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The most important premise of this essay cannot be challenged because it is based on high school math and humanity cannot change the rules of math. The table below permits you to determine the length of time, in years, it will take to grow anything based upon the annual rate of growth.

Growth Factor Annual rate of compound growth

1% 2% 3% 4% 5%

Two Times 70 35 23.3 17.5 14

Four Times 140 70 46.6 35 28

Eight Times 210 105 70 52.5 42

Sixteen Times 280 140 93.3 70 56

Thirty-two Times 350 175 116.5 87.5 70

Over one thousand time times 700 350 233 175 140

Over one million times 1400 700 466 350 280

Over one billion times 2100 1050 700 525 420

All of the times in the above table are less than, or about equal to, the length of time from the birth of Jesus until today---very, very short times by any measure

Using the table above, if the economy of the planet was to grow at the annual rate of 5%, in just 140 years it would be over one thousand times as large as when the growth started. If the annual growth rate was 4%, in just 175 years it would be over one thousand times as large as when the growth started. Anyone who takes the position that the economy of the planet can be over 1,000 times as large as the current economy is totally and completely insane and must be permanently placed in a mental institution. Since there is a relationship between resource usage and economic growth, the economy of the planet will never be 1,000 times as large as the current economy as the resources provided by the planet will never be able to support that level of economic growth. And the previous sentence is correct no matter what new technologies are developed

To be more realistic, at an annual growth rate of 5% the economy of the planet would be four times as large as the current economy in just 28 years---at an annual growth rate of 4% it would take 35 years to be four times as large as the current economy---at 3% under 47 years---and at 2% 70 years. The economies of nations and the planet grow in a percentage/compound manner and compound growth is the most powerful force in the universe. Nations generally aim for a growth rate of 3% or higher. To summarize this paragraph, at growth rates of 2, 3, 4, or 5% the economy of the planet would be four times as large, or larger, as the current economy by the year 2100. At growth rates of 3, 4 or 5% the economy of the planet would be eight times as large, or larger, as the current economy by the year 2100.

Four challenges—1) Write a paper proving that the math I used above is incorrect; 2) Write a paper proving that the economy of the planet can be eight times as large as the current economy by the year 2100; 3) Write a paper that the economy of the planet can be four times as large as the current economy by the year 2100; and 4) Write a paper proving that the economy of the planet can be over 1,000 times as large as the current economy by the year 2719—2019 plus 700=2719.

No intelligent person can deny the fact that humanity is presently in overshoot and no intelligent person can deny that any species that remains in overshoot must suffer a violent, massive, horrible and uncontrolled reduction in population to reduce the population to the level that can be supported by the resources that can be provided by the environment or niche occupied by the species for an extended period of time. And the environment or niche occupied by humanity is the entire planet

No one can deny that a growing planetary economy uses a growing amount of the resources provided by the Earth to humanity. No one can deny that the Earth and the resources it provides to humanity is finite and limited. Anyone who takes the position that the Earth can support an ever growing population or economy must be permanently placed in a mental institution. No one can deny the fact a growing population will use more resources than stable or declining population. No one can deny that fact that a population that has an increasing per capita usage of resources will use more of the Earth’s limited and finite resources than a population that has a stable or reducing per capita usage of resources.

No one can deny that it is almost certain----in my personal opinion it is absolutely certain----that the average per capita usage of resources will dramatically increase between now and the year 2100 due to the demands of the billions who presently live in (and the additional billions will be born in) the undeveloped and underdeveloped nations of the world. I challenge anyone to write a paper showing that the average per capita usage of resources will stay the same or decline between now and the year 2100.

The latest projection/prediction/estimate issued by the UN (June 2019) is that the human population will grow by 3.2 billion between now and 2100, reaching a level of 10.9 billion. That represents a growth of about 41.5% in just 81 years. The demographers at the UN are not Gods and cannot guarantee that the population will reach 10.9 billion in the year 2100. However, the UN’s demographers are among the best on the planet and, therefore, it would be the height of stupidity for the leaders of humanity to disregard the UN’s estimate of 10.9 billion by the year 2100.

A growing per capita usage of resources and a growing population must drive humanity deeper into overshoot. If the estimate made by the UN’s demographers proves to be correct and the population was to increase to 10.9 billion by the year 2100 (or even if the population only increased to 9.7 billion, just a 2 billion increase instead of a 3.2 billion increase), I challenge anyone to write a paper proving that voluntary population control starting after 2100 will reduce population level to the necessary level to get out of overshoot before civilization collapses. Anyone analyzing the population problem must take into account the fact that the average life expectancy is rather lengthy ( the world-wide average in 2016 was 72 years)and any reduction in the birth rate will take a substantial amount of time to affect the total population level. Some of the people born today will be alive in 2100.

Please do not insult my intelligence and do not accuse the UN’s demographers of being incompetent fools. They knew and I know that a number of nations today have TFRs below replacement level and that additional nations will reduce their TFRs to below replacement level in the future. Even with that knowledge the UN’s demographers estimated that the population will increase by 3.2 billion, resulting in a population level of 10.9 billion in 2100. Again, as indicated above, the UN’s estimate for 2100 may be wrong (high or low). However, to refuse to consider the estimate of 10.9 billion in planning for humanity’s future would be an act unforgivable stupidity.

According to the Global Footprint Network (GFN), a highly regarded think tank, humanity was using the resources of 1.7 Earth’s when the population level was 7.6 billion. Based upon simple math (7.6 divided by 1.7), the human population must be reduced to 4.47 billion to get out of overshoot. Therefore, if the population reached 10.9 billion in 2100, a reduction of 6.43 would be required to get humanity out of overshoot. And this reduction does not take into account the fact that the average per capita usage of resources will increase between now and 2100 due to the demands of the billions who will be living in the undeveloped and underdeveloped nations of the world. The leaders of humanity would be insane to gamble the collapse of civilization upon voluntary population control to reduce the population by 6.43 billion after the year 2100 in time to prevent the collapse of civilization with the deaths of billions and most likely the extinction of the human species.

There is not a drop of evidence that the year 2100 is a magical year such that a growing population will be converted into a non-growing population. More importantly, the growing population must be converted into a substantially and rapidly decreasing population in order to get humanity out of overshoot in time to prevent the collapse of civilization. To gamble the collapse of civilization on that change is totally and completely insane. To gamble that economic growth will become non-growing and more importantly to gamble that the economy will be able to be reduced to whatever level is necessary in time to prevent the collapse of civilization is totally and completely insane.

In evaluating any future course of conduct humanity must consider two questions— will the event occur and if the event occurs what will be the harm or benefit? If population growth continues it is almost certain (and in my opinion, it is absolutely certain) that civilization will collapse with the deaths of billions caused by starvation, wars (with or without weapons of mass destruction—in my opinion it will be with weapons of mass destruction) and other horrors. The result of continuing population growth may even be the extinction of the species due to wars with weapons of mass destruction. If the combined chance of the deaths of billions or even the extinction of the species is greater than 10%, it would be insane to only consider voluntary population as the method to prevent that from occurring. I challenge anyone to write a paper that it would be in the best interest of humanity to gamble the deaths of billions when the chance of that happening is greater than 10%. The harm to humanity is so great that any risk greater than 10% cannot be permitted

Since the Earth and the resources it can provide to humanity it finite, both population and economic growth MUST cease at some point of time. And as shown at the start of this essay, due to the power of compound growth the stoppage of growth will happen in the very near future. Those statements cannot be challenged and I do not care what action is taken by humanity. There are only three ways to stop population growth—1) wars, disease, starvation and other horrors; 2) voluntary population control; and 3) coercive population control. In reality, humanity is gambling the deaths of billions only on voluntary population control as no one desires number 1 and humanity refuses to consider number 3.

No one has attempted to determine the chance of voluntary population control failing before 2100 by examining every problem today faced by humanity. To gamble the deaths of billions solely on voluntary control without knowing (as best as it can be known) its chance of failure is insane. I challenge anyone to examine all the problems today faced by humanity to show that the chance of failure caused by one or more of those problems is less than 10%.

I challenge anyone to write a paper showing that the economy of the planet could grow by a factor of four before the year 2100. There is a relationship between economic growth and the usage of the physical resources the Earth provides to humanity. Economic growth cannot and never will be completely decoupled from the use of the physical resources provided by the planet. The relationship between economic growth and resource usage is unknown. However, using a very conservative 50% relationship between the use of resources and economic growth, an economic growth factor of four would result in resource usage doubling. Since humanity is in overshoot, a doubling of resource usage would be an insane act. It would be more than an insane act, it would be an act of criminal stupidity causing the almost immediate collapse of civilization.

A simple statement of fact----when economic growth ceases (as it must on the finite earth) population growth must immediately cease, if humanity does not want to cause the collapse of civilization. A growing population with a fixed economic pie means that the average slice of the economic pie must decrease. A decreasing average slice of the economic pie must result in world-wide social unrest and revolution causing the collapse of civilization. Another simple statement of fact—when the economy of the planet contracts, the population of the planet must contract.

By definition non-renewable resources are finite and limited. Almost every non-renewable resource can be used only once. A very small number of non-renewable resources can be used more than once. At some point in time all, or almost all, non-renewable resources will no longer be available for use by humanity. When one or more vital non-renewable resources are no longer available to humanity, economic growth must cease and start to contract.

The table at the start of this essay shows that any annual growth rate greater than 1% will result in the economy of the planet growing by a factor of four or greater before the year 2100. As shown above, any attempt to grow the economy by a factor of four must result in the collapse of civilization. Therefore, both economic and population growth must immediately cease, if humanity desires to prevent the collapse of civilization. And the only way this can be achieved is to immediately impose coercive population control on all of humanity.

Population can stabilize at only one of three levels—today’s population level, at a population level greater than today’s level or at a population level less than today’s level. The only intelligent choice is for population to stabilize at some level less than today’s level. The larger the population, the more of the non-renewable resources provided by the planet will be used and the less non-renewable resources will be available for future use by humanity. There is a direct relationship between resource availability and the length of time before civilization collapses---the less resources available requires the collapse of civilization sooner. I challenge anyone to write a paper that it would be in the best interest of humanity for population to stabilize at today’s level or at a level higher than today’s level. I challenge anyone to write a paper that the planet can provide humanity with an infinite amount of non-renewable resources. I challenge anyone to write a paper that the statement I wrote above—the less resources available requires the collapse of civilization sooner.

Dinosaurs ruled the planet for about 160 million years. Let us look just 50,000 years into the future for humanity. 50,000 years is almost an infinitely short period of time compared to the time Dinosaurs ruled the world----50,000 divided by 160,000,000=0.00031 And humanity considers itself smarter than the Dinosaurs. Every time humanity harvests food, (and/or harvests lumber) it takes resources from the land making the land less fertile. Humanity then uses fertilizers to replace the lost land resources. It is almost absolutely certain than after 50,000 years (and 50,000 years represents 50,000 loses of land resources) fertilizers will not be available to replace the lost land resources and humanity will starve to death. The only way to solve this conundrum is to reduce the human population to the lowest level possible. And the lowest level possible is the lowest level that will permit humanity to maintain the necessary genetic diversity. While I am not a geneticist, I would guess that number would be less than 50 million. The purpose of this paragraph is to cause you, the reader, to think about the possibility/probability/certainty that for humanity to survive on this planet for 50,000 years the population would have to be reduced by greater than 99%. In simple terms, every species that ever existed on the planet returned the resources it used to the planet to be again used in the future. The only exception to that statement is humanity—we use resources and do not return them to the land to be used in the future. The failure by humanity to return resources to the land to be used in the future means that humanity must go extinct. And humanity will go extinct in the very near future. I challenge anyone to write a paper to show that the math, facts or logic set forth in this paragraph is incorrect. And to be very direct, the only way that the human population can be reduced in time to prevent the collapse of civilization is by coercive population control.

It is now necessary and appropriate to discuss in some detail coercive population control. Every single human right, with the single exception of producing children, is in some manner controlled by society, when the exercise of that right may harm another person. I have the right to swing my arm, but I cannot swing it to smash into another person’s face. I have the right of free speech, but I cannot yell fire in a crowded space when there is no fire. Since the short term survival of humanity depends on reducing the population, having more than one child is an act of mass murder. And yet no one desires to prevent the collapse of civilization by coercive population control. The fact that most people object to coercive population control is not a sufficient reason not to impose it on all of humanity. To gamble the collapse of civilization on voluntary population control, when the chance of failure of voluntary population control is not known is an act of criminal stupidity.

Let me be very direct—I consider every person and every cleric of every religion who is opposed to abortion or who advises his/her followers to have more than one child to be a mass murderer. No country has been able to stop population growth without abortion being available to all who desire it at little or no cost. And if population growth continues, civilization must collapse with the deaths of billions. About 40% of all pregnancies are not planned for world-wide and in the USA. Yes, modern birth control methods could in the future reduce the need for abortions. However, modern methods of birth control will not in the foreseeable future eliminate the need for abortions to stop population growth world-wide. In simple and direct terms, population growth must cease due to the fact that the resources the planet provides to humanity are finite and limited and no action taken by humanity now or in the future will make those resources infinitely large.

I want to make it absolutely clear the limitation of child production to one child per family applies to every person on the planet. The limitation is to be applied to any every person, religion, group, nation, continent, developed, undeveloped, underdeveloped or area. There is nothing in the essay that is intended to be racist or limited to one group. Every person in a developed nation must be limited in the same manner as every person in an undeveloped nation.

A simple question—someone comes to you (the reader) and asks you to help him plan his family—he and his wife want to have six children. How do you respond? Do you respond -- great you are planning your family or do your respond you are a fool and causing the collapse of civilization? The words “family planning” is used by people who do not understand the problems facing humanity. Humanity must have ‘birth control” and not “family planning”. If the leaders of humanity do not use the proper words and do not demand that humanity follows the proper course of action, our civilization is doomed. The words “birth control” implies coercion and to that I respond coercion is the only way to prevent the collapse of civilization.

The fact that coercive population control may have failed when it was tried in India must not prevent the implementation of coercive population control in the future. Humanity, at this point in time, has only one choice---collapse of civilization with the deaths of billions or coercive population control. Based on that single choice, the leaders of humanity must take whatever steps are necessary to make coercive control work. Those steps may result in a very large number of people being executed for producing more than one child. The implementation process would advise every person that he or she would be executed if he or she produced more than one child and would provide every person with the education and means (including free or low cost abortions) to avoid producing a second child. Perhaps the easiest and best way to achieve that goal would be to permanently sterilize both the male and female after the birth of the first child.

Any person who produced a second child would not be a naive innocent after being told the reasons why he/she was limited to one child, after being provided with the means to prevent the birth of an additional child, and after being advised that he/she would be executed for producing a second child. In my view, that person would be an arrogant, egotistical fool who did not care that the production of a second child would lead to the collapse of civilization

There cannot be any doubt that a one child per family program would cause many social, political, and economic problems that would be extremely difficult or impossible to solve---one of those problems would be not enough young people to support the growing number of old people. Humanity, to the best of its ability, would have to minimize the problems and then suffer the remaining consequences. That is the price humanity will have to pay for its past stupidity of permitting the unnecessary and previous uncontrolled population growth. Permitting additional young people to be born to support old people would be a Ponzi scheme that must lead to the collapse of civilization.

Presently about eight nations have nuclear weapons—some have A-bombs and some have both A-bombs and H-bombs. In the future it is almost certain that additional nations could/would become members of the nuclear club. Unfortunately, there is also a possibility that terrorists could/would become members of the same club in the future---how far in the future no one can predict with accuracy. The A-bombs that ended the Second World War in 1945 had the equivalent of between 12,000 and 20,000 tons of TNT. An H-bomb type of device was exploded by the Russians that had the equivalent of 57 million tons of TNT. And this was only because the Russians did not want to reach the equivalent of 100 million tons of TNT. Those numbers again--- 12,000 compared with 100,000,000. Unless you can guarantee, with greater than 90% certainty, that the explosion of one nuclear device in anger, or even by accident, by one nation or group against another nation or group will not cause all, or most of the other, nuclear devices to go off, humanity must immediately impose coercive population control to reduce the chances of a nuclear Armageddon. A statement that cannot be challenged—the larger the population, the greater the chance that humanity will suffer a nuclear Armageddon.

At this point in the essay I am going to discuss four of the problems faced by humanity and how those problems relate to the near term collapse of civilization.

1. To make the results come out in the form of a percentage, I will assume that each person on average presently produces 1 pound of greenhouse gases per year. Since there are about 7.7 billion people on the planet, that would result in the production of 7.7 billion pounds of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere each year. If population was to increase to 10.9 billion, as estimated by the UN, each person would be limited to the production of 0.706 pounds of greenhouse gases ---0.706 times 10.9= 7.7. Just to not increase the production of greenhouse gases each person would have to, on the average, reduce his production by about 30%. And this reduction does take into account the increase in the production of greenhouse gases due the demands of the billions living in the undeveloped and underdeveloped nations of the world for an increased standard of living. Nor does it take into account the increase in the production of greenhouse gases by the industrialized and industrializing nations of the world. To gamble the prevention of one or more major catastrophes that will be caused by the increase into the atmosphere of an ever-growing amount of greenhouse gases by new and untested technological advances that would have to be used by most of the nations on planet is an extremely foolish and stupid gamble.
2. At present fossil fuels provide about 86% of all the energy used by humanity. Since fossil fuels are finite and limited at some point in time they will no longer be available to humanity. Anyone who disagrees with the previous statement and takes the position that fossil fuels will always be available to humanity is in idiot. All the other forms of energy are basically electricity. So far, the best of my knowledge, no other form of energy provides the weight power ratio that would permit a plane to carry people from Los Angeles to London or even from New York to Los Angeles. In reality, without fossil fuels it is almost certain that air travel and all air transportation will cease. Without fossil fuels (including coal), the only possible source of energy that will provide the power for international trade by the means of water transportation is nuclear energy. In fact, without fossil fuels it is almost certain that all water transportation will cease. While no one can guarantee the future, I cannot imagine a car carrying ferry being powered by electric batteries. There are many schemes for permitting major metropolitan areas to be powered by green energy—solar, wind, and tides. However, to the best of my knowledge, no one has put forth a detailed plan that would permit the New York Metropolitan area to function with green energy when an eight inch snow storm covered the entire North Eastern Area of the USA for nine or ten days. Unless humanity develops a technologically and practically feasible plan to replace fossil fuels, with 90% certainty, in all their uses such that civilization does not collapse prior to the exhaustion of fossil fuels, humanity must consider coercive population control. Remember that any plan replacing fossil fuels by any other energy sources in the future must be able to work for the entire planet. I am waiting for anyone to publish a detailed feasible plan for energy production that will be able to replace fossil fuels in all their uses such that civilization does not collapse prior to the time that fossil fuels are no longer available to humanity. And that plan must work for all of humanity. That plan must include every manner in which energy is used by humanity at every location energy is used. If such a plan is not developed (and I mean a technologically and practically feasible plan) in the very near future (we can debate how near, but it must be in the near future), there must be a dramatic reduction in both the economy of the planet and the number of humans on the planet to prevent the collapse of civilization and the deaths of billions in a violent and horrible manner.
3. The UN’s latest population estimates for specific countries in two extremely volatile areas

Country Population in the millions

Years 2019 2100

Egypt 100.4 224.7

Iraq 39.3 107.7

Israel 8.5 18.1

Saudi Arabia 34.3 42.2

State of Palestine 5.0 12.3

Syrian Arab Republic 17.0 36.1

Yemen 29.2 53.2

Iran 82.9 98.6

Population increase for Israel—9.6 million

Population increase in Muslim countries in close proximity to Israel---266.7 million

India 1,366.4 1,450.4

Pakistan 216.6 403.1

1. Many aquifers around the world have decreasing levels of water, including the aquifer under a portion of Northern China and the Ogallala aquifer under eight states in the Midwestern portion of the USA. No one can state with 100% accuracy when, or if ever, an aquifer will be unable to provide water for irrigation purposes. However, there cannot be any doubt that declining levels of water indicate that at some time in the future an aquifer will no longer be able to provide the water necessary for irrigation. If the aquifers under the Northern of China and/or the eight states in the USA were to no longer provide water for irrigation there would be a substantial decline in food production. The point is simple—in planning for the future, the leaders of humanity must consider the possibility/probability that one or more major aquifers will go dry and how that could affect food production for all of humanity.

A quote from Margaret Mead in ---1963

“We can no longer say that families should have as many children as they can afford, that all couples have a right to as many children as they wish. We cannot now as a people, continue to extol a way of life which… will ultimately turn the earth from a habitable place into a grim, overcrowded prison where individuals will survive only by stepping over the bodies of those struck down by hunger and despair. In the past, little could be done to avert disaster. The new element… Is the possibility of choice…. Above all we must recognize that the time to limit the size of families is now, that the living must take precedence over the unborn now if future generations are to be born into a livable world.”

There isn’t anything I can add to that quote.

At this point in the essay, it is necessary to consider the burden of proof. You have heard of the burden of proof, I am sure---in a criminal trial the prosecutor has the burden of proof that the defendant committed the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. In some trials the burden of proof may shift from one party to the other party after the initial party has made out a prima facie case. I believe that I have made out a prima facie case that humanity must immediately implement coercive population control (or at least made out a prima facie case that humanity must immediately compare coercive population control with voluntary population control) on a world-wide basis, if the human species is going to continue to survive on this planet for a very short period of time. Since I have made out a prima facie, the burden of proof shifts to anyone who disagrees with what I have written to prove I am incorrect in every aspect of what is set forth in this essay.

SUMMARY

Almost every intelligent person on the planet agrees with the proposition that population growth must cease, if humanity desires to survive on this planet even for a very short period of time. They and I disagree in a number of areas. They believe that humanity must gamble its survival on voluntary population control and I believe there isn’t any rational basis for the gamble. They even refuse to consider a study comparing voluntary population control and coercive population control. However, they cannot set forth any harm to humanity that will occur if such a study were undertaken. They refuse to determine, as best it can be determined, the chance voluntary population control will fail and that population will continue to grow until the growth is stopped by one or more major catastrophes causing the deaths of billions. It is unclear what proportion of intelligent people believes that population growth must cease and what portion believes that not only population growth must cease, but that it also must decrease. I believe that in order for humanity to remain on the earth for as long as possible the human population must be dramatically decreased. Every human being uses, and will continue to use, the finite and limited resources the planet provides humanity. Therefore, every single day and every single minute the remaining amount of resources that the planet can provide humanity in the future declines. At some point of time in the future, one or more of the essential nonrenewable finite and limited resources will no longer be available to humanity causing the collapse of civilization as we know it. The less resources used by humanity today, more resources will be available humanity in the future, thereby delaying the collapse of civilization. To the best of my knowledge, the largest structure ever created by humanity is the garbage dump containing the garbage created by New York City. That garbage dump is symbolic of the resources used by humanity that are not being recycled and will no longer be available humanity in the future. Another symbol of the resources used by humanity that will never be available for use by humanity in the future are the number of trees cut down every day to produce toilet paper that is flushed down the toilet. Not only must population growth cease, it must be decreased as rapidly as possible and to the lowest level that’s possible in order to permit humanity to survive on this planet the longest period of time. And there is not a single drop of evidence that voluntary population control will reduce the population fast enough and to the lowest level possible in order to permit humanity to survive on this planet longest period of time possible.

Almost everyone who reads this essay will be violently opposed the imposition of coercive population from on a worldwide basis. At this point I want to emphasize what I wrote above, that nothing in this essay is intended to be racist or to be applied to any special group. Anyone who reads this essay and believes it to be racist want to be applied to any specific group is not reading this essay correctly. All that I asked the reader to do is to read this essay and attempt to find errors in math, facts, and/or logic. If you, the reader, cannot find material errors in the math, facts, and/or logic, then you must agree with my conclusion--- and that conclusion is very simple. In order to prevent the collapse of civilization with the deaths of billions, even the extinction of the human species, and to permit humanity to survive on this planet longest possible period of time humanity must immediately impose coercive population control on a worldwide basis. I would be most happy if I could support voluntary population control. However, as indicated by everything written above, I believe that if humanity gambles its survival on voluntary population control that gamble will fail. I invite everyone reading this essay to write a paper supporting the proposition that is the best interest of humanity to gamble the collapse of civilization on voluntary population control, without comparing the chance that voluntary population control will fail with the chance that coercive population control will fail.

No matter how much you disagree with what is written in this essay, you cannot disagree with the math at the beginning of this essay. Even at 1% annual growth, the economy of the planet would be eight times as large as the current economy in 210 years. Anyone who believes that the planet can provide the resources to support an economy eight times as large as the current economy is a fool. Population growth must and will stop in less than 210 years. The only question is how. And if voluntary population growth fails to stop that growth prior to 210 years, it will be done with uncontrolled violence.

You are urged to read three books that can be obtained from Amazon or Barnes & Noble for nominal amounts of money—“Humans An Endangered Species” by Jason G Brent, “Blip” by Christopher Clugston, and “Our One and Only Spaceship--Denial, Delusion, and the Population Crisis” by Eric R. Pinka and Laurie J. Vitt. If you cannot afford to buy any or all of these books, please contact me and I will be happy to buy them for you. The only catch is that after you read any of them, you have to send me your comments and thoughts about what is contained in each book.