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According to the Global Footprint Network, humanity in the past has been and presently is in overshoot; humanity needs the renewable resources of 1.7 planets to supply the renewable resources humanity uses. No responsible scientist disagrees with the position that humanity is in overshoot. Overshoot as calculated by the Global Footprint Network, does not take into account all of the non-renewable resources that humanity has used in the past and is presently using. Humanity’s relationship to overshoot relating to resource usage is exactly the same as an individual that withdraws three percent every year from his bank account when the bank only pays one percent per year, eventually he must run out of money. The only difference between that individual and his bank account and humanity and its resource usage is the when humanity runs out of one or more essential resources is that civilization will collapse, with the deaths of billions and even the extinction of the human species. If humanity remains in overshoot, the collapse of civilization must happen no matter what other action is taken by humanity. The only question is when will that collapse occur? Every minute humanity remains in overshoot, the closer humanity comes to doom and destruction

There two and only two ways that humanity can get out of overshoot—reduce the number of humans on the planet and/or reduce the average per capita usage of renewable resources. Since overshoot is based upon the resources used by humanity and since that usage is based upon the number of humans on the planet times the average per capita usage of resources, I challenge anyone to set forth an additional method to reduce overshoot. If the human population and/or the per capita usage of resources were to increase in the future, it would increase humanity’s overshoot level and that in turn would cause the collapse of civilization to occur in a shorter period of time. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that humanity immediately determine, as best as it can be determined, the future growth or decline in the human population and the future status of the average per capita usage of resources. The latest prediction made by the UN’s demographers is that the human population will attempt to grow from about the current 7.6 billion to about 11.2 billion, a gain of about 3.6 billion or 41.2%, by the year 2100. All demographers essentially agree with the UN’s estimate. The UN’s demographers in making their estimate included the fact that some nations currently have Total Fertility Rates (TFRs) below replacement level and some nations will substantially reduce their TFRs in the future with some of those reaching TFRs below replacement level. . However, there is not one drop of credible evidence to support the proposition that because a number of nations now have, or will have in the future, TFRs below replacement level, the remaining nations on the planet will reduce their TFRs in time to prevent the collapse of civilization. For the purpose of determining future overshoot, humanity MUST assume that population will increase between now and 2100, causing overshoot to rise.

I challenge anyone to present a factual and logical paper showing that voluntary population control (also known as family planning and/or non-coercive population control)) has a greater than 50% chance of stopping population growth, or reducing population if that is necessary, in time to prevent the collapse of civilization. Just look at religion-- Orthodox Jews breed without limits, the Catholic Church is opposed to all modern means of birth control and is opposed to abortion and this will not change in the future, Mormons almost always have more than four children, the leaders of Islam have openly stated numerous times that they will use the power of the penis and womb to destroy Western Civilization, and many Protestant leaders are opposed to abortion.

By definition a non-renewable resource is something that is finite and limited —natural processes do not make more of it. A theoretically renewable resource is regenerated by natural processes. Example trees and fish in the ocean are theoretically renewable; oil, zinc, iron are non-renewable. Some non-renewables can be recycled and used more than once. For example iron made into steel can be recycled. However, every recycling process is not 100% efficient. Therefore, every time you recycle a non-renewable you have less of it. Eventually you run out of it. Many non-renewables can only be used once by humanity—examples all fossil fuels and all fertilizers used to grow food. Some non-renewables have substitutes and others do not have any substitutes. However, there are a number of problems with substitutes—they too will eventually be exhausted and will no longer available to humanity in the future and they may not be economically feasible now or sometime in the future.. Since all non-renewables at some time in the future will no longer be available for use by humanity, humanity is by definition in overshoot regarding non-renewable resources. Every second humanity uses non-renewable resources, humanity goes deeper into overshoot regarding those resources. Humanity is in overshoot regarding both renewable and non-renewable resources and humanity is digging a deeper hole for itself every second. No action taken by humanity, except reducing the human population and/or reducing the per capita usage of resources, will prevent the hole from getting deeper over the long run. Every second the collapse of civilization comes closer at an ever increasing rate.

Since every person on the planet and all governments strive for economic growth, we must assume that the per capita usage of resources will increase in the future. More importantly, every person living in the Third World, and the Third World contains more than 50% of the world’s population, desires a better standard of living. Putting that concept in different terms, every person in the Third World would like to live in the same manner as an American, or if not as an American as someone in the industrialized nations. The leaders of every Third World nation will never agree to the proposition that those in the industrialized societies have the right to a greater per capita usage of resources than those that live in the Third World. All leaders of Third World nations will attempt to increase the standard of living of those living in their nations and that must result in an increase in the per capita usage of resources on a world-wide basis. And that in turn must increase the overshoot for all of humanity.

The Americans will never reduce their standard of living and per capita usage of resources. That position was made absolutely clear when the first President Bush stated that the American standard of living was not negotiable. Even if the industrialized nations of the world substantially reduced their standard of living and per capita usage of resources and those resources were available to Third World nations, that fact would not prevent the overall per capita of usage of resources from increasing due to the much larger number of people living in Third World nations.

Realistically, there is only one way for humanity to possibily get out of overshoot in time to prevent the collapse of civilization and that way is to reduce the human population. Since it is almost certain that voluntary population control will fail, the only way to reduce population in time to prevent the collapse of civilization is coercive population control. While I personally believe that humanity must immediately impose coercive population control on a world-wide basis, it is not my present position. Rather, it is my present position that humanity must debate, consider, discuss and evaluate coercive population control and compare it in every way possible with voluntary population control. Of course, there are many reasons why coercive population control should and cannot be imposed. However, those reasons must not be permitted to prevent the discussion set forth previously. Rather all those reasons should be part of the necessary discussion. The failure to discuss coercive control, almost certainly, will cause humanity substantial harm and since the chance that humanity will suffer any harm from a discussion of coercive control is highly unlikely, anyone who is opposed to a discussion of coercive control has a position that cannot be defended. Humanity is not playing a game; humanity is very close to extinction.

The following calculation is based on the fact that presently humanity requires the resources of 1.7 planets and humanity has the resources of only one planet. Step number one—calculate the number of humans the earth can support without being in overshoot----1/1.7= 58.8%, 58.8% times the current estimate of population of 7.6 billion equals 4.47 billion. 4.47 billion is the number of humans the planet can support without going into overshoot based upon the current average per capita usage of resources. The point of this calculation is very simple---to get out of overshoot not only does population growth have to cease, population has to be substantially reduced to 4.47 billion or lower. If the average per capita usage of resources were to increase, and it is almost certain to increase, the population would have to decrease below 4.47 billion. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY ZERO CHANCE THAT VOLUNTARY POPULATION CONTROL WILL REDUCE POPULATION TO 4.47 BILLION OR LOWER IN TIME TO PREVENT THE COLLAPSE OF CIVILIZATION.

Everyone who refuses to discuss coercive population control and is prepared to gamble the survival of the human species on voluntary population control must assume that every demographer alive today is an idiot, when every single demographer predicts population will continue to increase in the future and not decrease. I have challenged numerous people to state what harm would follow from a discussion of coercive population control and have received only one reply. That reply was that people would immediately have more children. That claim is so ridiculous that no response is needed. The idea that a couple in Niger, or in some other Third World country, would have more children when a conference was held in New York City to discuss coercive control is ridiculous beyond words. Since no harm will be caused by a discussion of coercive population control. I challenge anyone to present a valid reason why such a discussion should not be held.

Since humanity must immediately start to reduce its population to get out of overshoot and to save civilization from collapse, humanity must immediately start to discuss coercive population control. I challenge anyone on the face of the earth to set forth reasons why it would be in the best interest of humanity to remain in overshoot. Since humanity must get out of overshoot as quickly as possible, anyone having more than one child must be considered a mass murderer and must suffer the consequences of that act.

Nothing is more important than saving civilization from collapse. Nothing is more important than saving all of the greatness of humanity—art, literature, music and science. All concepts of morality and justice, and all actions of every government on the face of the earth must take second place to the saving of civilization.