

**Archive of the Population-Environment Research Network (PERN)  
Cyberseminar Discussions on Revised Global Science Panel Statement  
on Population in Sustainable Development for Earth Summit 2002.<sup>1</sup>  
1-15 March 2002**

**From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>  
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Official start of 2nd GSP Cyberseminar  
Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 08:16:52 -0600**

Greetings, "Pernseminar" subscribers:

Today, March 1, is the official first day of discussion through this listserve on the Global Science Panel's REVISED statement on "Population in Sustainable Development". Discussion will continue through March 15.

If you have not done so, please visit the cybserseminar page at <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/> and download the Revised GSP Statement before contributing comments.

This seminar solicits reactions from the international research community to the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel (GSP) on Population and Environment. Their "Statement on Population in Sustainable Development" is being prepared for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). Also known as Earth Summit 2, it will take place September 2002 in Johannesburg: for more information and access to background documents and other resources, visit [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org). (The statement under review these weeks is a revised version of an earlier draft, drawing on comments from the October-November Cyberseminar.)

Your comments can address (for example) the content of the revised statement --especially changes since the preliminary statement-- remaining gaps (i.e., section 5, interdisciplinary training), and/or the relationship of the Statement to the Earth Summit 2002 Agenda.

Your comments will be read by other listserve subscribers and members of the Population Environment Research Network, as well as Global Science Panelists. Network coordinators will provide a summary after the first week, and a final summary after the second week.

Please forward this email to others who you think might be interested in the seminar. Thank you for your participation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/seminars.jsp>.

We are looking forward to the discussion.

Thank you.

Laura L. Murphy, PhD and Annababette Wils, PhD

Co-coordinators, Population Environment Research Network

<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>

To communicate with coordinators directly:

[Pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org](mailto:Pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org)

To post messages to the listserve: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)

**From: "Laura Murphy" <[murphyll@bellsouth.net](mailto:murphyll@bellsouth.net)>**

**To: <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**

**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] More on the Global Science Panel**

**Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 10:17:12 -0600**

Dear PERNSEMINARS subscribers:

Mahendra Shah, co-coordinator of the GSP, has kindly provided the following additional clarification on the background, composition and intent of the GSP. This might help readers in responding to the revised Statement.

-----  
Global Science Panel Population in Sustainable Development

Aim: To prepare a comprehensive scientific assessment about the role of population in sustainable development strategies, aiming at producing a substantive statement for the Johannesburg 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. Widely distribute this statement to national and international preparatory groups and make sure that the way from Rio to Johannesburg does not miss Cairo.

Organization and Sponsorship: Organized by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP), and the United Nations University (UNU). Sponsored by the UNFPA, the Government of Austria, and the MacArthur Foundation.

Patronage and Constitution: Maurice Strong and Nafis Sadik are the Panel's joint patrons. It consists of 30 independent distinguished scientists from different relevant disciplines.

Coordinators: Wolfgang Lutz and Mahendra Shah

The current draft of the panel statement has been derived from extensive consultations with scientists in population, human dimensions of environmental change and sustainable development . The goal of the

present cyber seminar ( March 1 to 15th 2002) is to solicit further comments and advise with a view to updating the global science panel statement. There will also be an Annex with supporting scientific information on specific issues and summaries of selected case studies illustrating these points. Suggestions for this Annex material are also welcome.

The statement will be finalized during a meeting of the Panel at IIASA 21-23 March and all comments made during the cyber seminar will be brought to the attention of the Panel members. This will provide an important input for the finalization of the document.

-----  
for more information about the GSP, visit the website of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis,  
<http://www.iiasa.ac.at/=20>

Thank you for your attention,

Laura L. Murphy, PhD  
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network  
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>  
Email: [pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org](mailto:pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org)

**Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 10:25:31 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: Gene Hammel <[gene@demog.berkeley.edu](mailto:gene@demog.berkeley.edu)>**  
**To: <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Introduction**

I am an anthropologist and demographer, emeritus Professor at the University of California, Berkeley. From 1947-1951 (as a student) I carried out archaeological, ethnographic, and linguistic work in California. In the late 1950s-early 1960s I carried out ethnographic work in Peru and Mexico. Beginning in 1963 I conducted ethnographic work in the Balkans, mainly in Serbia and Montenegro. My interests turned to historical demography, and from the early 1980s my work has focussed on reconstruction of population dynamics through family reconstitution in 18th-20th century Croatia and on population dynamics among different (and often contending) ethnic groups in the former Yugoslavia, especially in Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

I have broader interests in demographic theory as well. It is these that



\* web page: <http://demog.berkeley.edu/~gene> \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 17:01:46 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad bartholomew <[brad\\_bartholomew@yahoo.com](mailto:brad_bartholomew@yahoo.com)>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Immigration**  
**To: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)**

Greetings,

I have read through the amended policy statement and I find that the word 'immigration' is not mentioned. The UN reports I have been reading indicate that immigration, specifically replacement migration, is going to be the key factor in population issues in the 21st century which makes it all the more remarkable that the policy statement makes no mention of it.

There are very serious ethical issues looming concerning immigration and replacement migration.

Under current immigration policies as practised by developed countries in Europe and the new world, migrants are accepted from developing countries if they have money/assets, educational qualifications or work skills which will make them useful to the host country. Applicants who possess none of these attributes are rejected.

In my opinion the developed countries should either deny immigration to everyone or they should let anyone in who wants to come in. By skimming the cream off the top the developed countries ethically speaking are navigating very murky waters where there are serious racist and discriminatory undercurrents.

The TV ad comes to mind "It's the fish that John West reject that makes John West the best."

Some 23 European countries as well as Canada and the US now have a female fertility rate at or below replacement level. In the years to come these countries will be siphoning everyone with money, education or skills out of the developing countries.

In effect they will be seeking to maintain their prosperity at the expense of the developing countries.

How can the developing countries ever expect to advance with this constant leeching of all their privileged and talented people by the developed countries?

This is a matter which fits squarely within the field of the demographers' expertise, and I am suggesting the the GSP is duty bound to raise the issue at Jo'burg.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 18:24:58 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: Gene Hammel <gene@demog.berkeley.edu>**  
**To: brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**cc: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Immigration**

Good point. But note that in the absence of vigorous development efforts in the sending countries, the cream has no milk on which to float. Those who are highly qualified often can find no work in their home countries.  
Gene Hammel

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Prof. E. A. Hammel \*  
\* Department of Demography \*  
\* University of California \*  
\* Berkeley CA 94720-2120 \*  
\* (510) 642-1256, -9800 voice \*  
\* (510) 643-8558 fax \*  
\* e-mail: gene@demog.berkeley.edu \*  
\* web page: <http://demog.berkeley.edu/~gene> \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Date: Sun, 3 Mar 2002 22:32:13 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Immigration**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Gene Hammel states: <I have no particular brief here, but I would ask on what grounds MDCs should open their doors to individuals regardless of their qualifications. Surely they cannot, in their own interest, accommodate all who wish to enter.>

If it's ethically untenable to allow some to immigrate and refuse others, and if it would lead to economic, social and ecological collapse to allow anyone to immigrate who wants to, there remains only one option left. Cease all immigration for everyone. Period.

Just think of the advantages:

- 1) Most developed countries are so multi-cultural now their populations could go into gradual decline and they would still retain a rich ethnic mix.
- 2) With global communications being what they are and continuing to improve it is no longer necessary to have a flow of migrants to guard against isolationism. Whatever occurs in any country will still be world news.
- 3) Tourism, trade, intellectual and even labor exchange between countries can go on as before without permanent migration.
- 4) It's possible with affirmative recycling policy for any country with a declining population to actually increase its overall prosperity by artificially stimulating its real estate market and its rural and construction sectors.
- 5) The developed countries would make more strenuous efforts to raise living standards in developing countries to enable the privileged and talented people in those countries to actually find a fulfilling career in their country of origin. This would occur as a matter of necessity to guard against these people becoming disgruntled and pursuing hostile ideologies.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu, <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>, <Craig.Harris@ssc.msu.edu>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Growth = Prosperity?**  
**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 08:30:18 -0500**

Craig

First you seem to want to talk about the consumption patterns of "unskilled/low skilled, low income immigrants".

The whole point about immigration is to become 'economic Americans' and that includes consumption patterns.

The essence of the immigrant experience in America is that the ones that start "low income" do not stay that way for long. NOTE: there are many, many whose successful entry into the country has been due to their HIGH SKILL level and they move to American consumption levels even faster.

Meanwhile the fertility behaviour of immigrants from 'high birth rate countries' takes at least a generation to come down to current resident American levels.

Peter Salonius

**From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] on another subject (item 5 in statement)**  
**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 09:15:56 -0600**

Dear Pernseminar subscribers,

I am glad to see the lively discussion recently (on immigration/international migration), but I suspect many of the creative proposals are not politically feasible, and the point of the Statement is to highlight feasible implications of social science research into population/development/environment as they relate to the Earth Summit 2002. I'd like to solicit comments from participants on another subject that might be of interest to wider audience...

The authors of the GSP specifically ask for suggestions on point, which remains blank at this point: (5) Interdisciplinary training and research



on links between population, development and the environment must be strengthened . What would this training look like, where would it take place, and who would be involved? What specific points should be mentioned in this Statement (to be presented to a wide-ranging audience at Earth Summit from different sectors of society) that could enhance the field and contribute to knowledge?

For a start, in terms of formal education/training (setting aside public awareness and basic education altogether), we must begin with secondary school and undergraduate education (if not earlier, but definitely before graduate studies) to promote interest and foundational skills in both the social and environmental sciences. This will help build a future cadre of researchers (and research funders and policy-makers) who can truly integrate across disciplines. We also have to develop more international and interdisciplinary graduate programs, create employment (research and teaching positions) that value this training, and journals that publish their work --of which there is a growing number.

Thank for your attention.

Laura Murphy, PhD  
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network  
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>  
Email: [pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org](mailto:pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org)

Clinical Assistant Professor  
Department of International Health & Development, School of Public =  
Health and Tropical Medicine=20  
and Stone Center for Latin American Studies  
Tulane University

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <[psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca](mailto:psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca)>**  
**To: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu), <[murphyll@bellsouth.net](mailto:murphyll@bellsouth.net)>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Interdisciplinary training**  
**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 13:25:23 -0500**

The kind of "interdisciplinary training and research on links between population, development and the environment" is now taking shape in courses called ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS.

The training of students who can truly integrate between disciplines is much more expensive than the predominantly rote learning that still exists in primary and secondary schools, which is where the foundation in fostering investigative thinking must start before students become locked into an educational model that rewards memorization as opposed to thinking.

Expensive field trips into complex natural settings in order to give students an appreciation for the processes in self managing (non human ecosystems) would require a shift in the priorities of society that seeks to train technologists.

The style of examinations, requiring essay-type compositions that integrate aspects of the course as opposed to short-answer tests (that do not even require sentence construction) would require smaller class size and much more unstructured discussion in preparation for such testing. Furthermore the marking of such essay-type questions would be much more time consuming than the present simple answering. And still further (this especially applies to the lower grades), the type of curious, motivated and engaged student that would be encouraged to develop his or her full potential in such an educational setting.....would be much less easy to CONTROL than the students that we now encourage to pay attention, and not ask probing questions so the course outline can be completed as expeditiously as possible.

Presently, the major thrust of U.S. and Canadian federal, state and provincial governments appears to be to offer tax cuts to make the economy grow as fast as possible and to incarcerate the failures from the educational system who have not found motivation there and who have who developed antisocial law-breaking behaviours instead.

Until the high priests of GROWTH-AT-ANY-COST economic fundamentalism and their policy making and politician disciples are educated about the limits of the real world biosphere to accomodate open-ended expansionism, then the prospects for a shift in the educational system are rather dim.

Peter Salonijs

SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION  
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

**From: "Harris, Craig" <Craig.Harris@ssc.msu.edu>**  
**To: "'Salonijs, Peter'" <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>, <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Growth = Prosperity?**  
**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 15:52:54 -0500**

peter,

in your response to me you state two claims . . .

(1) unskilled/low skilled, low income immigrants quickly move to consumption patterns which have large, negative consequences for the environment . . .

(2) the fertility behaviour of immigrants from 'high birth rate countries' takes at least a generation to come down to the levels of u.s. native born persons . . .

what data would you offer in support of those two claims . . .

cheers,

craig

craig k harris  
department of sociology  
center for integrated plant systems  
national food safety and toxicology center  
institute for food and agricultural standards  
michigan state university  
429b berkey hall  
east lansing michigan 48824-1111  
tel: 517-355-5048  
fax: 517-432-2856

**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 16:26:18 -0500 (EST)**  
**From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand**

(This message is posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand)

I have just read with interest the revised draft science policy statement (26 Feb. 2002). I did not follow the earlier cyberseminar that led to that draft, so I apologize in advance if my comments below return to topics that have already been thoroughly discussed. <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

At present, the draft focuses heavily on empowerment issues enabling people (especially the most vulnerable) to better lead the lives they want being both a key goal of development and also an effective means for bringing about a viable long-term population-development-environment balance. I wholeheartedly agree with the importance of empowerment, but think the

arguments are overly simple in some aspects, especially with regard to how the human population (behaviors, growth) affects the environment. Empowering individuals and families is clearly of great value to their coping with the difficulties engendered by a changing physical environment. Empowerment does not, however, mean that people's behaviors will be ideal with respect to the environment and human-environment interactions, unless perhaps if people perceive, and fully benefit from / pay the full costs of their actions there are no externalities. Americans are highly empowered and buy an inordinate amount of SUVs that pollute the environment; arguably the right pareto optimal level of SUVs would come about only if they paid fully for all the costs of their actions the full costs related to global warming, climate change, etc. The economist would say that the solution is to resolve these externality problems and end the tragedy of the commons. That, however, may prove to be extraordinarily difficult and time-consuming to do witness the failure to resolve in time the overfishing crisis in the North Atlantic, which was child's play compared to looming problems of global air pollution. Limiting population growth is one way to give us more time and increase our options for the future.

In my mind, one topic is extremely important and is largely missing from the draft: the degree of uncertainty of many aspects of the long-term population & environment relationship and what this entails.

With regard to population growth, there is clearly a trend towards lower fertility in almost all low-income countries, and below-replacement fertility remains the norm in the developed world. That said, I don't think that we can necessarily conclude that long-term population growth beyond momentum is no longer an issue. Fertility in the US seems to be rising, approaching the replacement level, and it seems likely that many governments will eventually take much stronger actions to promote higher fertility in MDCs. Fertility levels remain high in Africa and South Asia, and it is possible that durable cultural or institutional differences may keep fertility levels there from falling rapidly to the replacement level. (These types of factors were important in historical Europe fertility fell in France long before economic development had reached the level that one might assume to be required. The fertility transition in historical Europe and also in many parts of the developing world too seems to have been heavily influenced by ethno-linguistic factors.)

Population momentum is the key determinant of population growth over the

next 50 years (cf. the studies by Bongaarts and his colleagues). According to the 1998 UN projections (the long-range UN 2000 projections are not available yet), the world population is projected to grow to 8.9 billion by the year 2050 (medium scenario), plus or minus about 16% for the quite plausible low-medium and high-medium scenarios (a range of about 3 billion people). By the year 2100, the low-medium is becomes 33% below the medium and the high-medium is 42% above it; the range of plausible population sizes is then over 7 billion people. The farther out into the future one goes, the greater the scale of differences in projected plausible population sizes by 2150 the difference between these scenarios grows to nearly 11 billion. Thus, while current evidence points towards a relatively rapid end to population growth, it cannot be taken for granted -- the level of uncertainty in population growth into the future remains quite large. A key issue here is that, in the words of Sam Preston "today's births are tomorrow's momentum" if we really want to make sure that we do not end up with high-medium population growth, then it is important to act now.

With respect to some of the most important aspects of the environment the pace of climate change, for example the level of uncertainty is still much greater. The consequences of climate change to the human quality of life are potentially enormous, and that should push us towards a very risk-averse approach to managing factors that affect the environment. However, in the political arena uncertainty is often a way to justify postponing actions to conserve the environment serious gas taxes, zoning regulations or increasing substantially the support for actions to limit population growth (children's education, family planning clinics, etc.). And all this is further complicated by issues of national and international equity (MDCs vs LDCs vs). As a result, while the importance of the topic should bring about a high level of activities to protect the environment, the diversity of governments, cultures, and interest groups along with the political effects of uncertainty, push instead in the direction of minimal protection and postponement of action. And this is very worrisome.

To reiterate: there is a great deal of uncertainty with regard to some key aspects of environmental change and a fair amount of uncertainty with regard to long-term human population growth. Given the long-term nature of much of this change change a large amount of inertia both in population growth via the age structure and in environmental change via the cumulative effects of some types of change, entrenched life-styles, existing infrastructures (dispersed poorly insulated housing, road networks...),

etc. it is important to act rapidly to limit the likelihood of dramatic environmental degradation in the future. And yet this same uncertainty, in the political sphere, tends to lead to real delays in taking these actions.

Hope these comments are of value to the debate.

Cheers.

Tom

---

Thomas LeGrand  
Professeur agrg / Associate Professor  
Dpartement de dmographie  
Universit de Montral  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville  
Montral Qc H3C 3J7 CANADA  
Tel: (1-514) 343-7262; fax: 343-2309

**Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 17:20:56 -0500**  
**From: Armindo Miranda <mirandaa@un.org>**  
**To: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand**

I would like to inform Dr. LeGrand (and all other interested parties) that the 2000 Revision of the United Nations Population Division's projections (World Population Prospects) -- are indeed available and can now be accessed online through the Population Division website <http://www.unpopulation.org> or directly from the World Population prospects database <http://esa.un.org/unpp/>

Armindo Miranda  
Interregional Adviser  
United Nations Population Division  
Room DC2-1904  
United Nations, NY 10017  
USA  
Tel. +1-212-963-4532 Fax: +1-212-963-2147

**Date: Mon, 04 Mar 2002 18:05:42 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand**

Dr. LeGrand makes some valid points, but perhaps expands a bit beyond the scope of the Global Science Policy Statements(GSP) purpose. Externalities (mentioned by others as well) and wasteful behavior occur in proportion to of the number of people with the opportunity to effect the relevant behavior. The empowerment discussed (as I read it) relates primarily to the ability to choose whether or not to become pregnant, as well as to persue education/training or a career. It was primarily addressed to the billions currently living in LDCs, many in patriarchal societies. The overconsumption by many in the wealthy nations will be thoroughly covered by many other statements (usually totally ignoring population).

- >Empowerment does not, however, mean that
- >people's behaviors will be ideal with respect to
- >the environment and human-environment interactions,...
- >

People's behavior will never be ideal, in my opinion, unless we all mutatae to some unknown fully cooperative species. What seems to be the case is that womens empowerment leads to lower fertility (among other benefits). Given the pressures of overpopulation and the role of GSP, I agree with the prominence it has in the draft.

- > Limiting population growth is one way to
- >give us more time and increase our options for the future.
- >

Yes. I fully agree. Regarding the "uncertainty" Dr. LeGrand discusses, that is the nature of Future Studies and social science in general. Perhaps one qualifying sentence could be placed in the introduction mentioning this; but we seem to have agreed (from last seminar) that human health and well-being now and in future cannot be improved and likely will be impeded by increased densities and overall population levels. Details needlessly complicate and LENGTHEN what should be a brief, clear communication of this message.

- >it is important to act rapidly to limit the likelihood of dramatic
- >environmental degradation in the future. And yet this same
- >uncertainty, in the political sphere, tends to lead to real delays in
- >taking these actions.
- >

- >Hope these comments are of value to the debate.
- >

Yes, these comments are extremely valid. It is my opinion, though, that

after 3 pages, people often stop reading. There can be addendums with references, but a brief statement is my preference.

Sincerely,

Steven Kurtz  
Ottawa

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpco/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility**  
**Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 09:59:47 -0500**

Yesterday Laura Murphy suggested to Pernreminar subscribers (as concerns the active on-line discussion about immigration/international migration, since March 1) that she suspects "many of the creative proposals are not politically feasible".

One of the "creative proposals" was to call a moratorium on immigration.

The narrowing distance that such a proposal is from the main stream (and how seious this issue is becoming in the United States) can be assesed by reading the news (below) about Congressman Tancredo's proposal for an immigration moratorium.

If the Earth Summit 2002 in Johannesburg does not deal with this (massive immigration to countries like Canada and the United States, which have the the highest per capita energy use and pollution production on the planet), then the meeting will have served to have discussed only long-term remedies such as (5) Interdisciplinary training and research on links between population, development and the environment, while problems with immediate legislative solutions (such as reversing pro growth policies for massive immigration) are left undiscussed for fear of offending the federal governments of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Earth Summit 2002 should seek solutions and not confine itself to academic symposia that avoid political realities. Few of the delegates will run for election after September, 2002 and it is to be hoped that not many of them



rely on the fundamentalist high priest economists of the GROWTH-AT-ANY-COST religion for their operating funds.

Peter Saloni

SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION

<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

-----  
> February 26, 2002

>

>

CONGRATULATIONS

>

>

> CCN congratulates grassroots activists from all over the USA who came to  
> Washington, D.C. earlier this month and circulated CCN's e-mail containing  
> Congressman Tancredo's moratorium and other proposals around the capital.  
> As one activist leader said in his e-mail to CCN:

>

> "I just returned from Washington, where we had 25 activists from over a  
> dozen states lobbying Congress in favor of joining the Immigration Caucus  
> and support for Tom Tancredo's immigration reform program.

>

> We circulated the CCN e-mail on Tancredo and the Caucus, which at last  
> count has 60 members and we expect that to climb to at least 65 when  
> Congress returns after President's Day recess. I hope other grassroots  
> groups will travel to WDC and support immigration reform while the  
> "window of opportunity" still exists!..."

>

> As Congressman Tancredo himself said:

>

> "...you have to talk about a moratorium. You can't talk about anything  
> short of a moratorium because, frankly, anything less will never get you  
> one step closer to stabilization."

>

> Are your members of Congress and the organizations you support pushing  
> hard for a moratorium? If not, NOW is the time to encourage them to get  
> behind a moratorium. If they do not support us, why should we support them?

>

> CCN encourages more grassroots efforts like this one. As another activist  
> told us:

>

> "I thank you for your message and I totally agree with your moratorium on  
> legal immigration.... ..in Southern California...the freeways are so  
> congested that most of the day it is quite difficult to get around and it

- > will get worse.... Can you suggest some other ways to eliminate (or at
- > least slow down) this insane population growth here?"
- >
- > Yes, CCN responds, we can. Over 92% of California's population growth, for
- > example, in the last decade has been caused by mass immigration. Stopping
- > that flow would do much to relieve further congestion. We have four
- > specific suggestions:
- >
- > 1) CCN encourages everyone to push your members of Congress to enact HR
- > 2712 with an amendment for a moratorium on all immigration in excess of
- > 100,000 a year so that we can actually achieve immigration reduction.
- >
- > 2) Get your local City Council or civic organizations to pass the ASAP
- > Moratorium Resolution which is very similar to the one which served as the
- > basis for the passage of the Colorado Resolutions previously. Visit
- > [www.carryingcapacity.org](http://www.carryingcapacity.org) to find out how to get a resolution campaign
- > started.
- >
- > 3) Help build our grassroots support to overcome the special interests.
- > Click [here](#) to give Gift Memberships.
- >
- > 4) Support CCN in our efforts to achieve a moratorium. Click [here](#) to help.

**From: "Vanwey, Leah" <[lvanwey@indiana.edu](mailto:lvanwey@indiana.edu)>**  
**To: <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility**  
**Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 11:52:51 -0500**

Perhaps we can combine some of the separate discussion threads into one recommendation for the GSP. Leaving aside the issue of the political feasibility of an immediate moratorium on immigration to the more developed countries, it is not entirely clear to me that this is a scientifically supportable recommendation. It is likely that an immediate moratorium on immigration to MDCs would lead to a stronger focus on population control in the developing world, by taking away the safety valve of emigration. However, it is also likely to lead to much less desirable outcomes. For example, lessened emigration opportunities will, all else equal, lead to a relatively higher ratio of workers to jobs. In countries where the economy is not growing fast enough or creating enough desirable jobs to incorporate these workers (one of the main reasons why there is emigration from these countries under the current policy regime), this is likely to lead to declining standards of living and political unrest. Some of the very factors that are often

implicated in internal migration to sensitive environments (and the subsequent degradation of these areas), and in the inefficient use of resources leading to pollution, etc. In short, the implications of zero international migration are complex and I don't find that we have enough evidence to predict the outcome of such a public policy.

My recommendation then is to combine our political and scientific concerns about international migration to the developed world with recommendations for future research and training. If the section on future interdisciplinary research and training is structured around certain key unresolved issues that have immediate policy relevance (international migration among them), we achieve two goals. We ask for more support (monetary or otherwise), but with a clear purpose and a clear plan for producing policy-relevant research. We bring these issues up for debate as future policies (and in that way participate in the creation of the political rhetoric surrounding this issue), without making arguments beyond scientific evidence.

Leah K. VanWey  
Assistant Professor of Sociology  
Indiana University  
1020 E. Kirkwood Ave.  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
phone: (812)855-7432  
fax: (812) 855-0781  
email: lvanwey@indiana.edu  
URL: <http://php.indiana.edu/~lvanwey/>

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>, <lvanwey@indiana.edu>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic**  
**Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 14:19:43 -0500**

Leah Vanwey has given us an excellent series of reasons why continued massive immigration to more developed countries is dangerous for the whole planet.

Prof. Vanwey states that lessened "immigration to MDCs would lead to a stronger focus on population control in the developing world, by taking away the safety valve of emigration."

\*\*Exactly so, and this would be an excellent result. The problems of many developing countries are directly traceable to the production of more humanity than can be supported by the carrying capacity of the land. If

there is a "safety valve" then there is less of an impetus to develop responsible population policies, because the problem excess migrates.

Prof. Vanwey says that "lessened emigration opportunities will, all else equal, lead to a relatively higher ratio of workers to jobs."

\*\* Exactly so, and the birth rate would slowly decrease to match the lower (overall) per capita income, all else equal, that would result from the real employment picture, absent the artificial subsidy of being able to export the results of reproductive irresponsibility. **NEGATIVE FEEDBACK WORKS IN BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS!**

Prof. Vanwey suggests that "in countries where the economy is not growing fast enough.....[curtailed emigration] is likely to lead to declining standards of living and political unrest."

\*\*Exactly so. Prof. Vanwey, and others in academia, believe that economies SOMEWHERE will continue to grow for ever so as to accomodate human reluctance to face the resource, space and other LIMITS of an earth which is not physically expanding. Prof. Vanwey's current choice for absorbing the overflow from excess reproduction is the (supposedly underpopulated) developed countries. As Albert Bartlett has said "CAN YOU THINK OF ANY PROBLEM IN ANY AREA OF ENDEVOR ON ANY SCALE, FROM MICROSCOPIC TO GLOBAL, WHOSE LONG-TERM SOLUTION IS IN ANY DEMONSTRABLE WAY AIDED, ASSISTED, OR ADVANCED BY FURTHER INCREASES IN POPULATION, LOCALLY, NATIONALLY OR GLOBALLY?"

Prof. Vanwey implicates the lack of an emigration safety valve in "the inefficient use of resources leading to pollution, etc."

\*\*I trust Prof. Vanwey will do the calculations based on the lifestyle that the massive influx of immigrants to developed countries quickly adopts upon arrival.

The most inefficient "use of resources" is in developed countries which are, from a resource utilization and pollution standpoint, effectively MUCH MORE OVERPOPULATED than LDCs. Consider the tiny numbers of people north of the Mexican border, who account for only 5% of the planetary population, but who use 25% of world resources and contribute a similarly disproportionate share to cumulative global pollution.

International migration (Prof. Vanwey's urge to put off legislative resolutions notwithstanding) does "have immediate policy relevance" and it is most certainly NOT one of the "certain key unresolved issues" that requires "FUTURE INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND TRAINING."

\*\*Scholars.... who have studied the relationship of resources to population growth in the absence of viable predator controls (and we have no predators)

...have consistently found numbers of individuals to overshoot the carrying capacity of their habitat and then CRASH.

These biological systems were populated with organisms that could not foresee their future demise and so could not plan to avoid it.

WHAT IS THE EXCUSE OF HUMANKIND FOR A SIMILAR LACK OF FORESIGHT?

Peter Salonijs

SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION

<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

**From: "Alex de Sherbinin" <[adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**

**To: "Salonijs, Peter" <[psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca](mailto:psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca)>, <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**

**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic**

**Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 15:32:59 -0500**

Mr. Salonijs' suggestion that immigration control will lead to reductions in fertility are grounded in over-simplified assumptions about the transferability of findings from the natural sciences to human populations. Negative feedback may work in biological systems, but humans are not gophers.

The world is messy and complex; strict immigration control is unlikely to have the impacts that Mr. Salonijs predicts, either in the sending countries or the receiving countries. For the latter, the issue of consumption pressures cannot be reduced to a simple IPAT equation in which the number of people living in industrialized countries somehow determines overall environmental impacts. Research shows that consumption varies significantly by income level, and though I don't have the data in front of me, I would guess that most recent immigrants are in the bottom quintile of income distribution.

Furthermore, I seriously doubt that any legislative effort would do more than to create a second-class citizenry of immigrants (henceforth branded "illegal") seeking a better life, but denied access to opportunities such as adequate employment, health care or services. While I am not necessarily an advocate of open borders, I don't think it is either ethical or realistic to stop migration. It has always been the nature of humans to seek a better life elsewhere, and we can't legislate this away. Having lived and worked in the developing world, I can identify with the desires of young people to receive an education and to work in developed countries. Perhaps the "scientists for population reduction" should ask themselves what they would

do if they were young, ambitious, and facing a situation of extremely limited opportunity.

Nevertheless, I do think the subject of migration and environment warrants more research, both at micro-levels and national-levels. I would also be interested to hear perspectives from developing country participants on these issues.

Regards,  
Alex de Sherbinin  
CIESIN, Columbia University

**From:** "V K" <vfk3@hotmail.com>  
**To:** psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu,  
Ivanwey@indiana.edu  
**Subject:** RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic  
**Date:** Tue, 05 Mar 2002 15:16:38 -0600

I find myself compelled to respond to Peter Salenius' discussion. It is not possible to address the issue of massive migration to MDCs from LDCs without looking at the global economic structures that act as the impetus for these movements – the push factors of poverty and the pull factors of the myth of easy wealth in the more developed world, especially the United States. I take issue with the notion that “the problems of many developing countries are directly traceable to the production of more humanity than can be supported by the carrying capacity of the land.” It seems more reasonable to say that the real problem is not impoverished women having too many babies, but of the inequitable distribution of wealth. This is certainly the case of Guatemala, in which approximately 2% of the population holds the majority of the country's wealth and resources.

Additionally, it is important to keep in mind the human component of all of this: What price are scientists and politicians willing to demand from the generation now being born in the developing world to halt future “excess reproduction”? One must consider, in addition to simple numbers, what impact halting migration between LDCs and MDCs would have for both sides. Specifically, I am thinking about seasonal migrants, such as farm laborers from the US-Mexico border. Who in the US would work in their place – given the conditions, low pay, and extremely poor opportunities for personal advancement – and what would be experienced by Mexican communities which depend on the income generated by this seasonal pattern of emigration and immigration and from which this labor is drawn?

Finally, I think it is important to realize that migration is part of the human condition. Human populations have moved and resettled since pre-history. Perhaps a more beneficial discussion would revolve around ways to address the push factors that compel individuals and families in LDCs to

move and the pull factors of conspicuous over-consumption in MDCs.

Verne Kemerer  
Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant  
Health Resources and Services Administration  
HIV/AIDS Bureau, Office of Science and Epidemiology  
5600 Fishers Lane, room 7-90  
Rockville, MD 20857  
301/443-1120  
VKemerer@hrsa.gov

**Date: Tue, 05 Mar 2002 16:37:07 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] UN still schizoid ?**

Just FYI.

I'm aware of the different positions proffered for years by UNFPA (pop is a serious issue) & UNPD (people first, numbers not that relevant). According to this summary of a Wall St. Journal article of yesterday, we've become irrelevant. Of course, they'd better explain why a 50% increase to an overloaded situation is 'no problem'. Anyone with access to the article, please respond with elaboration.

Steven Kurtz  
Ottawa

-----  
A Wall Street Journal commentary reports that the UN has declared overpopulation a nonissue.

publication date: Mar 04, 2002

"Now, however, the U.N.'s new proposal acknowledges that fertility is falling more rapidly than expected in some big, less developed countries with "intermediate" levels of fertility (2.1 to 5.0). These include India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, Egypt, Bangladesh and the Philippines. (China, at 1.8 is already below replacement level, in part due to coercive family planning policies.) The U.N. concludes that the less developed nations are heading toward a fertility rate of 1.85, down significantly from the 2.1 of earlier projections. This would yield a maximum global population in the 8 billion to 9 billion range."

Editor's note: A subscription required to access this article

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpco/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**From: Duc Hiep <duch@epa.nsw.gov.au>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic**  
**Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 11:03:59 +1100**

Realistically, migration is a fact of life in the global economy. A call for moratorium on migration is not feasible.

Migration between developed countries is in fact much more significant than that between developed and developing countries. Ethically, to stop the brain drain from developing countries, to alleviate poverty and to relieve pressure on environment, it may make more sense for developed countries to take in the poor and "less desirable" people from developing countries rather than the skilled people. To some degrees, the intake of refugees is one step but the current trend is this will be less in the future.

Verne Kemerer suggests "to address the push factors that compel individuals and families in LDCs to move and the pull factors of conspicuous over-consumption in MDCs" is sensible. This leads to governance questions and political stability in LDCs and their relationships with poverty and environment degradation. This is a potential difficult area of politics which should be left to others. My take is that the link between migration and population/environment is a minor factor in the sustainable framework, but I may be wrong.

Dr Hiep Duc  
Atmospheric Scientist  
Environment Science  
EPA, NSW Australia

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 07:28:21 +0530**  
**From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>**  
**To: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**CC: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility**



Is it possible for the respected participants to look at the chapter on international migration in the ICPD document (Cairo Conference), 1994?

Bal Kumar KC

**From:** Freda0867@aol.com  
**Date:** Tue, 5 Mar 2002 21:31:07 EST  
**Subject:** Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic  
**To:** psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca

This is posted by Freda White Ph.D.

Bravo Dr. Saloni! Apropos mainstreaming the overpopulation message and changing behaviours, I was disappointed to find that even WorldWatch Institute policy papers fail to integrate the population issue in comprehensive policy analyses.

In response to a recent policy paper, GROWING AWARENESS, SLUGGISH RESPONSE by Gary Gardner and circulated by WorldWatch Institute <<http://www.worldwatch.org/worldsummit>> in their FROM RIO TO JOHANNESBURG series, I replied...

While Gardner's analysis is admirable in scope and structure, I was disappointed to find that he failed to take on the causal issue: overpopulation. If such fine analysts as Gardner take an ostrich approach to population, then everything else becomes an irrelevant list of woes. I speak from experience. I worked in Mali as part of the Education for All initiative in the nineties. Mali, at that time, had one of the lowest primary school enrolment rates in the world, about 18%, much less for girls. Five years later...with millions invested, enrolment rates had more than doubled...but a million children, the same number as had been without schooling five years earlier, still remained deprived of a basic education-the cause, population growth.

As long as well meaning people fail to preface all statistics with the population problem, and the need for action now, we are all putting out heads in the sand.

Freda White Ph.D

**From:** "Harris, Craig" <Craig.Harris@ssc.msu.edu>  
**To:** "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>, <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>  
**Cc:** <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility  
**Date:** Tue, 5 Mar 2002 21:39:28 -0500

dr. kumar,

it would be helpful to me if you would provide a url for the chapter, and a summary of what you see as the main points relevant to this discussion . . .

thanks,  
craig harris

craig k harris  
department of sociology  
center for integrated plant systems  
national food safety and toxicology center  
institute for food and agricultural standards  
michigan state university

**Date:** Wed, 06 Mar 2002 11:57:59 +0530  
**From:** Yogesh Gokhale <yogesh@ces.iisc.ernet.in>  
**To:** Alex de Sherbinin <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**CC:** "Salonius, Peter" <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu  
**Subject:** Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic

I am Yogesh Gokhale, graduate student of ecology working on human-nature interactions in India. I am responding to some of the issues brought out by Alex.

Alex de Sherbinin wrote:

- > Mr. Salonius' suggestion that immigration control will lead to reductions in
- > fertility are grounded in over-simplified assumptions about the
- > transferability of findings from the natural sciences to human populations.
- > Negative feedback may work in biological systems, but humans are not
- > gophers.

I feel there is need to understand the sociology along with the biology.

- > Furthermore, I seriously doubt that any legislative effort would do more

> than to create a second-class citizenry of immigrants (henceforth branded  
> "illegal") seeking a better life, but denied access to opportunities such as  
> adequate employment, health care or services.

Denied opportunities is also a serious problem in developing countries. This roots back to the centralised development policies. In India Mumbai (Bombay) has been over saturated with the opportunities. SO no wonder if eople form all parts of the country rush there for opportunities giving rise to lot of other sociological problems due to over crowding.

> Perhaps the "scientists for population reduction" should ask themselves what  
> they would do if they were young, ambitious, and facing a situation of >  
>extremely limited opportunity.

There is another side of this coin as well. The ongoing computer revolution saw hoards of Asian getting invited all over the developed country simply based on the potentials, which was needed in those countries. This computer migration drive was absolutely demand driven. But I do not deny above point of Alex.

regards,  
Yogesh Gokhale,  
CES, IISc. Bangalore

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 07:12:03 -0700**  
**From: earth care <careearth@usa.net>**  
**To: Yogesh Gokhale <yogesh@ces.iisc.ernet.in>,  
Alex de Sherbinin <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic]**  
**CC: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>,  
<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**

I have been following up the discussion on migration with interest and would like to share my thoughts on the same..

Agreed that large-scale migration at all scales - beginning with an entire village relocating itself from dry areas to fertile delta regions to the transboundary migration does place a great strain on the resources of the 'receiver' - yet, is it feasible to identify and restrict populations to landscapes ? How does one define 'who belongs to which place' - documentary proof of residency will work only in those countries where there is a system - how about others. Further, when we, in the current scenario talking about solving other issues such as climate change, conservation of biodiversity etc using a transboundary - or very simply 'joining hands' strategy, how are we justified in identifying one issue (however causal) and declaring a moratorium on that?

As it has been said earlier in the discussion migration is a human condition and there is the other side to it...Great cultures and resources have evolved through migrations and India is indeed a classic example of this.

Best wishes. Jayshree Vencatesan

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 07:43:54 +0530**  
**From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>**  
**To: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand**

Population is measured in numbers but the environmental impact is a surrogate measure of the mass of people. How much of population reduction will lessen how much of environmental deterioration is not known. Also what kind of environment we are talking about, forest, land, water, air etc. I am afraid in such discussions there is always the argument given in favour of either developed or developing countries. Country specific problems are entirely different things.

Bal Kumar KC

Central Department of Population Studies  
Tribhuvan University  
Kathmandu, NEPAL  
Steve Kurtz wrote:

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 09:57:10 +0100**  
**From: "Laboratorio Eudemonia" <eulab@hyperlinker.com>**  
**To: <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility**

Many thanks for writing us.  
May be then you can find some interest in this:

Call to the European Political Forces and Governmental Organizations for the determination of an optimal local demographic density.

Since 30/06/2000 - This is the version 2.3

Kind Madame, kind Sir,

As you certainly know, in the last few months the world's population has reached and exceeded the amount of six billion units, that of India having exceeded one billion. These facts, although they represent a serious demographic issue that should be faced with immediate and extreme care, have not been treated with the necessary attention by the general public. Even the people and groups most socially committed are almost all indifferent to that which contributes heavily to the rise of the most serious social illnesses of our era.

Imagining that you, like us, are also feeling impulses of healthy personal involvement, we permit ourselves to contact you at this point in the hopes that you will want to treat this theme within your Group and in the administrative and politic local Assemblies. Far from being an issue that relates only to places far from our Nations, this demographic problem has, in fact, for some time and in the general unawareness, fully expressed itself also within those Nations, even made worse by heavily industrialized ways of life.

And in effect, observing the average of the European Union, we remember that (according to data of 1997) the population density of the whole territory is of 127 individuals per square kilometer, that means that every European, ideally dividing the territory of our Union, has at his disposal an area of only 0.78 parts of hectare (note 1) from which to get his life needs (note 2) and on which to enjoy his individuality and to express his creative power.

It is rather complex to determine through a scientific method a total optimal inhabiting density or the highest reasonable for a society, and to establish how many individuals a territory can support without degrading itself; however, with the simple comprehensive view we get by living this situation personally, it is easy to understand that we have already for some time exceeded a certain threshold of psychophysic wellbeing and healthiness, and also of sound economic independence, since the European's life, their territory no longer being enough to satisfy the exigencies of a widely excessive population, by now depends much more from other zones of the Earth than from Europe itself.

For these reasons of internal overpopulation, without forgetting the current phenomena of wild immigration onto European ground, deriving from external overpopulation and certainly destined to grow, we think it is right that the international demographic issue should be faced at, and should receive contribution from, various levels. It must be discussed, made clear and decided in a global ambient, with the intervention of overnational and world political forces, being the problem of a planetary burden, but also in a local ambient, at a national, regional and even provincial level, observing both right and duty, as the demographic issue manifests itself also locally and can find also locally effective solutions.

In particular and to begin, it would be more than opportune to start a diligent multidisciplinary study on the demographic situation, in every Region and Nation,

on the effects, not at all positive, that the local overpopulation, not only urban but also rural, produces on the individuals themselves, on the society and the environment. In this way it could be finally possible to attribute a more precise responsibility to many of the problems, still with a vague paternity, that worry us today, and to present them the solutions they are waiting for. In the same time it would be extremely auspicious to make clear in what measure we are real children of our land and in what other we are instead dependent on far zones of the world, in order to try to re-establish, with time, a sound equilibrium between these two economic modalities (note 3).

>From this study immediately it would emerge that our present demographic density has already reached and exceeded evident danger signals and that a further growth of the local population (whether for endogenous motives: restarting of local birth-rate, or exogenous: for immigration) would ulteriorly and terribly overburden our already precarious situation. In this case, even if it is late, this same study should then determine an optimal number, for our epoch and from the point of view of the individual, the society, and the environment, of inhabitants per Nation and for the whole European Union, that can serve as a point of referral for all our errands of present management and plans of future development (note 4).

Also aware of the numerous implications that such an initiative would involve, we believe that the local and planetary situations demand an immediate and intense engagement in this direction. We believe also that this engagement of self-discipline not only would secure a serene future to our Nations, but would also furnish an important point of reference both to the less developed Countries, generally affected by exponential growth of population, and to the other more developed, generally affected, like we are, by hyperurbanization, both being still immersed in the torpor, distracted and undecided on which direction to take.

For all this, we hope that the demographic issue will rise powerfully to the attention of our consciences and soon become theme of wide local debate, and similarly we hope the study here augured will soon become concrete reality (note 5).

Kind Madame, kind Sir, thanking you deeply for your courteous attention, and auguring ourselves that this initiative of ours, though modest, has met with you some degree of consensus, we extend to you our best wishes.

The researchers of the  
Laboratorio Eudemonia

NOTES

1) For a brief comparison, and starting with our Country: an Italian (national average) has at his disposal only 0.52 parts of hectare, an area much smaller than everyone would wish to, and be opportune to, have at his disposal. In this heavy, sad situation Italy finds inside the European Union crowded companions in Germany (235 inhabitants per square Km - 0.42 hectares per person), in England (243 inhabitants per square Km - 0.41 hectares per person), in Belgium (310 inhabitants per square Km - 0.32 hectares per person), and in Holland (457 inhabitants per square Km - 0.21 hectares per person). The European average is: 127 inhabitants per square Km, equal to 0.78 hectares per person; the world average is: 44 inhabitants per square Km. equal to 2.27 hectares per person (but mind that in this count are considered also deserts and ice-caps, otherwise the area per person goes down further: about 1.3 hectares).

Inside the planetary situation, there are cases as those of the United States in which every one has at his disposal still an area of 3.44 hectares of national territory, and Australia, where every one can enjoy 50 hectares (and we hope they will be able to preserve them); but there are also case of atavic carelessness as those of India, where every one has 0.31 parts of hectare, and of Bangladesh, where a human being has only 0.10 parts of hectare, the which gives light of greater clearness to many tragical facts we see in the daily chronicles told by the media.

2) Some researchers of the University of British Columbia, in Canada, have determined, even though with a large approximation, the ecological footprint that an individual, based on the style of life he leads, leaves on the territory. And so, through a special calculator available on the Internet, it is possible to derive that for the middle european individual needs of food, lodging, transports, consumer goods, services and what other he uses to live, it is necessary an area between 6 and 7 hectares. Even though certainly the measure is rough, we cannot not keep it well in mind in the important decisional processes relating our Region and Nations. Measure your own ecological footprint going to:

<http://www.lead.org/leadnet/footprint/intro.htm>

3) Both an economy that expresses itself locally and one that expresses itself globally have both values and faults. Here is not the place to face this argument, but we would however remember that a local economy makes the society that practices it more solid but gives it a scarce innovation; an economy that bases itself on exchanges with distant countries certainly enriches but at the same time creates instability and dependence from outside. The climate of continuous emergence and of insane economic chase we are living today derives in great part just from the lack of balance born from having given too much space to the global economy taking it away to the local one. A re-equilibrium of these two components is the wisest choice to which one could today dedicate himself in the economic field.

4) With regard to our future development, we permit ourselves to remember that today, in times of science and no longer of brute force, this development is favoured in an enormously greater way by a qualitative growth of people, then by their intellectual maturity and preparation, that not by a simple quantitative growth of population. More than favouring this last, then, we need to cultivate and organize as best we can the existing population: so doing, people that today may even be a burden for the society and are abandoned will tomorrow become able to accomplish authentic prodigies and to be a positive guide for others. Consider, moreover, that after such a great exterior, material development like that reached by our society, a natural organizational evolution, a real interior development, must necessarily be added now, otherwise the former not supported by the latter would fall down very soon on itself.

5) After about two months since the first drawing up of this call, we received an excellent study entitled "Optimum Population for Europe" made by David Willey, chairman of Optimum Population Trust and presented at the International Workshop on Population and Environment in Rome, 1996. Setting about the enterprise of the determination of an optimal local demographic density, this more general study will be a great help. This study is available asking for it at: [inlingua.opt@dial.pipex.com](mailto:inlingua.opt@dial.pipex.com) or at Mr. David Willey, OPT, 12 Meadowgate, Urmston, Manchester M41 9LB, England. Please, on the same theme, refer also to the work of the European Pherology Organisations Confederation (EPOC) applying to The Pherologist P.O. Box 137 NL-8300 AC Emmerloord - Netherlands.

Concede us this one last note. In case the study would confirm what we are here hypothesizing (that our territories already support too much humanity) we must engage ourselves even more, or begin very eagerly, to contribute in making better the conditions of life in those Countries whose inhabitants would have wished to move next to us. Maybe, just intensifying, or sending for the first time, temporaneous invitations to some of them in order to freely furnish them the knowledge that we have, that could help their Community to reach a full self-sufficiency.

At the same time, to avoid that our dutiful respect for an ideal demographic density could even in the least thwart the positive process of universalization of cultures and union of peoples that is already in act, we should promote even more cultural exchanges of excellent quality (mostly telematic, being immensely more effective than the simple transport of organic matter activated by conventional tourism) with all the Countries in the World.

-----  
DEPARTMENT FOR THE DEMOGRAPHIC ISSUE  
of the LABORATORIO E U D E M O N I A  
----- <http://spg.hyperlinker.com>



Thanks again for writing us, kind Mr. Saloni, kind all, please, receive our most distinguished greetings.

Danilo D'Antonio

---

LABORATORIO di Ricerca Sociale EUDEMONIA  
Via Fonte Regina, 23 - 64100 Teramo  
tel. 0861 415655 email eulab@hyperlinker.com  
<http://eulab.hyperlinker.com>

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 09:51:32 -0500**  
**From: "Michael Vlassoff" <vlassoff@unfpa.org>**  
**To: "Harris Craig" <Craig.Harris@ssc.msu.edu>**  
**CC: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>,  
<psaloni@nrca.gc.ca>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Political feasibility**

Try [www.unfpa.org](http://www.unfpa.org)

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 10:47:46 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] posted for Dr. Thomas LeGrand**

Greetings Dr. Kumar,

Thanks for your comments. We may not be that far apart in understanding.  
I suspect you missed some nuance in my language:

SK:

> Externalities and wasteful behavior occur in proportion to of the number of people with the opportunity to > effect the relevant behavior.

"The number of people with the opportunity" means that they must be in a particular region at a particular time and have certain needs and capabilities. The "relevant behavior" is the environmentally harmful behavior under consideration. Actually, there is no totally benign human activity, as we displace and disturb habitat for other life forms no matter how simply we live. (see John Logan's paper "Patch Disturbance and the Human Niche" <http://dieoff.org/page78.htm> )

Indeed there are different circumstances around the globe, but where is there an ecological desirability of greater human population density, level or growth? The GSP statement is intended to communicate what population policies are likely the best for the common good over generations.

Re your comment:

>How much of population reduction will lessen  
>how much of environmental deterioration is not known.

>

Obviously if there were far fewer people (*ceteris paribus*) there would be far less environmental damage. See Ecological Footprint analyses which are readily available through a websearch. The precise numbers aren't critical (or indeed possible) for a policy statement.

>I am afraid in such discussions there is always the argument given in favour of either developed or developing countries.

>

This need not be the case if BOTH consumption (level & 'cleanliness') and population are under examination. It is not an either/or situation. The GSP, though, is population focussed.

Cheers,

Steve Kurtz

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpco/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

>Population is measured in numbers but the environmental impact is a surrogate  
>measure of the mass of people. How much of population reduction will lessen  
>how much of environmental deterioration is not known. Also what kind of  
>environment we are talking about, forest, land, water, air etc. I am afraid  
>in such discussions there is always the argument given in favour of either  
>developed or developing countries. Country specific problems are entirely  
>different things.

>

>Bal Kumar KC

**From:** re@popact.org  
**To:** "Michael Vlassoff" <vlassoff@unfpa.org>,  
pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu  
**Subject:** Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] ICPD Programme of Action  
international migration chapter URL  
**Date:** Wed, 6 Mar 2002 10:48:56 -0500

I believe this is the URL that is being requested relative to the 1994 international agreement on population and development (and, intriguingly, on international migration).

<http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/Cairo/program/p10000.html>

The right of each national government to set policies on migration is clearly stated in this chapter. Among the other dominant themes, I believe (it's been a while since I read it) are: 1) respect for human rights and for migration itself as a long-term historical process that the government representatives at Cairo concluded had generally benefitted both sending and receiving countries, 2) the importance of "regularizing" migration, that is, distinguishing between legal and illegal migration and taking reasonable and rights-respecting steps to prevent the latter, and 3) the importance of improving information flow so that would-be migrants are not drawn to change countries out of false expectations. There was little treatment of the question of migration in terms of environmental impacts, an issue that came up again at Cairo Plus Five in New York in 1999 but remained unexplored.

Robert Engelman  
Vice President for Research  
Population Action International  
Washington, DC

**From:** "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>  
**To:** "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>,  
pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu, "Alex de Sherbinin"  
<adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic  
**Date:** Wed, 6 Mar 2002 14:43:23 -0500

Alex de Sherbinin suggests that we should not transfer "the findings from the natural sciences [done on GOPHERS and other animals] to human populations."

de Sherbinin suggests that negative feedback does not work for humans //

the economists should be fascinated by this hypothesis!

Absent our assuming that humans are animals like all the others and being proscribed by Alex de Sherbinin from the use of principles learned from biology.....we have no choice but to expect that human animals are not governed by any of the supply/demand and resource exhaustion factors that govern ALL OTHER ANIMALS so that we will have to run this unprecedented experiment that is the size of the planet.....  
.....to the ultimate test of the limits of the biosphere to find out IF we are governed by natural processes.

The results of the catastrophic collapse in human numbers will not be pretty, if Alex de Sherbinin is found to have been talking through his hat.

By the way, the "moratorium" that de Sherbinin seems to think means the complete "stop [to] migration" in fact concerned (see yesterday's post entitled POLITICAL FEASIBILITY and its trailer CONGRATULATIONS )the proposed enactment of HR 2712 with an ammendment for a moratorium on all immigration IN EXCESS OF 100,000 A YEAR.

Peter Salonius

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu, Ivanwey@indiana.edu, "V K" <vfk3@hotmail.com>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic**  
**Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 15:26:20 -0500**

Verne Kemerer tells us that "migration is part of the human condition". Exactly so. Another phenomenon that was "part of the human condition" (until the temporary era of energy subsidies from fossil fuel began) was widespread famine and chronic starvation as human populations world wide produced cycles wherein their numbers exceeded the carrying capacity of their lands and CRASHED // to be repeated again again.

The advent of agriculture made these cycles much more prevalent // hunter gatherers were much more adept at spacing their children and using infanticide (the only foolproof population control they had access to) to BETTER avoid the vicious cycle of overshoot-starvation-overshoot-starvation.

Albert Bartlett suggests that "Modern agriculture is the use of land to convert petroleum into food." Current world population is entirely unsupportable without the energy subsidy from fossil fuels, and given the fact that nature is not making the stuff any more // it is only a question of time before serious adjustments to human numbers will be made BY PLANNING and DESIGN or by the harsh realities of NATURE.

Given the seriousness of the imminent peak of world petroleum production (see the projections for the next 10 years by American petroleum geologists that are based on international oil company data in:

'THE WORLD PETROLEUM LIFE-CYCLE' at: <http://dieoff.org/page133.htm>

-the adjustment in human number will get started soon whether we like it or not.

Like Alex de Sherbinin, in yesterday's posting, Verne Kemerer apparently did not read far enough into my 'MIGRATION MAGIC' post to discover that the Carrying Capacity Network (CONGRATULATIONS, February 26, 2002) was not calling for "halting immigration".

To reiterate, "CCN encourages everone to push your members of Congress to enact HR 2712 with an ammendment for a moratorium on immigration IN EXCESS OF 100,000 A YEAR."

Peter Salenius

**Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 17:01:46 -0500**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**From: Annababette Wils <awils@world.std.com>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] How to argue that population should be part of sustainable development**

My name is Annababette Wils, I am one of the coordinators of PERN, and am entering the discussion outside of my official role as co-monitor.

I would like to start a new discussion thread that has more to do directly with how the GSP statement is going to influence the documents that come out of Jo'burg 2002.

The goal of the GSP Statement is to prepare a scientific assessment about the role of population in sustainable development strategies, aiming at

producing a substantive statement for the Johannesburg 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development -- presumably to influence the agenda and documents. The present statement is an admirable documentation of important population processes and I deeply admire the scholarship and understanding that went into it. Unfortunately, as it is written it misses the underlying goal of influencing the agenda or documents that come out of Johannesburg.

The latest agenda and documents for Johannesburg (available at [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)) discuss sustainable development with almost complete disregard for population and education. The Statement however, fails to argue forcefully why they ought to be.

The present Jo'burg goals for sustainable development are:

Reduce Poverty

Reduce Unustainable Consumption and Production

Increase Good Management of Natural resources

Improve globalization to reduce inequalities.

The Jo'burg papers then give a long list of means to achieve these goals, which include (in broad terms) technology transfer and innovation, financial incentives, implementation of existing treaties, improving the WTO, and the poor's access to resources such as water, land, housing, technology. Population growth, fertility reduction, and even universal education (!) are glaringly absent from the documents.

What does the GSP paper want to achieve in this forum? Does it want to add to the goals or add to the means of achieving the goals?

If it wants to add to the means of achieving the goals, but agrees with the goals themselves, then why not make that bridge to Johannesburg, and state -- here are the goals of the Summit that we address in this paper -- Reduce Poverty, Reduce Unsustainable consumption and production, etc. Then state, these goals can be better achieved if we address population/people issues.

Then, the first section should argue why population growth, or population aging are detrimental to achieving those goals (both population growth and rapid aging cause an enormous stress on economic resources, which takes away from ability to manage natural resource degradation, educate the public on how to change consumption, removes political arm-room to implement environmental treaties. Rapid population growth also makes it more difficult to reduce poverty). I am afraid that the section now, just makes a case for a particular way of looking at population change, but does nothing to argue why population should be on the Jo'burg agenda.

Section 4, (terrific start!) on education and lowering fertility would be

enhanced to make the case more strongly that universal education and lower fertility are extremely powerful leverages to achieve the first and most important goal of reducing poverty (recent work I am doing for Bob Kates and the SUST group has left me even more convinced of this point regarding education). Lower fertility also improves child health, and there is a large unmet need in the world to reduce fertility. The supplementary material could provide the empirical evidence.

In section 3) on vulnerability, the case should be made why vulnerability is a better, more inclusive term than poverty. The GSP says vulnerability must be reduced, Jo'burg says poverty. I find the two groups are basically in agreement on the goal. What we have here is an argument over definition or perhaps even just semantics: should we talk about poverty or vulnerability? Is vulnerability so much more powerful that it is worth making the effort to change the world's vocabulary? It might be, but I do not see the argument in the paper yet.

(I would follow the intro with section 4, since it is the most powerful, and then the section on population growth, and leave out vulnerability, or address it last).

Regards,

Annababette Wils, Ph.D.  
PERN Coordinator  
Visiting Scholar  
Tellus Institute  
11 Arlington St.]  
Boston, MA., 02110

**Date: Thu, 07 Mar 2002 07:55:30 +0530**  
**From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>**  
**To: Annababette Wils <awils@world.std.com>**  
**CC: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] How to argue that population should be part of sustainable development**

Dear all,

Still in my opinion, very little or no progress can be achieved if we do not accept the very basic principle that males and females are born equal and that they have equal human rights. To me this a precondition for sustainable development. How females are discriminated against in terms of employment, wages, property rights and so on almost globally is detrimental to sustained economic growth and sustainable development.

Mere empowerment on the paper is not enough. We have to be equal partners to reduce either population growth rates or achieve sustainable development socially, culturally and economically.

Bal Kumar KC

**Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 19:20:06 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Migration magic**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Greetings,

Attached to this email is a statement by the Australian Dept of Health concerning the recruitment of overseas trained doctors to work in outback rural areas where there is a shortage of doctors.

Basically the issue is that the Australian govt normally won't recognize the qualifications of doctors from developing countries. However if doctors from these countries are prepared to work in rural Australia they will fast-track their immigration application.

The Australian govt is actually enticing doctors with inferior qualifications out of countries like India, Pakistan and Africa to give rural Australians better medical services. Thus exacerbating the critical shortages of health care services in these developing countries.

No doubt most of you will say that these doctors have the right to come to Australia to seek a better life. Personally I regard these practices as reprehensible. This is so typical of the elitist attitude that permeates the immigration policies of developed countries.

Kind regards,  
Brad bartholomew

**STATE AND TERRITORY SCHEMES TO RECRUIT OVERSEAS  
TRAINED DOCTORS TO RURAL AREAS**

The Commonwealth is acutely aware of the difficulties



that many rural communities experience in attracting doctors on a long-term basis. It is for this reason that in 1999 the Minister for Health and Aged Care, offered to help States and Territories streamline processes for recruiting overseas trained doctors to work in rural areas. All States and the Northern Territory expressed interest in developing initiatives to address the rural medical workforce shortages on a permanent basis.

The Government is committed to ensuring that the growth, distribution and standard of the medical workforce are appropriate to the needs of the Australian community. Data from the Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee demonstrates that there is nationally an oversupply of general practitioners (GPs) in metropolitan areas and a shortage in rural areas. The Government's aim is to reduce the growth in the general practice workforce and to encourage both new and existing GPs to relocate to rural areas through a variety of incentive programs.

The Australian Health Ministers' Conference adopted a national framework to facilitate the recruitment of overseas-trained doctors to work in rural areas on 4 August 1999. This allows overseas-trained doctors with general practice qualifications, who seek or possess permanent residency, to be assessed by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP) as an alternative to their undertaking Australian Medical Council (AMC) examinations. Doctors going through this process are conditionally registered to work in rural areas for a period of 5 years.

The State recruitment schemes aim to attract general practitioners who do not require training or supervision whilst undertaking placements in rural and remote areas. Each State scheme is specifically aimed at those rural and remote areas in most need. The Commonwealth assists by providing streamlined immigration processes and Medicare access to help fill positions in those areas which otherwise face great difficulties in attracting doctors.

The two main incentives for eligible overseas-trained doctors who complete the five years in approved

districts of workforce shortage and obtain the FRACGP are:

1. Streamlined immigration procedures; and
2. Reduction in the 10-year moratorium on provider numbers under section 19AB of the Health Insurance Act 1973.

**From: Freda0867@aol.com**  
**Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 02:43:38 EST**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] How to argue that population should be part of sustainable development**  
**To: awils@world.std.com, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Dear Susanne,

At the risk of 'stuffing' your mail box, I am forwarding this PERN contribution. It seems that WorldWatch is not alone in completely missing the boat on the importance of the population issue, as below Ms. Wills states:

> The latest agenda and documents for Johannesburg (available at >[www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)) discuss sustainable development with almost complete disregard for population and education.

Here is the full text as population scientists grapple with how to present a statement which influences how we go about achieving sustainable development goals...rather than just saying what has happened and what needs to be done. Again, I hope that WorldWatch can move beyond goal statements to stressing the importance of immediate action on population policies...and of primary education for all girls.

Kind regards,  
F. White Ph.D.

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Cc: <Virginia.Abernethy@mcmail.vanderbilt.edu>**  
**Subject: FW: FW: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] More on migration magic**  
**Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 10:18:43 -0500**

The following treatise on 'The Immigration Safety Valve' should be part of the record of this cyberseminar.

Dr. Abernethy's piece gives support to the notion that **NEGATIVE FEEDBACK WORKS IN ALL BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS**. Where predator pressure does not control increasing numbers (as is the case for human populations) resource scarcity or abundance appears to drive either decreased or increased (repectively) reproduction rates.

Contrary to the advice of Alex de Sherbinin (March 5, 2002, 4:32 PM), perhaps we should not dismiss the legacy of biological systems research as concerns "the transferability of findings from the natural sciences to human populations."

Perhaps we should keep an open mind as to the possibility that human breeding systems are very much like those of gophers and other species in nature, and that we are not 'entities apart' that can function like gods who are exempt from natural checks and balances.

Peter Salonijs

-----

- > The Immigration Safety-valve to MDCs from LDCs Probably Helps Maintain
- > High Fertility in the LDCs.\*
- > Virginia Deane Abernethy
- > Vanderbilt University
- >
- > People immigrate to the United States to solve individual problems with
- > political oppression and limited economic oppportunity, so overlooking
- > immigration's other effects seems compassionate. Nevertheless, denial of
- > immigration's full ramifications is neither compassionate nor responsible.
- >
- > Emigration can be counter-productive for immigrant-sending countries and
- > the world ecosystem because it alters family size preferences. Preferred
- > family size is a major determinant of completed family size, accounting
- > for > approximately 85 percent of the variance according to a 1996 World Bank
- > study. The incentive structure promoting large or small families is, thus,
- > critically important to a society's ultimate fertility rate. The
- > emigration option appears to enhance the attractiveness of large family size.
- >
- > Historical and cross-cultural data point, overwhelmingly to the influence
- > of perceived economic opportunity on family size preferences. People who
- > anticipate expanding opportunity want more children. On the contrary a
- > sense of limitis promotes marital and reproductive caution.
- >
- > Family size targets rise in response to new opportunities which come in

- > the guise of technology, expansion, and migration. Migration encourages more
- > births per woman not only among those who move toward opportunity but also
- > among those who stay home and perceive spaces opening up in their own
- > locality.
- >
- > A study of 19th century England and Wales shows continuing high fertility
- > in depressed communities that young people were leaving, whereas fertility
- > declined rapidly in similarly depressed communities that had not adopted
- > the culture of emigration and, on the contrary, absorbed their own young.
- >
- > Whole countries provide equivalent comparisons. Compared with Great
- > Britain, France never adopted wholesale emigration as a means of coping
- > with poverty. France, instead, absorbed most of its own surviving young,
- > which forced the evolution of alternate adaptations. Students of the period
- > suggest that a primary adaptation was decline in the fertility rate.
- > France led the world into the pattern of small family size within marriage,
- > sometimes described as "the demographic transition." By 1850 France had
- > very low marital fertility, whereas this pattern did not emerge in Great
- > Britain until nearly 50 years later. [Incidentally, declines in infant
- > mortality were not the causal factor in lower fertility in either country
- > because the infant mortality decline did not occur until later,
- > approximately after World War I.]
- >
- > Contemporary comparisons between culturally-similar communities provide
- > further data supporting the hypothesis that the ability (or pattern) of
- > moving toward greater opportunity helps maintain high fertility rates in
- > the sending community. This pattern emerged in the Caribbean during the
- > 1970s and 1980s: Communities where many left had continuing high
- > fertility, whereas a precipitous decline in family size occurred in communities >
- > where emigration was not seen as an escape valve.
- >
- > Belief in enhanced opportunity consistently stimulates childbearing. For
- > further examples of the general hypothesis, please see my book, Population
- > Politics, Transaction Publications, reprinted in 1999.
- >
- > The model works in both directions. The summer, 1997 economic meltdown in
- > the former Asian tigers gave me the opportunity to predict, prospectively,
- > that fertility rates in these nine countries would plummet. With the aid
- > of a co-author, statistically significant declines were demonstrated for 8 of
- > the 9 countries. The exception in Thailand can possibly be explained by
- > earlier, very rapid reductions in fertility occasioned by the need to head
- > off the AIDS epidemic by means of widespread use of condoms; the system
- > had little left to give. [See Fertility Decline in Former Asian Tigers.
- > Population and Environment 23 (3), 245-266, 2002. A similar prediction
- > can now be made for Argentina, which is undergoing economic collapse. I urge
- > some enterprising graduate student to get cracking on this case study.

- >
- > Examples can be multiples. Fertility rises in response to perceived
- > opportunity, but falls when conditions perceptibly deteriorate. Efforts to
- > help are counterproductive when they obscure appraisal of local
- > environments and prospects. Aid that is grandiose by local standards as well
- > as a welcoming immigration policy communicate the wrong message. Both
- > policies are likely to be read abroad as signs that wealth is abundant,
- > opportunity > beckons, and any negative consequences of one's own fertility
- > decisions will be alleviated by others' generosity.
- >
- > Such interpretations neutralize economic and environmental information
- > that would otherwise motivate people to exercise marital and reproductive
- > caution. The comforting and comfortable assumption that open-arms
- > immigration policy is constructive for the countries from which immigrants
- > come is probably false.
- >
- > \*Sections of this communication appeared first in published papers, by
- > Abernethy. These are:
- > Asclepian Perspective on Immigration: First Do No Harm. National
- > Geographic
- > Research and Exploration 10(4): 379-383, 1994.
- > "The Demographic Transition Revisited" Lessons for Foreign Aid and U.S.
- > Immigration Policy. Ecological Economics, 8:235-252, 1993.

**Date: Thu, 07 Mar 2002 12:40:20 -0500**

**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**

**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] How to argue that population should be part of sustainable development**

Dr. Wils has made some excellent points. I agree that using the term "vulnerable" is perhaps counterproductive since it seems new to the discussions underway re Jo'berg. I also agree that the main task is to insure that population, fertility, health, womens empowerment, and education are linked to the traditional perception of Sustainable Development as an economic activity which does 'least harm' to the environment.

I'm a layman with little experience in formulating statements of this kind. One suggestion I will offer is for the GSP Statement to quote Julius Nyerere (I used this quote in the last seminar). I also reiterate that the LDCs have been actively seeking help re population since at least the late 1980s. From my paper of June 2000, now online in a peer

reviewed Journal:

<http://www.utoronto.ca/env/ies/iip/journal/articleFrame.htm>

"The Challenge to the South: Report of the South Commission, included this unequivocal statement:

" In the long run the problem of overpopulation of the countries of the South can be fully resolved only through their development. But action to contain the rise of population cannot be postponed." (Nyerere, 1990)

(from the same paper)

"In 1989, as verified by The UN Population Fund, the following countries signed a statement urging early stabilization of human population. Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Cape Verde, China, Columbia, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordon, Kenya, Rep. of Korea, Liberia, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Sri Lanka, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Vanuatu, and Zimbabwe. Note the absence of most wealthy nations. It is ridiculous to claim that the rich are trying to coerce the poor nations to reduce population. In fact, they are not responding to the affirmed needs of the poor.

The following countries are part of either the South Commission or Partners in Population and Development: Zimbabwe, Kenya, Mexico, Colombia, Thailand, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Morocco, Egypt, Tunisia, China, India, Pakistan, Uganda, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia (former), and Western Samoa. The "Partners" share expertise with each other in reproductive health, appropriate technologies, and population policy."

This sort of evidence should stop nay sayers in their tracks.

Steven Kurtz

Ottawa

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpc/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**From: "Laura Murphy" <lmurphy2@tulane.edu>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] migration of many sorts, and beyond**  
**Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 14:31:59 -0600**

We have seen a series of postings on migration generally, international migration, emigration and immigration. Several comments and thoughts follow:

1) To the extent that these comments can stimulate thoughtful treatment within the GSP statement of a major, complex, global (and ancient) demographic phenomena in relation to the environment, then these are useful comments. The Statement authors should perhaps try to address concerns with 'migration' and mobility more broadly, if possible, as a major challenge for sustainable development.

2) The comments have covered (and indirectly confused) a range of complex domestic and international, push and pull, contemporary trends in varied settings with historical patterns (i.e. in Europe, British Isle pre-modern contraceptive). I gather that migration per se is not the issue itself (I think), but 'emigration as safety valve preventing natural checks and balances on human population growth'. Migration, broadly is an important phenomenon that is receiving increasing attention in the population-environment arena (see the Spring cyberseminar on this theme).

3) It seems the slowed (if not anti-) immigration movement is arguing against a 'straw man' that those who disagree with the stance are not in fact concerned with rapid population growth in LDCs. That is not true. It is just that population growth is no longer the ONLY issue (and there is wide-scale agreement on how address it in a humane and effective way.)

3) If the issue at hand is "international migration to MDCs is a force for maintaining high fertility rates in LDCs", (and that this should thus be incorporated into the GSP statement), then the arguments are incomplete and insignificant in terms of the larger picture.

Incomplete because individuals and families are not making fertility choices because of a perceived option to emigrate internationally-I would wager that most poor households in the populated LDCs with high growth rates (in Africa and Asia) do not actually dream of moving to the US, for example. International migration is (already) difficult, costly. They may choose to migrate within the country, which has other social and environmental implications.

[See Kingsley Davis and Richard Bilborrow on the range of economic and demographic responses to population pressure, of which out-migration --not 'emigration'-- is only one option among many.]

The Cairo Programme statement on population (see Michael Vlassoff's comment for the link) mentions "1.4 million net immigrants to MDCs, 2/3rds from developing nations" This is a very small number (coming from many places) in relation to the population of LDCs, so it is hard to see how this can influence in a meaningful way fertility behavior in the sending countries.

We return to education, empowerment and improved status of women, and the widespread provision of reproductive health services --as a human right, and an effective instrument for slowing population growth over the long run.

The GSP should perhaps pay more attention to the complex issue of 'migration' --internal and international, seasonal and permanent, south-south (the majority of cross-border movements I think) as well as international -- But this is a complex area of study and it is not clear what the empirical evidence can say, nor yet what clear policy recommendations arise to fit in the short statement.

Finally, the GSP seeks to highlight 'win-win' policies that benefit people and the environment and which are acceptable and scientifically justified. Discussion on how well the statement fulfills this aim would be welcome. Babette Wils comments suggest an approach: more directly linking the Statement to the Agenda for the WSSD (downloadable as the chair's paper from [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org))

thank you for your attention

Laura L. Murphy, PhD  
co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

Clinical Assistant Professor  
Department of International Health and Development &  
Stone Center for Latin American Studies  
Tulane University

**From: Freda0867@aol.com**  
**Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 15:43:30 EST**



**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Fwd: Earth Policy News - Primates Disappearing**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Posted by F. White Ph.D.

OUR CLOSEST RELATIVES ARE DISAPPEARING as predator pressure (human) and resource scarcity overwhelms survival capacity of many species.

In a message dated 3/06/02 7:14:54, rjkauffman@earth-policy.org writes:

NEWS FROM EARTH POLICY INSTITUTE.  
Eco-Economy Update 2002-3 (Share This Update With a Friend.)  
For Immediate Release  
March 5, 2002  
Copyright Earth Policy Institute 2002

OUR CLOSEST RELATIVES ARE DISAPPEARING  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/Update7.htm>

Janet Larsen

After more than a century of no known primate extinctions, scientists recently confirmed the disappearance of a subspecies of a West African monkey. The loss of this monkey, known as Miss Waldron's red colobus, may be a harbinger of future losses of our closest evolutionary relatives.

Out of some 240 known primate species, 19 are critically endangered, up from 13 in 1996. This classification refers to species that have suffered extreme and rapid reductions in population or habitat. Their remaining numbers range from less than a few hundred to, at most, a few thousand individuals. If their populations continue to shrink at recent rates, some species will not survive this decade. This group, according to the World Conservation Union's 2000 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, includes 8 monkeys from Brazil's Atlantic rainforest, where 97 percent of the forest has been lost, 2 apes and a monkey from Indonesia, 3 monkeys from Viet Nam, 1 each from Kenya and Peru, and 3 lemur species from Madagascar.

At the endangered level, the IUCN's next degree of threat, there are 46 primate species, up from 29 in 1996. These species face a very high probability of extinction, some within the next 20 years. An additional 51 species are listed as vulnerable. These primates have slightly larger populations but still may disappear within this century. Critically endangered, endangered, and vulnerable species together total 116, or nearly half of the 240 some primate species. (See table

<http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/Update7.htm>.)

When the last Ice Age ended 10,000 years ago, baboons outnumbered humans by at least 2 to 1. If all non-human primate populations were counted together, including the large populations of some of the smaller species, they dwarfed the human population. Now that has changed. The development of agriculture allowed for rapid human population growth, and about 2,000 years ago, humans--numbering 300 million--became the most abundant of the primates. By 1930, the human population of 2 billion likely outnumbered all other primates combined.

Today, at 6.1 billion and climbing, we are threatening the survival of many of our primate cousins, including our closest living relatives, the chimpanzees and bonobos, with which we share over 98 percent of our genome. The other apes are quite close to us as well, not only genetically, but also in observed behavior. Yet with the 300,000 human babies born each day exceeding the total population of the great apes, even our evolutionary proximity may not prevent us from eradicating our near-kin.

While humans now inhabit every corner of the earth, most other primates exhibit strong endemism, meaning that a species is restricted to a particular area. Almost three quarters of all primates live in just four countries: Brazil, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire), Indonesia, and Madagascar. In each of these countries, forest cover is decreasing. Because habitat loss is a danger to 90 percent of threatened primates, their concentration in a few countries greatly increases their vulnerability.

In Indonesia, diverse forests and wild inhabitants have suffered from logging fueled by corruption and political instability. Within the past decade, deforestation rates doubled, claiming almost 2 million hectares each year. As deforestation rates doubled, orangutan numbers dropped by half. By 2005, the country faces the loss of all lowland forest from Sumatra, and thus the extinction of the critically endangered Sumatran orangutan, among many other species. The Borneo orangutan, after suffering from logging, hunting, and the catastrophic fires of 1997, is not likely to survive beyond 2010 if current trends continue.

Our closest relative, the bonobo, is endemic to the Congo, a country plagued by civil war and occupation by foreign military and rebel groups. Along with many other primates in the region, the slow-breeding bonobo has seen a rapid decline. In 1980 there were close to 100,000 bonobos; now there may be fewer than 10,000.

Although the civil war has created millions of human refugees and may have elevated the demand for meat from wild animals (bushmeat), the resulting

sluggish economic development may have slowed logging in the Congo, the country containing half of Africa's remaining tropical moist forests. If political stability returns, tree cutting could increase several fold in the next few years, accelerating what could be the first great ape extinction.

Gorilla populations have dropped to dangerously low levels, largely from illegal commercial bushmeat hunting. Fewer than 325 mountain gorillas exist, and all are in one subpopulation spanning Rwanda, the Congo, and Uganda. The rarest, the Cross River Gorilla, is limited to only 150 to 200 individuals scattered among several lingering subpopulations on the Cameroon/Nigeria border region.

In parts of West and Central Africa, hunting is an even greater threat than forest loss. There the bushmeat trade, consisting primarily of forest antelope, pigs, and primates, is worth over \$1 billion a year. In areas where social turmoil has ravaged traditional economic activities, and the average annual family income is less than \$100, the lure of earning \$300 to \$1,000 each year as a hunter has enticed many. Logging and, to a lesser extent, mining companies have penetrated forests, with their settlements increasing bushmeat demand, while their roads facilitate hunting.

Exploitative hunting is not profitable in the long term, however, because wild populations, especially those of the large and slow-reproducing apes, are soon decimated. Over 1 million tons of wild meat is consumed annually in the Congo Basin, almost 6 times more than the forests' sustainable yield. Commercial hunting has emptied forests that were once full of animals.

Though rural communities have long subsisted on wild animals and other forest foods, with up to 60 percent of their protein coming from bushmeat, most bushmeat from this region is now consumed in cities. Almost half of the 30 million people living in the forested regions of Central Africa are city-dwellers who are being fed with bushmeat from collapsing wildlife populations. As cities grow and bushmeat hunting accelerates to meet rising demand, it is estimated that hunting could eliminate all viable African ape populations in fewer than 20 years.

To save other primates from being lost in what is considered the earth's sixth major extinction event, resources are needed to curb illegal logging and hunting. Illegal logging has ruined vast stretches of original primate habitat. Much of the bushmeat hunted comes from protected areas, and international trade in primates is already unlawful under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species. But when enforcement is lacking, illegal practices continue.

Large wilderness blocks of biologically rich areas can be converted to new parks that take into account the needs of wildlife and human populations.

Ecotourism endeavors can be used to support primate conservation, and hunters can find alternative income in park protection work once they realize that live animals can be much more valuable than dead ones.

Understanding ourselves better--our biology, psychology, and sociology--depends in part on understanding our closest living relatives better. If we destroy them, we may never fully understand ourselves.

# # #

Additional data and information sources at <http://www.earth-policy.org> or contact [jlarsen@earth-policy.org](mailto:jlarsen@earth-policy.org)

For reprint permissions contact [rjkauffman@earth-policy.org](mailto:rjkauffman@earth-policy.org)

If you find this "Eco-Economy Update" of interest, please share it with your friends and colleagues. Perhaps they would like to subscribe to our listserv <http://www.earth-policy.org/Subscribe/index.htm>

This email list is maintained by and used solely by Earth Policy Institute. Postings to this list include Eco-Economy Updates, Eco-Economy Successes and Setbacks, Eco-Economy Key Indicators, and news releases. The Earth Policy Institute, founded by Lester R. Brown, is a nonprofit research organization focused on providing a vision of an environmentally sustainable economy—an eco-economy.

To remove yourself from this mailing list, send an email to [<imailsrv@earth-policy.org>](mailto:imailsrv@earth-policy.org)  
In the BODY of the message (NOT the subject line), type  
Unsubscribe public

**Date: Thu, 07 Mar 2002 16:11:02 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <[skurtz6332@rogers.com](mailto:skurtz6332@rogers.com)>**  
**To: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] migration of many sorts, and beyond**

Greetings Laura,

Your comments are appreciated and cogent. I have one question. Do you place the current US administration among those in "wide-scale agreement?" Also, I've not yet heard about the results from Ireland re the referendum on tightening abortion rules. We've still got a monster battle as I see things.

Steve Kurtz

PS. I've already stated that it's not an 'either (pop) or issue.'

**From:** "Thomas Legrand" <legrand@demo.umontreal.ca>  
**To:** <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**Subject:** [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] GSP Seminar  
**Date:** Thu, 7 Mar 2002 16:37:50 -0500

I fully support the ideas expressed in Dr. Murphy's last message and also in those of the message written by Babette Wil. Despite the interest of the issues being discussed in this forum, it is important to rapidly get back to how to prepare a GSP that is both scientifically solid and likely to make a real impact on the upcoming conference. And for me, a heavy emphasis on the need to greatly restrict international migration is not the way to go -- I fear that it will detract from the core message that we need to convey and end up getting us ignored once again.

Just to get in my last two-bits, I would also hope to see somewhere in the final text a reference to the issue of uncertainty and the need for prudence. The environment is an extraordinarily important issue for future human welfare and there is considerably uncertainty with regard to population projections, population-development-environment interactions, and humanity's ability to devise feasible and effective political solutions in time to address potential problems. This argues for the need to be highly prudent and act quickly on factors such as fertility and population growth (via education, later marriages, providing quality reproductive health services, enabling women to be more fully involved in their societies' economic and political activities, etc. ) that can easily be justified in many ways.

Tom

-----  
Thomas LeGrand =20  
Professeur agr=E9g=E9 / Associate Professor  
D=E9partement de d=E9mographie =20  
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville  
Montr=E9al Qc H3C 3J7 CANADA  
Tel: (1-514) 343-7262; fax: 343-2309

**Date:** Thu, 7 Mar 2002 17:21:56 -0800 (PST)  
**From:** brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] migration of many sorts, and beyond  
**To:** pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

I feel that the issue of immigration is specifically relevant to the GSP statement in two ways:

1) The primary proposal of the statement is to push education in developing countries as a means of stabilizing population growth. The realities are however that anyone who has an education in a developing country is going to be target for immigration to the developed countries. See for instance the aggressive policies of the UK and Germany to attract people with IT training.

The developing countries will be bearing the cost of enhanced education only to see their investment disappear as soon as they graduate. Under these circumstances there will be no improvement in living standards overall and no population stabilization.

The GSP statement should therefore contain a sentence to the effect that our education proposal would work if the developed countries would please stop leeching all the educated people out of the developing countries.

2) The second main proposal of the statement is to provide improved reproductive health services to women. I read this as meaning providing qualified doctors who can guide women through their pregnancy and deliver their baby under clinical conditions. Alternatively at the pregnant woman's choice to terminate her pregnancy safely and hygienically.

The GSP statement should therefore contain a sentence to the effect that our proposal for improved reproductive health services would move one step closer to reality if the developed countries would please stop leeching the doctors out of the developing countries.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu, <lmurphy2@tulane.edu>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Global environmental damage**  
**Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 09:13:42 -0500**

Laura Murphy has reminded us that "population growth is no longer the ONLY issue".

What is being discussed is the revised draft of the GSP which has been submitted to the Population-ENVIRONMENT Research Network cyberseminar. Dr. Murphy may have lost track of the ENVIRONMENT considerations as they are influenced by population growth.

Of course Dr. Murphy is correct in saying that "migration per se is not the issue itself."

The major issue regarding massive migration from ANYWHERE to the MDCs is the contribution of these migrants to exponential POPULATION GROWTH IN THE MDCs.

The MDC's are responsible for more than 80% of the planet's resource throughput and a similar disproportionate share of the pollution load on the ENVIRONMENT. Any growth in MDC population (because of their obscene overconsumption) is unconscionable as concerns the rapid degradation of the ENVIRONMENT. As we approach the unknown thresholds of the planetary biosphere's ability to absorb the insults of collective humanity // every member of the human family is increasingly skating on the thin ice that keeps us from catastrophic ecosystem collapse.

Dr. Murphy's dismissive conclusion that "1.4 million net migrants to MDC's..... is a very small number" fails to relate the influence of these people on MDC population growth in the context of MDC domestic fertility that would, absent massive immigration, produce stable or even slowly DECLINING human numbers in the countries that are responsible for the greatest PER CAPITA contribution to ENVIRONMENTAL damage.

Peter Salonius  
SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION  
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

**From: Freda0867@aol.com**  
**Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 12:04:33 EST**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Fwd: UNF UPDATE: Biodiversity, Population and Human Health**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Posted by F.White Ph.D.

Tom LeGrand writes > The environment is an extraordinarily important issue for future human welfare... < The case study below points to the need for action now.

The United Nations Foundation website - <http://www.unfoundation.org/> - is featuring a U.S. Congressional briefing on the link between biodiversity loss and human health. "'Bushmeat' and the Origin of HIV/AIDS: A Case Study of Biodiversity, Population Pressures and Human Health" is sponsored by the Center for Health and the Global Environment at Harvard Medical School, Population Action International, the Jane Goodall Institute, and the Environmental and Energy Study Institute.

Please visit <http://www.unfoundation.org/spotlight/index.asp?src=3Dbiodiversity> to review the briefing.

The diversity of life on Earth tends to be concentrated on land in some twenty-five areas designated as "biodiversity hotspots." While making up only 1.4 percent of the total land surface, these areas contain large proportions of its species, for example, more than one-third of all known mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. Often, they are also sites of high human population density and growth, and species in these regions, therefore, may be particularly at risk. This briefing focuses on one such hotspot - the West African Forests region - and looks at the slaughter of chimpanzees, gorillas, and other primates for "bushmeat" as an example of how species may be endangered by human activity, and how the loss of our closest relatives may have significant implications for human health, including the spread of HIV/AIDS.

For further information about this briefing, please contact Tracy Graham of the Center for Health and the Global Environment (617-432-2164 or [tracy\\_graham@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:tracy_graham@hms.harvard.edu) or <http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/biobrief.html>), or Beth Bleil of EESI (202-662-1885 or [bbleil@eesi.org](mailto:bbleil@eesi.org)).

-----  
To unsubscribe from the UN Wire Notification Service, go to [http://www.unfoundation.org/unwirelogin/unf\\_listadmin.asp](http://www.unfoundation.org/unwirelogin/unf_listadmin.asp) or send a blank email to this address: [unwire-alert-unsubscribe@mail.securestone.com](mailto:unwire-alert-unsubscribe@mail.securestone.com)



Questions, concerns and comments can be sent to [unf@unfoundation.org](mailto:unf@unfoundation.org).

UN news and other submissions should be directed to [unwire-submit@unfoundation.org](mailto:unwire-submit@unfoundation.org).

To subscribe, visit the UN Wire Web site at:  
[http://www.unfoundation.org/unwirelogin/unf\\_listadmin.asp](http://www.unfoundation.org/unwirelogin/unf_listadmin.asp) and enter your email address. Registration is required.

**From: "Laura Murphy" <[murphyll@bellsouth.net](mailto:murphyll@bellsouth.net)>**  
**To: <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] week one summary**  
**Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 14:08:55 -0600**

Week One Summary, GSP Revised Statement Cyberseminar (March 1 -15 2002)

This is a summary of the first week of discussion of the Revised Statement on the role of Population in Sustainable Development (prepared by the Global Science Panel for the World Summit on Sustainable Development). The purpose of the cyberseminar is to provide feedback to GSP to revise its statement. This summary includes a review of key themes with representative comments (heavily edited to save space). Below also find additional background to the Statement intent and listserve addresses and subscribe/unsubscribe instructions.

Dozens of participants contributed over 50 postings. Substantive discussion and recommendations to the GSP covered a range of topics from empowerment to immigration to vulnerability. Much commentary centered on 'international migration', the political dimensions of population growth: ethical policy and environmental dimensions of immigration. Related topics were population growth and consumption in MDCs, education in LDCs and the 'brain drain'. The high degree of uncertainty in population, environment science and political arenas was highlighted. A reorganization of the Statement to directly address and match the structure of the WSSD agenda (goals/means) was suggested (this seems a fruitful direction for more discussion in the second week). Interdisciplinary training for P/D/E received some attention. The use of the term 'vulnerability' vs. poverty in the WSSD goals was questioned.

For the second and final week, please review the GSP revised statement, aim for specific additional suggestions for the authors. New themes and suggestions for additional Annex material (requested by the GSP) are

welcome.

Selected (edited) comments from week one:

The structure/organization of the Statement: The latest agenda ([www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)) discusses sustainable development with almost complete disregard for population and education..The Jo'burg papers give means to achieve several goals (poverty reduction, reducing consumption, etc.) including technology transfer, financial incentives, access to resources.[But] Population growth, fertility reduction, and even universal education (!) are glaringly absent .So does the GSP paper want to add to the goals or add to the means? I.e., if the latter, state "these goals can be better achieved if we address population/people issues." population growth, or population aging are detrimental to achieving those goals; universal education and lower fertility are extremely powerful leverages to achieve the first and most important goal of reducing poverty. (Wils)

Migration, Immigration.

...'immigration' is not mentioned [in the Statement, but it will be a] key factor in population issues in the 21st century . (Bartholomew)

.[let's] get back to preparing a GSP Statement that is scientifically solid and likely to make a real impact on the upcoming conference.emphasis on the need to restrict international migration will detract from the core message (LeGrand)

.Rapid population growth.high child-dependency ratios.contributes to political instability. .The human misery arising from this is incalculable..(Hammell)

.What data show that low-skilled, low-income immigrants to the US. consume resources as do middle-class and upper-class native-born citizens ? If [they do] it is because the economy locks them into low-paying jobs (and energy inefficient transportation ) . . (Harris)

.expansionist population policies are due to the mistaken belief that the economic (GNP) growth, that is driven by these skyrocketing numbers, is of general benefit. [but] the long-term social and environmental destruction that these policies produce is obvious to social and environmental scientists in ecological economics. Earth Summit 2002 should seek solutions and not avoid political realities [or else] problems with immediate legislative solutions (such as reversing pro growth policies for massive immigration) are left undiscussed for fear of offending the federal governments of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. (Salonius)

. an immediate moratorium on immigration to MDCs would lead to a stronger focus on population control in the developing world, by taking away the safety valve of emigration.and less desirable outcomes. declining standards of living, unrest, environmental degradation. the

implications of zero international migration are complex-- we lack evidence to predict the outcome of such a public policy. (Vanwey)

.the suggestion that immigration control will lead to reductions in fertility are grounded in over-simplified assumptions about the transferability of findings from the natural sciences to human populations...Migration the subject of migration and environment warrants more research. I would also be interested to hear from developing country participants (de Sherbinin)

.migration is a fact of life .a call for moratorium is not feasible.

Migration between developed countries is more significant than between developed and developing countries. Ethically, to stop the brain drain from developing countries, to alleviate poverty and to relieve pressure on environment, it may make more sense for developed countries to take in the poor and "less desirable" people from developing countries (Duc Hiep)

.Denied opportunities is also a serious problem in developing countries.(due to) the centralised development policies. In India Mumbai (Bombay) has been over saturated with the opportunities. no wonder people rush there (Yogesh Cokhale)

.How does one define 'who belongs to which place' --talking about climate change, conservation of biodiversity etc using a transboundary approach --how are we justified in identifying one issue and declaring a moratorium on that? (Jayshree Vencatesan)

.I take issue with the notion that "the problems of many developing countries are directly traceable to the production of more humanity than can be supported by the carrying capacity of the land." the real problem is not impoverished women having too many babies, but of the inequitable distribution of wealth. (Kemmerer)

.Find the 1994 Cairo agreement at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/Cairo/program/p10000.html> [This highlights] the right of each national government to set migration policies [and] 1) respect for human rights and for migration itself as a long-term historical process generally benefiting both sending and receiving countries, 2) the importance of "regularizing" migration and 3) the importance of improving information flow. There was little treatment of .environmental impacts (Engelman)

#### Interdisciplinary training:

.begin with secondary and undergraduate education to promote interest and skills in both social and environmental sciences.to build a cadre of researchers (funders and policy-makers) who can integrate across disciplines (Murphy)

. interdisciplinary training and research on links between population, development and the environment" is now taking shape in ecological economics (Salonius)

...[Let's] combine our political and scientific concerns about international migration to the developed world with recommendations for

future research and training-- structured around key unresolved issues with policy relevance (international migration among them). We can achieve two goals: ask for more support and bring these issues up for debate without making arguments beyond scientific evidence. (Vanwey)

Empowerment:

.Two key policies should be three-- The third is women's empowerment itself (Bartholomew)

.little progress can be achieved if we do not accept that males and females are equal and have equal human rights. This is a precondition for sustainable development. Women are discriminated in employment, wages, property rights Mere empowerment on the paper is not enough.(Kumar)

.Empowerment does not mean that behaviors will be ideal with respect to the environment. (Americans are empowered and buy SUVs-- ) An important topic missing: the degree of uncertainty of many aspects of the long-term population & environment relationship. (LeGrand)

Uncertainty. the level of uncertainty in population growth into the future remains quite large (for example). With respect to the environment - climate change, for example - the level of uncertainty is greater. The consequences are potentially enormous-- that should push us towards risk-averse approach (but) in the political arena uncertainty is a way to justify postponing actions to conserve the environment - i.e., serious gas taxes or increasing substantially the support for children's education, family planning clinics...All further complicated by equity issues (MDCs vs LDCs vs.). (LeGrand)

Vulnerability vs. Poverty. Why is vulnerability a better term than poverty? The GSP says vulnerability must be reduced, Jo'burg says poverty .(Wils)

-----=  
October-November Cyberseminar.) The current draft of the panel statement = has been derived from extensive consultations with scientists in = population, human dimensions of environmental change and sustainable = development. The goal of the present cyber seminar (March 1 to 15th = 2002) is to solicit further comments and advise with a view to updating = the global science panel statement. There will also be an Annex with = supporting scientific information on specific issues and summaries of = selected case studies illustrating these points. Suggestions for this = Annex material are also welcome.=20

-----end of week one summary-----

Laura L. Murphy, PhD

Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network  
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>  
Email: [pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org](mailto:pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org)

**From: "Gelda Lhamas-Coelho" <[glhacoe@hotmail.com](mailto:glhacoe@hotmail.com)>**  
**To: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] additional suggestions**  
**Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 13:43:51 +0000**

I am a civil engineer (Brazil), Master on Environmental and Sustainable Development (Mexico, DF- Mexico), PhD on Environmental Sciences (Puebla, Mexico), now working on a research about environmental urban planning and public health services (FAPEMIG/Brazil).

According to the Week One Summary, GSP Revised Statement Cybeseminar, Interdisciplinary training and research on links between population, development and the environment received some attention.

As additional suggestions are welcome, I would like to point out some points that could enhance this field and contribute to knowledge.

Some points have already been touched by Prof. VanWey, who gave us such a good idea - structuring the interdisciplinary research and training around certain key unresolved issues that have immediate policy relevance (international migration among them)- and by Dr. Kurtz who considered that the empowerment via education and health must be focused as well.

Having in view that many delegates that will be on the GSP are from countries where these topics are not well worked on, such a lack of knowledge (technology and theory), mainly on the fields of education and health, can be considered a good point to be emphasized, not only giving theoretical ideas but also showing some examples that can be recognized as successes (there are many, even though they are long-term responses to some urgent problems).

Also, having in view that 50% of the world population is female, that in most LDC's they represent more than that percentage and that women are the "head of the families" (lack of husbands and fathers) gender equity is another topic that must be emphasized. Talking about the urban areas, for example, the role of the female population is getting greater and knowing that cities are environments where the energy consumption is pretty high, working this point would be good as well.

Discussing about growth of population, migration and immigration of people all around the world and concerning about the climate changing we are facing now, all the postings of this cyberseminar recognized that the world (nature and society) is not giving us the responses we would like to have on our development.

While building interdisciplinary training and research we cannot miss these points.

Thanks

Gelda Lhamas-Coelho  
Rua Santo Antonio, 266 &#8211;802  
36015 &#8211;000 Juiz de Fora, MG  
Brazil  
e.mail: glhacoe@hotmail.com

**Date: Sat, 9 Mar 2002 18:54:21 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Empowerment of Women**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Further to Gelda Lhamas-Coelho's remarks I would like to see the policy statement put a lot more emphasis on the provision of family planning services.

The time has come for experts to go a lot further than simply making bland references to reproductive health. It is necessary to state specifically what services should be provided and that includes making a specific statement that the GSP is 'pro-choice'.

Malcolm Potts in an article The Unmet Need for Family Planning in the January 2000 Scientific American estimates that 100,000 women worldwide die each year from pregnancy, childbirth or abortion. This is appalling carnage. If this many women died each year from a diagnosable disease there would be a worldwide push to find a cure.

Surely the GSP has the courage to state its convictions if it can help alleviate human misery of this magnitude.

I suggest that a section of the policy statement be entitled The Unmet Need for Family Planning and that the arguments made by Malcolm Potts be reproduced. This is an article in Scientific American. It is state of the art science. And this is what the GSP should be saying.

Simply making a reference to reproductive health without defining exactly what is required and why it required is not 'scientific'.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**Date: Sun, 10 Mar 2002 09:56:06 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSEminar\_GSP2] Empowerment of Women**

I agree with Bartholomew's position re family planning needing specificity. Vague language isn't useful in a "Science" statement.

Steven Kurtz

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpco/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**From: "Xizhe Peng" <xzpeng@hotmail.com>**  
**To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: [PERNSEminar\_GSP2] government role**  
**Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 13:16:23 +0800**

I agree with Wils' argument about the goal or means of the Statement. I think the Statement should state clearly that Government at each level should take the responsibilities to facilitate the population balance and the sound P/E/D relationship. We cannot leave the P/E/D issue to be tackled by the market alone. Although the approaches of such a government intervention vary widely between countries, governments should commit to

taking initiative and effective policy measures in this field, with the participation of the public. Urbanization and migration policies are just two examples.

While over-spreading of metropolitans may create heavy environment pressure, the rapid development of wide scattered small and medium sized cities and towns may also lead to great environment deterioration, as the scale of population concentration did not reach the optimal size that sufficient environment protection and resource saving mechanisms could be installed and work in full function. The precaution measures in the process of rapid urbanization should be made by the government.

Migration issue, not only the international migration, but the internal one as well, should be dealt with in the Statement. Migration is an inevitable result of unequal development process. As a vulnerable group, migrants are often suffering from the pollution disproportionably, while they also, in many cases, cause the pollution and environment deterioration disproportionably. Institutional arrangement to integrate the migrants into the main stream of the receiving society is another policy measure to reduce the potential environment damage caused by migration.

Peng, Xizhe  
Institute of Population Research  
Fudan University  
Shanghai, China

**Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 03:53:52 -0700**  
**From: earth care <careearth@usa.net>**  
**To: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>,  
<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: Re: [Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Empowerment of Women]**

I fully endorse the position of Bartholomew and Kurtz that specificity is needed especially while discussing women and empowerment - we have had so many instances where issues relating to gender have been discussed without being translated into action. Parts of rural India ( as I am sure it is elsewhere) still remain in a state where women do not have access to even basic health care - I have had the misfortune of rushing a young pregnant woman of 18 to the nearest Primary Health Centre that was 30 km away in great hurry since there was no qualified medical doctor in her village. Aggravating this was the fact that her village is in a hill range and this meant that we had to come down 72 hairpin bends to reach the plains - most importantly, this was not an isolated case - but the only when in which help reached on time.

Best wishes. Jayshree Vencatesan



**Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 09:23:13 -0500 (EST)**  
**From: Daniel Hogan <djhogan1942@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] comments on GSP**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

In my opinion, this is an excellent text, striking a balance between major demographic concerns and the delicate political issues to which they relate. One important lacuna continues to be the question of population distribution processes and patterns and their relationships with environmental change and sustainable development. I suggest including this in paragraph four as a "critically important component..," as well as inserting a paragraph later in the text (not leaving the whole issue to "supplementary texts". The following comments address specific sections of this draft, with a view to its consolidation.

Item 1, paragraph 3: is the opposition established in this paragraph necessary? Wouldn't it be appropriate to give attention to ageing and education, even with population stabilization?

"Moderate growth or ageing may not have negative implications...": This is true in the short to middle range. We need here to distinguish between planetary/biosphere considerations and the local/national spheres. Even with population stabilization at the world level, local/national populations may grow. Whether they grow rapidly or moderately will imply problems and possibilities discussed in the development literature. But surely long-range stabilization is necessary and likely (if not actual long-range population decline).

Item 2, end of first paragraph: the emphasis on being trapped in mindsets is an important point. The environmental problem is also a cultural one. This link could be made with the question of education and training.

On vulnerability: the definition of poverty melds into that of vulnerability. The advantage of the vulnerability concept is to draw attention to the greater susceptibility of some individuals or groups to (environmental) hazards. It shifts the focus from purely monetary emphasis to the relationship between hazard and the ability to protect oneself from this

hazard. It's not just a question of financial resources to buy the way out of vulnerability. Other conditions make some individuals and groups more susceptible and less able to react. Equally poor groups (considered in terms of household income) may be less vulnerable to water-borne disease if the community has basic sanitary infrastructure; if educational levels and a political tradition of participation and involvement are higher.

On education: the evidence for the contribution of education to more sustainable lifestyles is not very strong, to say the least. There are many good reasons to encourage education, but in this context the recommendations need to be more specific. In addition to comments already made in the discussion, I would like to emphasize the importance of non-formal education. It is important to incorporate an environmental perspective in curricula at all levels, but we cannot wait for the results of this long-range cultural change. One successful experience is with short courses for young professionals (such as those of the IHDP, for example) which not only give them tools for directing their skills to the solution of environmental problems, but legitimate these concerns in their different fields and motivate them to seek and find career rewards outside traditional, disciplinary lines which only reinforce the status quo.

On governance: there is a lot of this in the sustainable development literature. If this document is to say something, it should be specific to population concerns. For example, it would be important to view population dynamics in an integrated way; health, distribution issues and reproductive rights should march together. The text would have to go beyond generic recommendations and make some concrete suggestions (or leave governance aside).

Political and institutional factors will be main issues in Johannesburg: How has implementation of Agenda 21 with its creation of new political-institutional mechanisms fared? The question to be faced is how have these mechanisms dealt with population factors? How might they do so? Who wins and who loses? Where will we find the political actors to forward these views? How does population fit in? The population-related NGO presence at

Johannesburg will be basically in the area of reproductive health. Who, how and when do other issues enter the calculation of stakeholders and how do they interact with population groups?

One of the problems of Our Common Future was its inattention to the political dimension. When there is no mention of conflicting interests, no mention of who would be the agents of political change, no mention of who wins and who loses with sustainable development, the implicit perspective is an ingenuous voluntarism.

My example is from the population distribution question. Without serious ecological-economic zoning, all parts of the territory will be considered apt for the realization of any of society's many goals.

Recognizing the finite and spatial character of natural resources implies the need to plan the location of population and its economic activities.

This means favoring some interests over others, which will only happen with political-institutional mechanisms that permit establishing the necessary trade-offs. The market's invisible hand will not promote the sustainable use of resources.

The discussion of migration and environment implies treating the distribution of natural resources in space; the historically given use by human populations of these resources; and their depletion or degradation. It also implies treating consequences for mobility of environmental changes provoked by human activity. All the aspects of the various processes of population mobility that have been examined and systematized over the years have an environmental dimension. They are factors of attraction, expulsion or retention; factors of change and stagnation; migrant selectivity; migrant turnover; residential segregation; occupation of new lands and the depletion of old lands; seasonal migration in agriculture; commuting.

What changes the importance of the environmental factor in studies of population mobility is the perception of the limits of natural resources, represented - before all else - by the disappearance of the frontier. As a population response to land scarcity or degradation, frontier movements are no longer possible. While in many countries, concentration of land ownership still leaves room for settling large population contingents, this does not

change the fact of the finiteness of land. The land use and land cover change issue has proven to be a significant way for demographers to deal with environmental questions. Both PAA and IUSSP meetings have been the focus for such work; this concern should be present in the GSP statement. For the use and preservation of natural resources, population mobility is the most significant demographic factor. Where the population lives, works and plays will always have an impact on nature - and vice-versa.

Considering the volatility and unpredictability of population mobility, it becomes a crucial factor for sustainability. Environmental limits point to the urgent need to conciliate these limits with the distribution of human activities in space.

These considerations are also pertinent to international migration. Rather than focus on restrictions or quotas, however, the GSP statement should note the need to understand, on the one hand, environmental change in sending countries as a driving force of international migration and, on the other hand, the environmental impact in receiving countries.

This impact is not, a priori, negative. Immigrant groups provide labor for urban sanitary infrastructure and other labor-intensive services and serve as yeast in promoting cultural change - an important ingredient of responding to environmental threats.

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>  
To: "pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu"  
<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] [PERNSiminar\_GSP2] Governance  
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 09:25:38 -0500**

The revised draft, in part (6):  
COORDINATION AND STRENGTHENING OF GOVERNANCE FOR  
POPULATION IN SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT states that :

"The issue of governance and institutions is relevant not only at the national level....." This is certainly true.

As an example // Environmental assesment at the federal level, in Canada,

was established in legislation in 1995, however the mandate has been in relation to specific development projects.

Environmental assessment in Canada has not been charged with the responsibility of examining the incremental destruction of the environment that is fostered by legislation and regulations that are promulgated by the governments at all levels but most particularly legislation and regulations created by the Canadian federal government. No doubt there are similar problems in the mandates of Environmental Protection Agencies worldwide.

The scrutiny of policy and legislation in Canada..... (such as the intention to INCREASE the GROWTH RATE of the national human population that

has been in place since 1993, through the use of massive immigration, in the face of a declining domestic birth rate)..... is handled by government standing committees.

These committees have the same narrow mandates that characterize the various government departments after which they are named.

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency does in fact operate independently of all federal departments, but its activities are confined to the scrutiny and attempt to minimize the environmental damage caused by about 6000 projects (construction etc) annually.

NOTE: Albert Bartlett has pointed out that:

---Smart GROWTH destroys the environment

---Dumb GROWTH destroys the environment

\*\*Smart GROWTH just destroys the environment with good taste

Growth, a paradigm (religion-like faith) that governments world wide are committed to, is the problem. Adherents to this faith (economic growth fundamentalist high priests) spread their gospel around the world, maintaining that ONLY MORE GROWTH CAN REDRESS THE PROBLEMS PRODUCED BY PAST GROWTH.

I visualise the monitoring activities of many national Environmental Protection Agencies (including those of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency) as supervision of 'house fly and mouse-sized' projects to attempt to keep the environmental damage caused by them to a minimum. Meanwhile the 'elephant-sized' Canadian government orchestrated influence of continued exponential population growth (over 1% annually) inexorably continues to wreck environmental havoc and irreversible ecosystem attrition, UNSEEN BECAUSE OF ITS ENORMITY.

As a result of Canada's irresponsible, state sponsored skyrocketing

population growth, the extent and size of the damage and the number of projects, that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency has to deal with, increase in an open-ended fashion coincident with the open-ended expansion of the TOTAL national human enterprise. Thus buildings, pavement, agricultural clearing of former forest land, and forest plantation activities to increase products for an endlessly growing population.....continually increase the proportion of Canadian land wherein complex, self organizing natural ecosystems have been replaced by simplified (and inherently more unstable) human dominated ecosystems. The more of the natural world we eliminate, the more dependent we are on the manufactured world that we are creating; money can not be converted back into extinct species or their destroyed habitat.

I am sure that subscribers to this cyberseminar can identify similar societal directions in their home countries and identify with the governance infrastructures that preclude almost everyone in society from STEPPING BACK TO ASSESS WHERE ALL THIS GROWTH IS LEADING.

There are only two biological entities that never stop growing / cancer and collective humanity \*\*\*\*\*we are in rather unsavoury company !

Some agency in each country (perhaps the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency in Canada) must assume the responsibility to review draft legislation and regulations, emanating from GOVERNMENT itself, to assess and attempt to modify those that have the 'elephant-sized' potential to influence the direction of society-at-large in a manner that will be detrimental to the size, diversity, and integrity of the environmental processes that sustain us, BEFORE THEY BECOME LAW.

Peter Salonijs  
SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION  
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

**Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 15:53:29 -0500**  
**From: Roderic Beaujot <rbeaujot@uwo.ca>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] A late first message**

Introduction: I am Rod Beaujot from the University of Western Ontario. I was member of the Canadian delegation to the Cairo conference, and have been on the Board of Action Canada for Population and Development. I have read the document but not the comments of others, and wanted to join by sending the following comment:

I am told that the dialogue at the prep-cons seems to be breaking down

between an interest in the North for environment and in the South for development. Could it be that each is unwilling to face the problem that both high consumption and population growth need to be addressed. Is it because of our unwillingness to face both of these issues that we want the conference to fail?

Especially in terms of carbon-dioxide concentrations, the human population is now affecting the very climatic systems of the planet. This comes from large numbers of middle class people with high consumption, it comes from the large number of poor people who have no choice but to use environmentally stressful technology for basic survival, it also comes from the increasing number of people who become richer and consume more. It is not clear that the planet can support 2 billion people living in two-car families, let alone 6 or 9 billion. Yet everywhere there is pressure for more consumption.

Some specifics on the following pages:

1, At the ... Cairo in 1994, a new international consensus was reached recognizing that population policy should be oriented toward improving social conditions and expanding choices for individuals.

Add: Less elaboration was given to questions of social responsibility, yet on childbearing the concept of "free and responsible decisions" was used. There needs to be better attention to questions of responsibility in individual decisions, including responsibility to the collectivity and to the environment.

1, rather than "two key policies - education and reproductive health-" I would say "three key policies - family planning and reproductive health, education, especially for girls, and health, especially for children. It seems to me that social policies, in health, education, security, equity, and family planning, are those that are most conducive to fertility decline.

2, rather than "too rapid ageing brings massive stress for old age security systems", I would say "brings stress..."

3, is there evidence that educated people have more environmental awareness and more sustainable life-styles?

3, Increased productivity probably does "lead to less pollution-intensive production", but it also means more production.

Rod Beaujot  
University of Western Ontario

**From:** "Laura Murphy" <lmurphy2@tulane.edu>  
**To:** <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**Cc:** <skurtz6332@rogers.com>  
**Subject:** [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary  
**Date:** Tue, 12 Mar 2002 08:01:30 -0600

In the summary for week one, I wrongly attributed this quote (edited in the summary): 'Two key policies' should be expanded to 'three'. The third policy is women's empowerment itself, which seems to be a necessary precursor to education and reproductive health..." the author is Steve Kurtz (Sun 03 Mar)

my apologies.

Laura L. Murphy, PhD  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
Department of International Health and Development &  
Stone Center for Latin American Studies  
Tulane University  
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200  
New Orleans, LA 70112  
(504) 584 - 2681  
lmurphy2@tulane.edu

**Date:** Tue, 12 Mar 2002 16:54:19 -0800 (PST)  
**From:** brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary  
**To:** pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

That's right. Steve Kurtz said: " 'Two key policies' should be expanded to 'three'. The third policy is women's empowerment itself, which seems to be a necessary precursor to education and reproductive health..."

But why aren't there more people out there stating that they agree with it?

The policy statement makes a general reference to reproductive health services for women and then immediately acknowledges that this call has gone



unheeded before and will probably go unheeded again.  
Such an approach is self-defeating.

It's been a long while since I read Dale Carnegie's  
"How to win friends and influence people" but I bet  
there was something in there that if you want  
something, state openly and specifically what you want  
and let the other person say 'yes' or 'no'.

Let the people at the Summit state "No, we don't agree  
that a woman should be given the right to choose  
whether or not to carry her baby to term."

The lives of many women now and in the future will  
depend on the GSP's ability to influence this Summit.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 07:01:41 +0530**  
**From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>**  
**To: brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**CC: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one  
summary**

I wholeheartedly agree with it. This is the precondition for sustainable  
development. Very little can be done without the involvement of women, be it  
environment, development or reducing fertility and infant, child and maternal  
mortality. Even there should be the provision of equal inheritance property  
rights among males and females whichever country it applies for particularly in  
the developing south Asian countries and the countries of Southeast Asia. I am  
not aware much about the African and Latin American Countries.

Bal Kumar KC

Professor and Head  
Central Department of Population Studies  
Tribhuvan University  
Kathmandu, Nepal  
<http://www.cdps.edu.np>

**From: "V K" <vfk3@hotmail.com>**  
**To: brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary**  
**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 08:44:35 -0600**

I certainly agree with Mr. Kurtz's reiteration that the third policy issue that must be addressed is women's empowerment. Unfortunately, by labeling it as such, makes it an impossible issue to address. Women's empowerment must be operationalized to include a very concrete set of goals and objectives as well as an implementation scheme on a region-by-region basis. This is quite a bit of work that may be beyond the scope of this discussion. However, it is important to acknowledge the role that social structures, status, poverty, infant and child mortality, the need for labor for food production, and the need for care in old age that children provide play in keeping the birth rates high in many developing countries.

Verne Kemerer

**From: "Dharma Chandra, Population Studies, SSED" <chandra\_dw@usp.ac.fj>**  
**Organization: The University of the South Pacific**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 09:05:22 +1200**

Many developing countries have begun their fertility decline and this trend is likely to continue. However, to further fertility decline ( in order to reduce the birth rates and total fertility rates) there is more need for appropriate reproductive health services to reach people at the local /community level. For this improvements in services, support and the will of the state and involvement of both men and women is needed. There is need for male involvement in reproductive health particularly in developing country societies that are male dominated.

Dharma

++++  
Dharma Chandra  
Population Studies Program  
University of the South Pacific  
PO Box 1168  
Suva  
Fiji

**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 17:20:41 -0500**  
**From: Roderic Beaujot <rbeaujot@uwo.ca>**  
**To: V K <vfk3@hotmail.com>**  
**CC: brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] three policy areas**

If there are to be three areas of social policy, to me they should be (1) family planning and reproductive health, (2) health, especially for children, and (3) education, especially for girls. There are also broader issues, especially in social security and equity, by gender and other areas of disadvantage. My reading of the research would be that these forms of social policy are more important than economic development to fertility reduction. To put it simply, these things make people (including various disadvantaged groups in a society) more ready, willing and able to have fewer children.

Rod Beaujot, University of Western Ontario

**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 16:37:48 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad\_bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>**  
**Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**

Please think about these words that Bal Kumar has used: "This is the precondition for sustainable development. Very little can be done without the involvement of women, be it environment, development or reducing fertility and infant, child and maternal mortality."

You can hold a thousand Earth Summits every ten years for the next 10,000 years. Unless we give women the universal right to have a safe timely abortion the human race is lost and the planet is lost.

It all gets down to this.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] last two days of discussion**  
**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 21:16:47 -0600**

Reminder: The cyberseminar on the GSP Statement on 'Population in Sustainable Development' runs only another two days, through Friday, March 15.

Please submit your comments before then, so we can include them in the final summary of discussion. This will be shared with the Global Science Panelists, who will be meeting later this month to finalize the Statement, drawing in part from cyberseminar comments.  
Thank you.

Laura L. Murphy, PhD  
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network  
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>  
Email: [pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org](mailto:pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org)

**From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] empowerment; vulnerability**  
**Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 21:36:17 -0600**

On empowerment: from the 'gender and development' literature, this concept is seen as a multi-dimensional phenomena, both process and outcome, that results from having rights, knowledge, skills and the confidence to act and function. (It applies to women and men). Education is one element (especially primary education and literacy), as well as income, legal rights, political freedoms and health (broadly, not just reproductive, but physical and mental health and safety). It is important but not equivalent to 'education' and 'reproductive health' care. From this standpoint--empowerment of women as a goal-- the means are to provide primary education, (reproductive) health, as well as legal rights (as touched upon by Bal Kumar--access to land, credit, etc.) and other human rights. The statement should probably touch upon extension of legal rights as a key elements necessary to the process of empowerment.

"Education" as mentioned by other participants, is not necessarily a cure for environmental ills (the income-consumption effect in wealthy

nations on environmental services/resources being greater than any awareness-conservation effect). The Statement should emphasize universal and effective 'primary education' and for women as the focus, which I think is what is intended.=20

On vulnerability: Wils notes the use of 'poverty' (Earth Summit agenda) vs. 'vulnerability' (in the Statement), and they are not clearly distinguishable. They could be, too advantage. Poverty is 'deprivation' (of shelter, food, health, more broadly but not commonly livelihood and safe environment), but vulnerability is broader and a suitable term for sharing what we learn from 'population - environment interactions. Vulnerability is an outcome of (individual) poverty and the (community) physical or natural environment, as well as (community) social capital and resilience. Vulnerability is part of the terminology of the IPCC reflecting the 'environmental' dimension. The differences are not made clear in the Statement, but could be made so.

Laura Murphy, PhD  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
Department of International Health & Development, School of Public =  
Health and Tropical Medicine=20  
and Stone Center for Latin American Studies  
Tulane University

**From: "Catherine M Marquette" <cmarquette@earthlink.net>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] general comments on statement and this week's discussion**  
**Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 10:36:14 -0500**

Some general comments on the revised statement as it stands and thoughts stimulated by the comments (of Beaujot, Hogan, Murphy, Lhames-Celho, Peng, Wils) during the cyberseminar this week--- I take the mandate of the statement to be to carve out territory for population and environment research and issues within the larger population and sustainable /human development discourse and communicate this to policy makers. I don't think the statement yet clearly recognizes and marks out this terrain. Namely, it does not put environment right up front---the first heading is "Population in Sustainable Development" not "Population, Environment and Sustainable Development" ---in fact---it takes three paragraphs to get to the word "environment". The key conclusions are about "Population and Sustainable Development" ---again, "Where is the environment component?"

We all agree at this point, I think, that population and environment dynamics are embedded in a social matrix (that varies by scale, geography, culture, history) and is woven up with many other critical socioeconomic variables like education, women's empowerment and access to reproductive health care, and poverty. And yes we need to communicate recognition of this enveloping matrix to policy makers. But this goal should not hijack the statement's core.

The (reciprocal) connections between population dynamics, environment, and development need to be explicitly and clearly discussed up front if the rationale of the statement is to evolve, mark out some new and distinct terrain, and ultimately make sense to policy-makers. At the moment, the social matrix issues are discussed at more length than the core connections and the mandated terrain is never delineated. As a result, the "key conclusions" and their environmental relevance seem diluted and frankly repetitive of the numerous conclusions, discussions etc. that have evolved since Rio and Cairo ---even since Bucharest---- perhaps on the links between population, development and in more recent years sustainable development. There has been extensive discourse on the social matrix of development (including the issues raised by many of the discussants and in the statement-woman's empowerment, education, poverty, vulnerability etc.). What is missing is really fitting together these issues and the way they interact and affect the links between population dynamics and environmental change. This will take some work but it is the territory the statement should traverse. Just like a picture, a case-study is worth a thousand words and could be used more extensively throughout the statement to accomplish this.

Marking out that terrain will also mean trying to put forth some demarcation in terms of what variables are embraced by the terms population dynamics and environment and development ----currently there is no such demarcation for population dynamics-population growth and fertility seem implicitly given. Because of this lack of boundary marking on the population side the migration, spatial distribution, urbanization issues which are so central to current empirical research that is going on are weakly integrated (as Hogan notes also). Environment is never even defined as the physical environment. Development is probably best defined and the only definition explicitly stated. A second step after the basic terms are clear involves weaving these three terms together in a meaningful way. The issue of defining the concept of vulnerability perhaps differently as Hogan and Murphy suggested this week may be useful here in doing this.

Some specific thoughts relating to the statement, its conclusions and comments by cyberseminar participants that may help refocus the

conclusions----Looking at conclusion (1) that addresses population trends ---some discussion (thus missing) on the scale issues (both social and geographical) and variation in population and environment dynamics could be addressed here. Also, it seems rather than emphasise the mortality or growth impact of HIV/AIDS in Africa elsewhere a far more important impact in the pop-env context are the links between factor like HIV-related illness, household structure and economic activity, and resource management. (Again some discussion of scale could set a point up like this which has much local relevance in terms of resource management-case studies information would also make the point). Again the HIV/AIDS issues also raises the need to demarcate population dynamics in terms perhaps of the health dimension---which would embrace reproductive health (HIV/AIDS falls within that). In that context, I think that family planning issue really needs to be put in the context of reproductive health and the connections between health and resource management (again keep the core focus in mind) and not singled out as a separate issue as some of the commentators have implied. I think women's empowerment issues also may be most relevantly situated in that context perhaps. This is not a statement on gender, environment and development----but one on population, environment and development. The social matrix must be given as the context for this core focus not the other way around.

I would take issue with making a statement regarding government roles in population and population policy issues (as suggested by Peng and Wils).

I think that this is not really meaningful unless you are looking at either a very specific local context -again it would need specification by level (are you taking about local government, international bodies) to be really be meaningful. I would suggest letting case study discussion illustrate what is possible here rather than make a blanket statement.

Finally, on the training and interdisciplinary research issues ---there is an increasing amount of research being done that it testing the models and limits for this (e.g. the series of Macarthur funded population and environment projects-some of which will have summaries in Ambio this year). There have been lessons learned from those which would allow some specific comments (like Hogan makes) to be included on these research and training issues rather than just making general statement about the need to do it.

Catherine Marquette

Co-Coordinator

IUSSP/IHDP Population and Environment Research Network

email: pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch

**From:** "Alex de Sherbinin" <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**To:** "brad bartholomew" <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary  
**Date:** Thu, 14 Mar 2002 17:54:29 -0500

Brad,

I don't see any reference in Bal Kumar's statement to granting women the universal right to abortion on demand. So where are you getting this from?

The GSP has nothing to gain by wading into thorny moral and ethical territory. Even those who believe that a woman (or a couple) has the right to dispose of an unborn child would generally agree that abortion should be a last resort. Unfortunately, in some societies abortion becomes the "contraceptive" of preference (e.g. former Soviet Union), and in others it is used in conjunction with sonogram in order to prevent girl-children from being born. This seems to me to be simply another means of propagating male hegemony, the result of which is far from "women's empowerment".

I'm afraid that more than the planet risks being lost here.

Alex de Sherbinin  
CIESIN, Columbia University

**Date:** Thu, 14 Mar 2002 16:36:48 -0800 (PST)  
**From:** brad bartholomew <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] corrected attribution in week one summary  
**To:** pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

It is true I took a liberty attributing to Bal Kumar specific agreement with a universal right for women to have an abortion and I apologize for that.



Alex de Sherbinin states "The GSP has nothing to gain by wading into thorny moral and ethical territory", and this is what I question.

There has already been a Rio summit and a Cairo conference and yet the population and environmental problems continue to escalate.

Unless the Jo'burg summit adopts a new approach, the GSP will be presenting another well-written and politically correct policy statement at the Earth Summit 3 in Istanbul ten years from now lamenting the fact that nothing has been achieved since the Jo'burg summit.

If however as a result of the Jo'burg summit free abortion clinics are set up in every village in every country in the developing world there will be no need for an Earth Summit 3 in Istanbul ten years from now.

I would like to see the day when an unwanted pregnancy is as matter-of-fact to a woman as catching a cold. She simply goes to the drug store and takes something for it.

I'm sorry to be a bit over the top with all this, but in common with Martin Luther King - I have a dream.

Kind regards,  
Brad Bartholomew

**Date: Fri, 15 Mar 2002 14:38:51 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: "pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu"**  
**<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] memes for developing the world**

Thanks are in order to PERN and it's leaders. This seminar has moved the yardsticks a bit further towards the goal line; another round after another draft revision should help even more in my opinion.

I just became aware of this video production, and want to share it with

you all.

<http://www.ninapaley.com/parasitetreatment.html>

We're all on the same side, and comprise a tiny minority of environmental and social activists. If some hot button issues are judged impossible to present directly in the GSP statement, I'll understand the difficulties involved. However, I urge the authors to not 'pussyfoot' around the message that more humans (an apparent inevitability for the next 30+ years) makes development of any kind more likely to cause negative, unintended consequences via systemic feedback loops. The well being of individuals, therefore, is in probability terms likely to be higher the fewer of us there are.

If this isn't made clear, I'd judge the statement to be largely a waste of time and effort.

Steven Kurtz  
Ottawa

--

<http://magma.ca/~gpc/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**Date: Fri, 15 Mar 2002 16:15:49 -0500**  
**From: Steve Kurtz <skurtz6332@rogers.com>**  
**To: "pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu"**  
**<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**CC: Sci4PR list <members@scientists4pr.org>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] US Pop pressures**

FYI

This was in today's email weekly news (free) from NPG.

Reality seems to be kicking in. The need for more revenue payers (incl social security) in future is bumping up against the social contract costs of education, recreation, transport, etc. Local/state/national disputes should increase with court cases likely in my opinion.

Steve

=====

--Massachusetts Tries Slowing Population Growth with Age-Restricted Housing--

The Boston Globe reported last week that growing numbers of Massachusetts cities and towns are putting age restrictions on residential development or favoring projects where builders agree to sell only to those 55 and older, in an attempt to keep families from moving into fast-growing communities and overwhelming schools with new students.

Twenty-eight communities are either imposing or encouraging age restrictions on new development. Non-senior housing has a tougher time getting approved, as towns and cities increasingly try to put the brakes on conventional growth, such as single-family homes.

Reports the Globe: "Many believe that age restrictions on housing, or restrictions on the number of bedrooms per housing unit, which tend to discourage buyers with children, are also the result of a simple calculation: A family with two kids moving into a town often does not pay enough in taxes to cover the cost of the expanded educational services the family requires."

--New from NPG--

The February/March issue of NPG's newsletter, Population and Resource Outlook, is now online at  
<http://www.npg.org/newsltr/2002/febmar02.html>

---

NPG Population-News Listserv

[www.npg.org](http://www.npg.org)

To unsubscribe from this list, send an email to [majordomo@npg.org](mailto:majordomo@npg.org) and type "unsubscribe population-news" in the body of the email.

---

<http://magma.ca/~gpco/>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

**Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:12:21 -0500 (EST)**

**From: "Laura Murphy" <[lmurphy2@tulane.edu](mailto:lmurphy2@tulane.edu)>**

**To: <[pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)>**

**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Week Two Summary, GSP Revised Statement Cyberseminar (March 1-15, 2002)**

## Week Two Summary, GSP Revised Statement Cyberseminar (March 1 -15, 2002)

This is a summary of the second week of discussion of the Revised Statement on the role of Population in Sustainable Development. This summary covers key themes from the second and final week of discussion (see the first week's summary online with all messages under View Postings). Specific suggestions are listed first, then additional comments (heavily edited to save space. Over a dozen participants contributed in the second week, on topics ranging from abortion to education to migration to vulnerability. This summary concludes our second GSP Cyberseminar. All comments and summaries are being shared with members of the GSP, who will meet later this month to finalize the Statement, drawing in part from participants' comments.

### Background to this cyberseminar:

This seminar was set up to solicit reactions from the international research community to the Statement of the Global Science Panel (GSP) on Population and Environment. Their "Statement on Population in Sustainable Development" is being prepared for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). Also known as Earth Summit 2, it will take place September 2002 in Johannesburg: for more information and access to background documents and other resources, visit [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org). The second revised draft of the Statement was derived from extensive consultations with scientists in population, human dimensions of environmental change and sustainable development (with contributions from the participants of the October-November 2001 Cyberseminar). The short statement will be supplemented by an Annex, with supporting scientific information on specific issues and selected case studies. Discussion took place at <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/seminars.html>. All the original comments can be viewed here (indefinitely).

### Week two recommendations for the Statement (names given where comments can be attributed to a single participant):

Item 1, Paragraph 3: give attention to ageing and education, even with population stabilization. (Hogan)

A case-study is worth a thousand words and could be used more extensively throughout the statement to accomplish this [emphasizing the reciprocal connections between population dynamics, environment, and development] (Marquette)

Item 1, End of first paragraph: the environmental problem is also a cultural one. This link could be made with the question of education and training. (Hogan)

Education: be more specific about the type and level and target (i.e., female primary education, vocational training for youths)

Empowerment: touch upon extension of legal and human rights as a key elements necessary to the process of empowerment; (separately) make 'empowerment' itself one of three key policies

Family Planning: put more emphasis on the provision of family planning services --go further than simply bland references to reproductive health -- state what services should be provided and that the GSP is 'pro-choice' (Bartholomew); put it in the context of reproductive health and the connections between health and resource management (Marquette)  
On governance: say something specific to population concerns, i.e., view population dynamics in an integrated way; health, distribution issues and reproductive rights should march together (Marquette). Go beyond generic recommendations and make some concrete suggestions (or leave governance aside) (Hogan).

Page 1, rather than "two key policies" say 'three key policies - family planning and reproductive health, education (especially for girls), and health (especially for children) the policies most conducive to fertility decline. (Beaujot)

HIV/AIDS rather than emphasize the mortality impacts---more important impacts are the links between HIV-related illness, household structure, economic activity, and resource management. (Marquette)

Land use and land cover change: is a significant way for demographers to deal with environmental questions; this concern should be present in the GSP statement (Hogan)

Migration--not only international internal --should be dealt with in the Statement. Migration is an inevitable result of unequal development process. (Xizhe Peng)

(Expand and clarify) variables embraced by the terms population dynamics and environment and development --the migration, spatial distribution, urbanization issues which are so central to current empirical research that is going on are weakly integrated Then.. weave these three terms together in a meaningful way--perhaps using the concept of vulnerability (PAGE) 1, "At the ... Cairo in 1994 expanding choices for individuals." Recommend adding: 'Less elaboration was given to questions of social responsibility, yet on childbearing the concept of "free and responsible decisions" was used. There needs to be better attention to questions of responsibility in individual decisions, including responsibility to the collectivity' (Beaujot)

In the conclusion (1) discuss scale issues (both social and geographical) and [their] variation in population and environment dynamics.

Training and interdisciplinary research issues ---an increasing amount of research is testing models (e.g. Macarthur Foundation). Lessons learned

from those allow specific comments on these research and training issues (Marquette)

Differentiate poverty (as 'deprivation') vs. vulnerability (with its environmental hazard dimension)

Additional, selected (heavily edited) individual participant's comments:

The overall vision of the statement: I take the mandate of the statement to be to carve out territory for population and environment research and issues [but] the statement does not mark out this terrain--it does not put environment right up front. Population and environment dynamics are embedded in a social matrix --we do need to communicate this to policy makers. But this goal should not hijack the statement's core. (Marquette)  
This is an excellent text, striking a balance between major demographic concerns and the delicate political issues to which they relate. One important lacuna is population distribution processes/patterns and their relationships with environmental change and sustainable development (this should be included in paragraph four as a "critically important component...", as well as inserting a paragraph later in the text (not leaving the whole issue to "supplementary texts". (Hogan)

On vulnerability (vs. poverty): The advantage of the vulnerability concept is to draw attention to the greater susceptibility of some to (environmental) hazards. Equally (income) poor groups may be less vulnerable to water-borne disease if one community has basic sanitary infrastructure, higher educational levels and a political tradition of participation (Hogan)

Education - (on page 3), is there evidence that educated people have more environmental awareness and more sustainable life-styles? (Beaujot)

On education: evidence for the contribution of education to more sustainable lifestyles is not strong. Recommendations [to encourage education] need to be more specific (including) non-formal education. One successful experience is with short courses for young professionals (i.e., the IHDP's)..(Hogan)

Empowerment:

"Two key policies" should be expanded to "three". The third policy is women's empowerment itself, which seems to be a necessary precursor to education and reproductive health". (Bartholomew)

Empowerment is the precondition for sustainable development. Very little can be done without the involvement of women, be it environment, development or reducing fertility and infant, child and maternal mortality. Even there should be the provision of equal inheritance property rights (Bal Kumar KC)

On women's empowerment by labeling it as such, makes it an impossible issue to address. Women's empowerment must be operationalized to include a very concrete set of goals and objectives as well as an implementation

scheme on a region-by-region basis (Kemerer)

Yes, specificity is needed especially while discussing women and empowerment - in many instances issues relating to gender have been discussed without being translated into action. Parts of rural India remain in a state where women do not have access to even basic health care -(Vencatesan)

On empowerment: this is a multi-dimensional phenomena, both process and outcome, that results from having rights, knowledge, skills and confidence. (It applies to women and men). Education is one element, but also income legal rights, freedoms and health (broadly). (Murphy)

This is not a statement on gender, environment and development-----but one on population, environment and development. The social matrix must be given as the context, not the other way around. (Marquette)

We need more appropriate reproductive health services to reach people at the local /community level. Improvements in services, support and the will of the state and involvement of both men and women are needed. (Dharma Chandra)

Interdisciplinary training/research: VanWey gave us a good idea - structuring the interdisciplinary research and training around 'certain key unresolved issues that have immediate policy relevance' (i.e., migration) -- gender equity is another topic. In urban areas, for example, the role of the female population is getting greater and knowing that cities are environments where the energy consumption is pretty high -- (Lhamas-Coelho)

Abortion: Unless we give women the universal right to have a safe timely abortion the human race is lost and the planet is lost. (Bartholomew);  
The GSP has nothing to gain by wading into thorny moral and ethical territory (of abortion on demand). Even those who believe that a woman (or a couple) has the right to dispose of an unborn child would generally agree that abortion should be a last resort. Unfortunately, in some societies abortion becomes the "contraceptive" of preference (e.g. former Soviet Union), and in others to prevent girl-children from being born. [a] result far from "women's empowerment" (de Sherbinin);  
There has already been a Rio summit and a Cairo conference and yet the population and environmental problems continue to escalate Unless [Jo'burg] adopts a new approach, in ten years, the GSP be presenting another well-written and politically correct policy statement lamenting the fact that nothing has been achieved (Bartholomew)

Migration:

The discussion of migration and environment implies treating the distribution of natural resources in space; the historically given use, their depletion, and (environmental) consequences for mobility. [Many aspects of] population mobility have an environmental dimension: factors

of attraction, expulsion or retention; change and stagnation; migrant selectivity; migrant turnover; residential segregation; occupation of new lands and the depletion of old lands; seasonal migration in agriculture; commuting. What changes the importance of the environmental factor in studies of population mobility is the perception of limits, i.e, the frontier...The land use and land cover change issue has (thus) proven to be a significant way for demographers to deal with environmental questions (Hogan)

Immigration Rather than focus on (immigration) restrictions or quotas; note, on the one hand, the need to understand environmental change in sending countries as a driving force of international migration and, on the other hand, the environmental impact in receiving countries not, a priori, negative. Immigrant groups provide labor for urban sanitary infrastructure and serve as yeast in promoting cultural change - an important ingredient of responding to environmental threats. (Hogan)

Governance, government role in policy:

Political and institutional factors will be main issues in Johannesburg: How has implementation of Agenda 21 with its creation of new political-institutional mechanisms fared? How have these mechanisms dealt with population factors? How does population fit in? The population-related NGO presence at Johannesburg will be basically reproductive health. Who, how and when do other issues enter the calculation of stakeholders? Without serious ecological-economic zoning, all parts of a territory will be considered apt for society's many goals. The finite and spatial character of natural resources implies the need to plan the location of population and its economic activities. This means favoring some interests over others [Hogan]

"The issue of governance and institutions is relevant not only at the national level...." True: The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency operates independently, but its activities are confined to the scrutiny and attempt to minimize the environmental damage of projects {but} Growth, a paradigm (religion-like faith) that governments world wide are committed to, is the problem Some agency in each country must assume the responsibility to review draft legislation and regulations, emanating from GOVERNMENT itself (Salonius).

Government's role: I agree with Wils' argument about [linking to] the goal / means of the Statement. The statement should state clearly that Government at each level should take the responsibilities to facilitate the population balance and the sound P/E/D relationship. We cannot leave the P/E/D issue to be tackled by the market alone. Although the approaches of such a government intervention vary widely between countries, governments should commit to taking initiative and effective policy measures in this field, with the participation of the public. Urbanization and migration policies are just two examples. (Xizhe Peng)

I take issue with making a statement regarding government roles in



population and population policy issues--this is not meaningful unless you are looking at a specific local context (Marquette)  
North-South relations: the dialogue at the prep-cons seems to be breaking down between an interest in the North for environment and in the South for development [Are we] unwilling to face the problem that both high consumption and population growth need to be addressed? -- carbon-dioxide concentrations are now affecting climatic systems -- This comes from large numbers of middle class people with high consumption, from large number of poor people who have no choice but to use environmentally stressful technology, and from the increasing number of people who become richer and consume more-- everywhere there is pressure for more consumption (Beaujot)

**From: "Kathleen M. Dowd-Gailey" <kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>**  
**To: "brad bartholomew" <brad\_bartholomew@yahoo.com>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] migration of many sorts, and beyond**  
**Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2002 17:59:57 -0800**

I realize that it is late to be commenting on these contributions, but due to recent trips i have been out of town and do feel that a response to this message is needed.

The main pushes for education in developing countries are at the secondary (junior high to high school) and even as basic as primary school in many instances. This is especially true for girls education. This types of projects hardly qualify one for a ticket to the developed world, but rather provide these children with a basic education, the kind many take for granted.

The importance of education projects should not be underestimated.

Kathleen Dowd-Gailey

Kathleen M. Dowd-Gailey  
Michigan International Development Associate  
Pronatura Peninsula de Yucatan, A.C.  
Calle 17 #188-A x 10  
Colonia Garcia Gineres  
Merida, Yucatan 97070, Mexico  
tel/fax: 52.999.925.3787,  
52.999.920.4641

**From: "Alex de Sherbinin" <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Links Between Migration, Globalization and Sustainable Development**  
**Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 10:32:40 -0500**

Given the debates concerning migration as a contribution or impediment to sustainable development in the last cyber seminar, participants may wish to look at this IIED briefing on the subject:

[http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd\\_18\\_migration.pdf](http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd_18_migration.pdf)

Alex de Sherbinin  
CIESIN, Columbia University

**From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>**  
**To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu,**  
**<adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Links Between Migration, Globalization and Sustainable Development**  
**Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 13:59:43 -0500**

In the IIED paper Alex de Sherbinin has recommended to us, the authors (Tacoli and Okali) tell us that "policies designed to curb international migration usually only benefit illegal smugglers and employers who hire undocumented migrants."

If this is to suggest that international migration will happen as an organic phenomenon, and that individual nations really have no control over what kind and what number of migrants cross their borders.....then the future of globalization implies that all nations will ultimately be populated far above their carrying capacities as resource-poor countries continue to maintain unsustainable fertility levels while using the safety valve of migration to avoid confronting their irresponsible birth rates.

The authors advise that "Documented migrants, whose employers pay full non-wage contributions, are an asset in supporting pension and health systems and policy-makers need to take this into account" has been adopted by such countries as Canada, where domestic fertility has dropped below the replacement level, to justify massive immigration policies designed to keep the population GROWING at an exponential rate of 1% annually (if these

irresponsible pro-GROWTH policies are continued, human numbers in Canada will double in 70 years with markedly negative implications for both the global (Canada is part of the 5% of the world population, along with the U.S. that is responsible for 25% of the resource throughput and a similar portion of the pollution) environment, and the national environment as Canadians destroy the last vestiges of complex, self-managing ecosystems that remain in the settled (non-boreal) parts of the country with pavement, buildings, forest plantations and agricultural clearing.

The migration that the authors depict as "inescapable" is the direct result of reproduction rates that result in unsustainable numbers. Mass migration, in the end will not solve the problem of excess fertility.....but it will move the unsustainable excess human biomass elsewhere so that all parts of the earth surpass their carrying capacity.

As concerns the problems of "reduced number of workers" that will result from responsible reproduction rates that either stabilize populations or result in a gradual population shrinkage.....participants may wish to read the website proposals of:

SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION at:

<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

where arrangements to decrease the disruption of a shift to a lower population numbers are described.

Peter Salenius  
SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION

**Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 15:10:13 -0800 (PST)**  
**From: brad bartholomew <[brad\\_bartholomew@yahoo.com](mailto:brad_bartholomew@yahoo.com)>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] The Links Between Globalisation, Migration & Sustainable Development**  
**To: [wssd@iied.org](mailto:wssd@iied.org)**  
**Cc: [pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu](mailto:pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu)**

Hi,

I read the above article on your website but I question whether the article really addresses the major issues.

Current immigration polices allow people to migrate if they have money education or skills that will be useful to the host country. Applicants who do not possess those attributes are rejected.

Essentially people with half a life are allowed to immigrate to a devoped country to seek a better life, but people with no life at all in developing countries are not allowed to immigrate to seek a better life.

Current immigration policies are elitist and discriminatory in the extreme.

In addition some 23 European countries as well as Canada, Australia and the United States now have a female fertility rate at or below replacement level. In future they will be looking to leech eveybody with money education or skills out of the developing countries.

How can the developing countries ever hope to raise their living standards under these conditions.

To be frank with you I find the article a trifle one-eyed.

Yours truly,  
Brad Bartholomew  
Webhmaster  
Scientists for Population Reduction  
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

**Date: Fri, 5 Apr 2002 09:34:41 -0500 (EST)**  
**From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**  
**Subject: [PERNSeminar\_GSP2] Congratulations on a successful cyberseminar**

Dear cyberseminar participants,

We would like to thank you for your participation in and contributions to the March 1-15 cyberseminar on the Population in Sustainable Development Statement. We consider the seminar to be an unqualified success, thanks to you.

The Global Science Panel members, who wrote the statement, were very interested in the cyberseminar discussion and it was frequently alluded to during the March 21-23 meeting when which the Statement was revised. The revised version of the Statement, which is being presented in New York at Prepcom3 on April 5, is now available online at <http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Admin/INF/hague/statement27March2002.html?sb=14>. As you will note, many of the comments, ideas, insights, and concerns raised by you have been incorporated.

We look forward to your participation in upcoming seminars and hope you will continue to be active members of the PERN network.

Sincerely,

Annababette Wils, PERN  
Laura Murphy, PERN  
Alex de Sherbinin, CIESIN