832 - Disease X Act of 2023](#)

[The World Health Organization is worried about Disease X and you should be too 'Disease X' could cause the next pandemic, according to the WHO—or Ebola, SARS, or Nipah. 9 pathogens researchers are keeping a watchful eye on](#)

*Cosponsored by Dan Crenshaw, Mike Burgess, and Susie Lee, who want BARDA to develop some more “**medical countermeasures**,” which is code for **bioweapons**. - [zeeemedia](#)*

Related articles:

[Dr. Yeadon Comments on “Disease X” Fearmongering and “Preparing for the Next Pandemic” Advertising by The Wellness Company](#)
[Read full story](#)

[Get Ready For The Next One](#)
[Read full story](#)

[“For the Greater Good”: Shanghai COVID Atrocities Foreshadow Things To Come](#)
[Read full story](#)

[The Plan of the WHO Revealed by the Insider: 10 Years of Pandemics, From 2020 to 2030](#)
[Read full story](#)

[Event 201 Monkey Style: 2021 Tabletop Exercise Predicted Monkeypox “Attack” in May 2022](#)
[Read full story](#)

[Satanic Pfizer: The Occult Symbolism Found On The Pfizer Mural. They Are Mocking Us](#)
[Read full story](#)

[The World Is A Stage](#)
[Read full story](#)

[The Corona End Game](#)
[Read full story](#)

[The Corona End Game. Addendum](#)
[Read full story](#)

WHO Demands Global Meat Consumption Ban by 2025

Hunter Fielding January 16, 2024



The World Health Organization (WHO) has just upped the ante with its globalist “Net Zero” agenda by demanding that the general public must be banned from consuming meat and dairy products by 2025 globally.

The head of the United Nations “health” agency, Tedros Adhanom, declared in a [statement](#) that citizens around the world must begin the shift to plant and insect-based “foods” in order to “*save the planet*” from “*global warming*.”

“Our food systems are harming the health of our people and planet,” he said.

“Food systems contribute to over 30 percent of greenhouse gas emissions and account for almost one-third of the global burden of disease.”

He estimates that eight million lives could be saved each year with this one change. Although shifting away from red meat has been recommended for many years for health reasons, his motivation here appears to be purely environmental, with a context note on a video of him declaring the war on meat noting that climate change “*refers to long-term shifts in temperatures and weather patterns, mainly caused by human activities.*”

He went on to say “*I’m therefore very pleased that over 130 have signed the COP28 UAE Declaration on climate and health.*”

This includes the United States, who, under the Biden administration, signed this declaration.

The WHO's war on meat is part of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) COP28 "roadmap" for reducing the rise in global temperatures by 1.5 degrees Celsius, in keeping with the Paris climate agreement.

Although the FAO claims the meat industry is harming the planet with its nitrogen and methane emissions, the jury is still out on this question, and researchers have found that [methane actually traps heat in the atmosphere](#) and forms cooling clouds that offset surface warming, meaning that livestock farming could actually be cooling the planet.

Ahead of the conference, *Bloomberg News* reported: *"Nations that over-consume meat will be advised to limit their intake while developing countries — where under-consumption of meat adds to a prevalent nutrition challenge — will need to improve their livestock farming."*

The criticism began to pile up almost immediately, with lawyer and journalist Gordon Chang pointing out the WHO's connections to the Chinese Communist Party.

He wrote on X: *"[Tedros] and [the WHO] should be paying attention to [China's] biological weapons programs—including the [Chinese] 'genetic drugs'—instead of pontificating on matters outside their scope of responsibility."*

Other critics accused Tedros of hypocrisy, such as Dr. Kat Lindley, who wrote:

"I wonder what plant-based delicacy he eats every day and is he eating insect snacks when he is hungry?!"

"I suspect the answer is NO."

"Sometimes I listen to his words and just wonder what did we do to deserve this nonsense."

Others felt he had taken a [puzzling stance](#) for an African person, with South African scientist Tim Noakes commenting:

"Tedros must know that there is widespread protein malnutrition in Africa and the goal of his organization should be to reverse that. Not to make it worse. Instead what he also really wants to [do] is to give Africa more vaccines."

"One reason why he comes to visit my neck of the woods."

As alarming as the WHO's demands are, there are some climate groups that are taking the insanity even further.

For example, the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, which is a globalist organization composed of almost 100 cities around the world, wants to completely eradicate the consumption of both meat and dairy by 2030.

Prince Charles Openly Endorses New... **Draconian Population Study**

by Jurriaan Maessen
January 16, 2013



A decade ago HRH Prince Charles endorsed a new population study that reveals his motives behind his “Sustainable Development” SDGs. The basic fact is this is not about Net-Zero Carbon footprint or Climate Change at all. It is a cover story for HRH Prince (king) Charles fabricating global Democide or Depopulation.

New Population Study:

“(...) provide all sexually active human beings with modern contraception and backup abortion. The degree to which those steps would reduce fertility rates is controversial, but they are a likely win-win for societies.”

Prince Charles has openly expressed support for a recent population study by biologists **Paul and Anne Ehrlich**, calling for drastic global efforts to reduce fertility worldwide.

On the official website of the Prince of Wales, prince [Charles commended](#) Paul and Anne Ehrlich’s latest population study published in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society* on January 8, 2013 of this year, calling among other things for globally provided “back-up abortions” to avert overpopulation catastrophe.

The prince writes:

“We do, in fact, have all the tools, assets and knowledge to avoid the collapse of which this report warns, but only if we act decisively now.”

In their latest study entitled '[Can a Collapse of Global Civilization be Avoided?](#)', biologists **Paul R. Ehrlich** and his wife repeat their decade-long mantra, namely that global population growth is certain to collapse civilization as a whole, and only a concerted global effort to reduce fertility may avert the feared catastrophe.

The report mentions that global population reduction is a monumental task, but they add:

“Monumental, but not impossible if the political will could be generated globally to give full rights, education and opportunities to women, and provide all sexually active human beings with modern contraception and backup abortion.”

The degree to which those steps would reduce fertility rates is controversial, but they are a likely win-win for societies.”

These words contain some drastic and draconian implications.

In order to provide “*back-up abortions*” to women on a global scale, a worldwide population reduction strategy must be outlined and then enforced by all nations of the planet.

The Erich's concede that such a worldwide effort would not go down well with nations opposing abortions:

“Obviously (...) there are huge cultural and institutional barriers to establishing such policies in some parts of the world. After all, there is not a single nation where women are truly treated as equal to men.”

Despite that, the population driver should not be ignored simply because limiting overconsumption can, at least in theory, be achieved more rapidly. The difficulties of changing demographic trajectories mean that the problem should have been addressed sooner, rather than later.”, the Erich's write.

Responding to countless recent studies showing that not overpopulation, but [under population seems to be an increasing problem](#), especially in Europe, the Erich's state:

“That halting population growth inevitably leads to changes in age structure is no excuse for bemoaning drops in fertility rates, as is common in European government circles.”

Reduction of population size in those over-consuming nations is a very positive trend, and sensible planning can deal with the problems of population aging.”



They also write that besides change in the politics of demography, the educational system should also join the effort in a “symmetrical” manner, *“moving towards sustainability and enhancing equity (including redistribution).”*

The scientific community must throw its weight behind the effort, the Erich’s say, especially to counter all religious counter-argumentation underlining the value of life:

“To our minds, the fundamental cure, reducing the scale of the human enterprise (including the size of the population) to keep its aggregate consumption within the carrying capacity of Earth, is obvious but too much neglected or denied.

There are great social and psychological barriers in growthmanic cultures to even considering it.

This is especially true because of the ‘endarkenment’ - a rapidly growing movement towards religious orthodoxies that reject enlightenment values such as freedom of thought, democracy, separation of church and state, and basing beliefs and actions on empirical evidence.

They are manifest in dangerous trends such as climate denial, failure to act on the loss of biodiversity and opposition to condoms (for AIDS control) as well as other forms of contraception. If ever there was a time for evidence-based (as opposed to faith-based) risk reduction strategies, it is now.”

Global population reduction and global redistribution of wealth.

These things can of course only be accomplished through a concerted global effort or, as the authors declare *“an unprecedented level of international cooperation”*:

“At the global level, the loose network of agreements that now tie countries together, developed in a relatively recent stage of cultural evolution since modern nation states appeared, is utterly inadequate to grapple with the human predicament.

Strengthening global environmental governance and addressing the related problem of avoiding failed statehood are tasks humanity has so far refused to tackle comprehensively even as cultural evolution in technology has rendered the present international system (as it has educational systems) obsolete.

Serious global environmental problems can only be solved and a collapse avoided with an unprecedented level of international cooperation.”

The two end this line of reasoning by regurgitating the neo-Malthusian mantra- which simultaneously harbors a veiled threat, namely:

“If people do not do that, nature will restructure civilization for us.”

After Prince Charles endorsed the conclusions of their study, Paul Ehrlich twittered (click below image),

*“I wish our leaders were as far-sighted”,
...to which one of Ehrlich’s followers responded,
“Suicide on a grand scale needs reconsidering.”*

Comments such as these show that morality is nowhere to be found in the vicinity of these neo-Malthusian characters.

The fact that Prince **Charles** felt compelled to endorse the conclusions of this report only reaffirms that his lineage is still of the opinion that people are a scourge on the earth, or as his father Prince **Philip** stated, a plague:

As current Bing professor of Population Studies and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, Paul Ehrlich is living proof that old habits die hard - and [eugenic habits](#) die even harder.

After his famous book ‘*The Population Bomb*’ was published in 1968, he has fallen somewhat in credibility for the world kept on turning and mankind is apparently still around, despite of all the doom predicted.

In 1969 Ehrlich [predicted](#) that, *“smog disasters’ in 1973 might kill 200,000 people in New York and Los Angeles”* and *“By 1985 enough millions will have died to reduce the earth’s population to some acceptable level, like 1.5 billion people”*.

Nevertheless, despite Ehrlich's prediction of the total collapse of human society if the population would continue to rise, after 40 years the man still maintains his point, this time pointing to "climate change" as the consequence of increased human activity.

During an interview in December 2009, Ehrlich stated:

"The population explosion will come to an end. The only question is whether it will do so by humanity balancing its interventions to decrease death rates with interventions to decrease birth rates, or whether the death rate will soar."

In 2009, Ehrlich also expressed his desire to see the global population fall below replacement:

"Until and unless we can humanely begin to shrink the global population, following the lead of over-consuming and over-populated European nations, the future seems grim."

"Humanely shrink the global population", says Ehrlich.

He is wise enough to edit the word "humanely" in if he is to avoid the same indignation that befell his friend **John Holdren**, who co-authored [Ecoscience](#) (large file) with him in 1977.

There is of course no humane way of shrinking the global population. Only a planetary authority, enforcing such a shrinkage, could get the job done. And it is exactly such a planetary regime Mr. Ehrlich [called for](#), together with current chief science advisor to President Obama. In the following fragment, Paul Ehrlich advocates the creation of a "global system" to create a "behavioral change".

Ehrlich:

"We don't have any international effort to say, you know, how are we behaving. We have global problems, why don't we have a global system to fix it."

[Pastor Bob: I have been following this exaggeration of the so-called "Population Bomb" rendition since Dr. Paul Ehrlich provoked the world into believing that there are too many of us in the world. HRH Prince Charles entire family have been adherents to the Malthusian teachings their entire life and with their wealth and power have been instrumental in hyping through cryptic language their desires and plans to depopulate the planet under the guise of "saving the planet" through contrived and fabricated lies and deceptions. HRH Prince Charles pushes his depopulation agenda through cryptic and egalitarian terms. He may believe redistributing wealth is desirable because alleviating poverty is a moral imperative. Unfortunately he forgets or fails to tell the world that he is the "Richest" person on the planet. Each passing day reveals the hypocrisy of HRH Prince Charles who is presenting the image that he is going to save the planet with his so-called "Sustainable Initiatives" propaganda.

PRINCE CHARLES is clear and simple a HYPOCRITE living essentially a double standard that is at the center of so much environmentalism. He wants to make our lives

more inconvenient to save the planet from alleged climate change but the Prince refuses to make any changes in his own life.

The film points out how Prince Charles, with his wife and a staff of 14 flew more than 16,000 miles around south America to, *"warn about the dangers of climate change"*.

Instead of a small private jet Prince Charles traveled on a giant Airbus (normal capacity 134 passengers) that was converted into a luxury private plane.

This is classic hypocrisy and needs to be exposed. Watch this short video link below:
<https://youtu.be/zhpNJAKq7dE>

The Prince of Wales says he believes he has been placed on Earth as future King 'for a purpose' - to save the world...

Giving a fascinating insight into his view of his inherited wealth and influence, he said:

'I can only somehow imagine that I find myself being born into this position for a purpose.'

'I don't want my grandchildren or yours to come along and say to me, "Why the hell didn't you come and do something about this? You knew what the problem was". That is what motivates me.'

'I wanted to express something in the outer world that I feel inside... We seem to have lost that understanding of the whole of nature and the universe as a living entity.'

Green 'champion' Prince Charles, a long-term committed supporter of the environment says the modern world has lost the understanding of nature. His impassioned comments come during a film about his belief that unbridled commerce has led to the destruction of farmland and countryside.

The documentary, called *'Harmony'*, was to be aired on the U.S. network NBC in November, 2010 to coincide with the launch of a book of the same name by the prince. Charles is understood to have waived his author's fee, and all royalties will go to his charity, the Prince's Trust.

But the Prince has previously come under fire for hypocrisy over his eco-values.

He commandeered a jet belonging to the Queen's Flight to attend the Copenhagen climate change summit, generating an estimated 6.4 tons of carbon dioxide - 5.2 tons more than if he had used a commercial plane.

Critics condemned his words as 'delusional'.

'I don't want my grandchildren or yours to come along and say to me, "Why the hell didn't you come and do something about this? You knew what the problem was". That is what motivates me'

Graham Smith, of the anti-monarchy group Republic, said:

'He is under the impression he has been sent to save the world and deliver us from our sins. It's quite delusional.'

'He will have to be impartial and keep his mouth shut when he's king. If he really believes this is his mission and he disagrees with Government in future, he risks plunging us into a constitutional crisis.'

Senior royal aides denied the prince was attempting to mold his public image and pave the way to ensure a positive legacy. They stressed Charles also cared passionately about his other royal duties, such as defense.

One said:

'In private he has dismissed talk of legacies - that's not for him to say because it's for others to judge. But hopefully his charities will carry on for many years to come.'

'He has said there is a reason why he's in a position to raise these issues - that there is some higher power. But there is more to his role than just green problems.'

'It's true that outside royal duties, the environment is the thing he cares most passionately about.'

In a trailer to the film, the prince spoke passionately about his decades-long quest for what he described in a statement as 'a sacred duty of stewardship of the natural order of things'.

He said:

'I started 22 years ago on something that nobody really wanted to know about except a few people who thought it was pretty crazy.'

'The way nature presents itself - we've turned it into merely a mechanical process.'

This may surprise you, but the British Crown happens to be the world's largest property owner clocking in possessions amounting to [6.6 billion acres](#) across, Australia, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Canada, Great Britain and the Falkland Islands.

On top of the "Crown Lands" and "Crown Corporations" which are legally owned by the monarch of Britain, an organization called 'The Crown Estate' is one of the world's largest property groups.

Describing the institution which sends 25% of its earnings directly into the Monarch's purse every year, *Die Welt Business* [had this to say](#):

"The Crown Estate owns property all across the UK, from castles and cottages to agricultural land and forests plus retail parks and shopping centers.

It owns more than half the UK's entire seashore, giving it hugely valuable auction rights for offshore commercial activity, such as wind farms."

The Crown controls nearly the entire seabed (and half the seashore) around the UK with any business wishing to build offshore windmills as part of the [Green New Deal](#) forced to rent their sea beds from the Crown Estate.

It was noted [by Byline Times](#) that the Crown will stand to become *"the biggest beneficiary of UK's Green Agenda"* which recently unveiled a 10 point plan for a *"green revolution"* and full decarbonization by 2050.

For anyone confused about the exploding prices of inefficient energy sources across England, they wouldn't get far without appreciating the tax-payer subsidized boondoggle of windmill farms.

Prince Charles himself has demonstrated that he certainly doesn't see the Crown as a symbolic entity and was accused of *"incontinent lobbying"* in 2013 when dozens of personal letters (dubbed the ["Black Spider Memos"](#)) to MPs and the Prime Minister were made public after an intense legal fight to keep them secret.

Charles' official biographer **Jonathan Dimbleby** even wrote in 2013 that upon Charles' succession to the Crown that things would become much more hands on, and, ["that a quiet constitutional revolution is afoot."](#)

Prerogative Powers are Real

Although much effort goes into portraying the Crown's prerogative powers as merely symbolic, they cover nearly every branch of governance and have occasionally been used... although those British spheres of influence where they most apply are usually so self-regulating that they require very little input from such external influence to keep them in line.

These powers were first revealed publicly in 2003 and in an article titled ['Mystery Lifted on the Prerogative Powers'](#), the *London Guardian* noted that these powers include (but are not limited to):

- "domestic Affair,
- the appointment and dismissal of ministers
- the summoning, prorogation and dissolution of Parliament
- Royal assent to bills
- the appointment and regulation of the civil service

- the commissioning of officers in the armed forces
- directing the disposition of the armed forces in the UK (and other Commonwealth nations)
- appointment of Queen's Counsel
- Issue and withdrawal of passports
- Prerogative of mercy (used to apply in capital punishment cases. Still used, e.g. to remedy errors in sentence calculation)
- granting honors
- creation of corporations by Charter
- foreign Affairs
- the making of treaties
- declaration of war
- deployment of armed forces overseas
- recognition of foreign states
- accreditation and reception of diplomats"...

When a [2009 bill was introduced](#) into parliament proposing that these powers be limited, a Privy Council-led Justice Ministry review concluded that such limitations would 'dangerously weaken' the state's ability to respond to a crisis' and the bill was promptly killed.

Acting on Provincial levels, we find Lieutenant Governors who (in Canada) happen to be members of the Freemasonic Knights of St John of Jerusalem.

Charles demonstrated this "more hands on" approach to governance on June 3, 2020 when he became the official patron of the World Economic Forum's Great Reset and even officially launched the project Tweeting out #TheGreatReset:

On his official website, the Prince launched the project saying,

"Today, through HRH's Sustainable Markets Initiative and the World Economic Forum, The Prince of Wales launched a new global initiative, The Great Reset".

Charles has demonstrated the sort of enthusiasm for decarbonization of the world which one tends to only find in a religious fanatic setting himself up as the eco-warrior of monarchs, a Crusader King of a new religion, except instead of Muslims in the Holy Land, our [new Davos-connected eco-crusaders](#), ...have targeted carbon dioxide and the industrial civilization, farming and useless eaters who cause it, to be the poisonous threat that must be destroyed.

Charles appears to see himself walking in the footsteps of his WWF-founding father as the new leading spokesman for a total transformation of society under a WEF-green governance priesthood.

A [July 2022 edition](#) of *Australia's Spectator* aptly characterized Charles' misanthropic activism in the following terms:

"The environmentalism that the Prince has decided to occupy himself with while he awaits to ascend the throne is not a harmless sort of apolitical tree-planting or rainforest-saving activity.

He's not hugging pandas or funding wildlife sanctuaries.

Instead, he has engaged himself in a hybrid business and political uprising that threatens the survival of the political system which he is meant to oversee.

In addition to being a betrayal of the ordinary citizen, his actions represent a failure to his sole duty as future king - to protect the constitutional monarchy from rising climate fascism and globalism."

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, EvanTeachr@aol.com
www.pastorbobreid.com

