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Voluntary population control will fail to control population growth causing a major world-wide catastrophe in the very near future, probably before the year 2100. That catastrophe most likely will result in the destruction of civilization, as we know it, with the horrific deaths of billions and may even result in the elimination of the human species from the face of the earth. Since the earth is finite, population growth must cease—the earth will not support infinite population growth and no action by humanity can change that fact. At this point only two questions need to be considered—how will population growth cease and when will population growth cease?

There are three and only three ways that population growth will cease—1) War, disease, starvation and other horrors; 2) Voluntary control; and 3) Coercive population control. I defy anyone to set forth another method of population control. Since no one wants choice (1) and since all of humanity refuse to consider choice (3) at this point in time, our species is gambling the survival of all of humanity on choice (2)—voluntary population control. It is not mere stupidity, it is total insanity, that humanity is gambling its extinction on voluntary population control without determining the chance of failure of that method of control. I have not read, and I believe there does not exist, a detailed, comprehensive and intelligent analysis of all the factors necessary to determine the chance of failure of voluntary population control, even in a relatively broad range.

There are a very large number of problems (I will not list them, as they should be known to every person receiving a copy of this essay) that humanity now faces that could cause the collapse of civilization, either singly or in combination, in the very near future, probably before the year 2100. Therefore, to obtain the best estimate of failure of voluntary population control it will take a few years and a number of conferences of the best minds and best experts covering a number of different disciplines. I urge all those reading this essay to do all in their power to start the process necessary to obtain the best estimate of failure of voluntary control.

At this point, notwithstanding what I have written in the paragraph above, it is my intention to present a very strong case that the chance of failure of voluntary population control is greater than 95%. Since we are considering the possible total collapse of civilization, the deaths of billions and even the extinction of the human species, a chance of failure of 10% or greater demands the immediate consideration (and I do mean immediate) of coercive population, as that is the only alternative to voluntary control. In my view, if the chance of failure of voluntary control is 90% or greater we do not need discussion or evaluation; we need immediate implementation of coercive population control. I will set forth, in no particular order, seven reasons why voluntary control will fail. There could be many more reasons for failure, but these are seven that I could quickly think of.

1. The desire for power.
2. Culture—a male’s status may be determined by the number of children he produces,
3. Religious fanaticism.
4. Errors made by the UN’s demographers.
5. The numbers issued by the UN are based on an unsupported assumption.
6. The cowardice of the moral and intellectual leaders of humanity. They all, without a single exception, use the words “family planning”, rather than the words “birth control”.
7. Decrease in population instead of merely stopping population growth.

A group’s power is determined, in part, by the number of its followers and the number in its military. In a democracy the outcome of an election is determined by the number of people who push the lever for a certain candidate. No one is concerned about the morality, the business acumen, the intelligence, knowledge of the problems that society faces, or anything else of the lever pusher. All that counts is bodies. Even today with weapons of mass destruction, the number of bodies in a nation’s military is one consideration of the power of that nation. I can absolutely guarantee that over time group A or nation A will attempt to gain power over group B or nation B by increasing its population and when group B or nation B learns of that power grab there will be a breeding war. The hell with voluntary population control! More than a few leaders of Islam have openly stated that Islam will conquer Western Civilization not by weapons of war, but by the weapons of the penis and womb—population growth. Not one western leader has intelligently listened to that statement

According to the Pew Research Center, Islam will equal Christianity in number of adherents in about 2050 and surpass it by 2070. According to that organization, Islam will grow by 73% while Christianity will grow by 35% by mid-century. Also by mid-century, 40% of all Christians will live in sub-Saharan Africa. The Christians that live in sub-Saharan Africa are much more likely to follow Catholic Church doctrine regarding abortion and birth control. And anyone who follows Catholic Church doctrine regarding birth control and abortion is more likely to have in excess of two children continuing the exploding human population. According to Pew the world average total fertility rate (TFR) is 2.5 with the Christians coming in at 2.7 and the Muslims coming in at 3.1, the highest for any religious group.

No citation of authority is needed to state that there are many cultures on the planet in which the status of a male is determined wholly, or in part, by the number of children he produces. In many cultures the status is additionally determined by how many male children he produces. The best proof of these two statements is the number female abortions in China, substantially changing the birth sex ratio. While cultures can be changed, it is almost certain that cultural change on a world-wide basis cannot be achieved in time to prevent the exploding population from causing a major world-wide human catastrophe.

Today Catholic doctrine demands that the followers of the religion do not use the most modern means of birth control, only the rhythm method and the rhythm method is a very bad joke—it does not work. That doctrine also demands no abortion. No nation on the earth has ever controlled it population without abortion being cheaply, or at no cost, available to its citizens and the most modern means of birth control will not change that fact. Even the most modern means of birth control are not used properly, are not used in the heat of passion, and sometimes just fail. I will concede that many, if not most, Catholics in the USA and the other industrialized nations do not follow the Church doctrine regarding birth control usage. However, the vast majority of Catholics in the third world follow that doctrine. The best example of that fact is the fertility rate in the Philippines and in Africa. Most Catholics, even those in the USA and other industrialized nations follow Catholic doctrine regarding abortions. The best example of this is Melinda Gates, wife of Bill Gates. She was brought up a very devout Catholic, whose aunt was a nun, and she attended Catholic schools. She has come out in favor of birth control after visiting third world nations and seeing the horrors caused by having a large number of unplanned and unwanted children. However, to the best of my knowledge she has not come out in favor of abortion. In the USA, according to the best information, over 40% of all pregnancies are unplanned. That percentage is probably the same or higher in the rest of the world. Now to come to the conclusion regarding Catholic doctrine---without a change in Catholic doctrine voluntary control must fail to prevent a major catastrophe caused by the ever growing human population. The
Catholic Church will never change its doctrine on either birth control or abortion. The reason is simple—if the Church changed its doctrine relating to either or both of those concepts even the dumbest follower would realize that the Church did not receive its doctrine from God.

Orthodox Jewish Rabbis exercise mind control over their followers and demand that their followers have children beyond number. While their number is miniscule compared to those of the Catholic Church, the concept is exactly the same. Many Protestant Pastors condemn abortion causing their followers to have children they did not plan for, cannot support, and do not want. And without abortion voluntary population control must fail. Mormons, on average, have more than two children per couple. No action, in my opinion, will cause the followers of the Mormon religion to reduce their average number of children per couple short of killing every member of that religion. **Voluntary population control** **will fail because religion will do all in its power to cause it to fail**.

While the UN’s demographers are probably among the best on the planet, in 2004 they predicted (medium variant prediction) the population in 2100 at 9.1 billion and then in 2015 increased that prediction to over 11.2 billion. In just 11 years the UN’s demographers increased their prediction for 2100 by about 2.1 billion. Either they are incompetent fools or voluntary control is a complete and total failure. You make the choice.

The UN’s medium variant prediction, the most used and quoted prediction, is based on the ASSUMPTION that the TFR will decline to 1.85 by the year 2050. The word “assumption” was set forth in the papers released when the UN issued its predictions about population growth. The UN did not set forth any facts supporting its assumption. Humanity cannot and must not gamble its extinction on an ASSUMPTION.

The UN’s demographers issued two additional predictions that are very important for any consideration of the future of humankind. The high prediction (an increase in TFR of 0.5 children per woman above the medium variant prediction) would increase the estimated population for 2100 to above 16 billion and the constant fertility prediction (no increase or decrease in the current TFR) would increase the estimated population for 2100 to above 25 billion. Anyone who takes the position that he/she would NEVER consider coercive population control is fool and potential mass murderer. The determination of the method that humanity must use to control population must be evaluated and reevaluated periodically based on future events.

A fair and logical question that should be answered by all those opposed to coercive population control-- assume that the TFR did not decline and remained at the constant fertility level and it was determined in 2030 that the humanity population level at was on the way toward over 25 billion in the year 2100, would you still refuse to even consider coercive population control and still gamble the survival of humanity on voluntary population control? To put the question differently, is there any event or events that could occur in the future that would cause you to change your mind and support coercive population control? If your answer was that no future situation or facts would cause me to change my mind and I will never support coercive population control, you are a fool and mass murder. Since humanity has on average, about a lifespan of about 70 years, a final decision must be made no later than 2030, as to which method of population control is in the best interest of humanity. If humanity were on track in 2030 to reach above 25 billion in the year 2100, logic demands that humanity immediately institute coercive population control in that year. The previous sentence is overly optimistic. If humanity were on track in the year 2030 to reach any population level greater than the estimated 11.2 billion in 2100 of the medium variant projection, it would be irrational not to immediately institute coercive population control 2030, as it is almost certain that any attempt to reach a population greater than 11.2 billion in the year 2100 would lead to the collapse of civilization before 2100.

To the best of my knowledge, everyone concerned about the coming collapse of civilization caused by the exploding population uses the words “family planning” and not the words
“birth control”. Some claim that “family planning” and “birth control” are the same thing—covey the same concepts to those that hear or read those words. They are not the same thing and are entirely different concepts. If you want people to limit the number of children they produce, you must clearly state your desire and the words “family planning” does not state that desire clearly. You must advise the people that they must use “birth control” and that they must limit themselves to no more than one or two children. How would you respond to the following statement? –“I want you to help me plan my family, my wife and I want a minimum of eight children and we can afford them”. If you respond that he (the person who made the statement) was a very wise man who planned his family, you would, in my opinion, be assisting in the destruction of civilization. If you respond that having eight children was extremely destructive, he would laugh in your face. The point is simple—we must use the proper words and if we are afraid to do that voluntary population control will fail. Some refuse to use “birth control” because those words imply coercion. If coercion is what is necessary to prevent the extinction of humankind, then we must not shy away from using the proper words.

Since the planet is finite in size, neither population nor economic growth can continue forever into the future. Both must stop at some time in the future. Anyone who disputes those two statements is an idiot. That is not a personal attack. It is a statement of fact. Due to the power of compound growth, both the economy and population must stop growth in the very near future. President Trump stated the he would cause the economy of the USA to grow at an annual rate of 3.5%. Not to attack President Trump, Hillary would have made a very similar statement. At a compound growth rate of 3.5%, everything doubles about every twenty years. Since there are 83 years until 2100, there would be over four doublings resulting in an economy being over 16 times (2,4,8,16) as large as the current economy. The same calculation would apply to the entire planet, if the economy of the entire planet grew at the annual rate of 3.5%. Neither the economy of the planet nor the economy of the USA will ever achieve an economy 16 times as large as the current economy. In my opinion (it is just a statement of opinion that I am not going to support at this time with proof) neither will ever achieve an economy even four times as large as the current economy. Based the logic set forth above, it is reasonable to assume that economic growth will cease before the year 2100. Reducing the assumed growth rate will only slightly increase the time until both must cease growth. And when economic growth ceases, population growth must cease at the same time or shortly thereafter. Based on an annual growth rate of 3.5%, ten doublings would require only 200 years resulting in a growth factor of 1,024—2,4,8,16,32, 64, 128. 256, 512, 1,024. Anyone who believes that either the economy of the USA or of the economy of the entire planet can ever grow by a factor of 1,024 is an idiot. Again that is not a personal attack. It is a simple statement of fact. No new technologies will permit the economy of the world to grow by a factor of 1,024.

After population reaches its peak, and it must reach a peak, only one thing happen—sometime after it reaches its peak it must start to decline due to the fact that the peak population will be using non-renewable resources until one or more of the essential resources necessary for modern civilization to exist (and all substitutes) are no longer available to humanity. The previous statement also applies to theoretically renewable resources. Based on the fact that at some time in the future the human population will have to decline, not merely reduce growth to zero, voluntary control will not only have to reduce population growth to zero, but will have to cause it to decline. Due to the average life span of humanity (and that life span is increasing), population control will have to commence many years prior to the coming collapse. And humanity will not accept or participate in voluntary control until the tragedy is upon them---voluntary population control will not start the necessary 75 or 80 years prior to the destruction of civilization.

Looking at the problem in a different manner, no one knows what level of the human population will permit the human species to exist on this planet for the very, very short period of time of 1,000 years. (Note that dinosaurs ruled the planet for about 65 million years.) There are three and only three choices for that level—1) Lower than the current level of about 7.3 billion; 2) The current level of about 7.3 billion; or 3) As some level greater than the current level of 7.3 billion. If the survival level, the level that would permit the human species to exist on this planet for 1,000 years, was 7.3 billion or lower (choices 1 and 2) it would require the immediate commencement of voluntary population control today and that have to be on a world-wide basis with 100% effectiveness. To summarize the point so far—if the survival level is 7.3 billion or lower voluntary control will not work and civilization will collapse. It is that simple. Since the year 2100 is within the life span of someone born today and since the predicted population is over 11.213 billion for 2100, if the salvation level is between 7.3 and 11.213 billion, voluntary population control must start today on a world-wide basis with 100% effectiveness. That is not going to happen. No one on the face of the earth can show with 100% certainty that the salvation level is greater than 11.213 billion. To summarize this paragraph, humanity is doomed to destruction unless coercive population control is started today on a world-wide basis with 100% effectiveness.

A number of experts (whatever the word “experts means) have stated that the salvation level (for this essay the “salvation level” has been defined as the highest level of the human population that will permit humanity to exist on the planet for 1,000 years) is no greater than 2 billion people. If that statement is correct, there is absolutely no chance of that level being obtained by voluntary population control in time to prevent the collapse of civilization with the deaths of billions and most probably the extinction of the human species. Remember we are on the way to over 11.213 billion by the year 2100. If that statement has only a 10% or even a 20% chance of being correct, the failure to consider coercive population control is an act of supreme arrogance and mass suicide.

Since all fossil fuels are finite, at some point of time in the future they will no longer be available to humanity. I can state with absolute certainty that there is some chance that all alternative sources of energy combined with all other resources that will be available to humanity when fossil fuels are no longer available will not be able to replace fossil fuels in all their uses, such that humanity suffers a violent major catastrophe. To use different words, no one on the planet can guarantee with absolute certainty that when fossil fuels are no longer available there will not be a violent and massive die-off of humanity. Even if there is only a 10% or 20% chance of a major die-off when fossil fuels are no longer available to humanity, it is an act of supreme stupidity and arrogance not to compare and consider both voluntary and coercive population control.

Fred Hoyle, the famous British scientist has stated that humanity only has one shot at civilization. If civilization is destroyed there will not be enough resources to start civilization again. The human species cannot make even one single mistake. Therefore, humanity must take the most conservative position regarding everything set forth in this essay.

At this point you, the reader, may scream at the top of your lungs that the author of this essay is a fool. The author previously showed that almost most every religion would work against voluntary control. Therefore, it can be assumed with almost 100% certainty, that those same religions, and same religious leaders, would violently oppose coercive population control. How is that conundrum solved? The solution is very simple---to save the human species from extinction, execute every religious leader who opposes coercive population control, opposes the use of the most modern means of birth control and/or opposes abortion for crimes against humanity. And they would be committing crimes against humanity when they opposed coercive control and advised their adherents to oppose coercive control. You don’t like what the author has written so far in this paragraph. You think the author is an immoral and evil fool for what he has written in this paragraph. That is your problem. Any attempt to maintain continuing population growth on the finite planet will lead to the extinction of the human species. And if you disagree with that statement and contend that the human population can continue to grow, you are an idiot. Therefore, there must be a showdown between those religious leaders who demand continued population growth and those of us that want humans to continue to exist on this planet. Abstinence and the rhythm methods of birth control are very bad jokes on humanity—they do not work. Therefore, in reality, the Catholic Church is demanding continuous population growth and any statement made by the Pope or any other Catholic leader to the contrary is also a very bad joke on humanity. Humanity is now faced with a choice—compel all religions to change their positions on birth control and abortion or face extinction of the human species in the very near future. The choice is ours to make.

There is one and only one question that humanity must answer today—what action is better for all of humankind, discuss, debate, evaluate, analyze and consider all aspects of the exploding human population including all methods of birth control or not to have any discussion? I cannot think of one reason why discussion would be harmful and I can think of many, many reason why failing to have that discussion would be harmful. No, that is not correct!!! Not having any discussion is not merely harmful; it will lead to the extinction of all of humanity by the year 2075.

One last comment. Lifesite, an anti-abortion organization, on its web site stated that within the last 40 years 1.72 billion abortions had been performed worldwide. The best estimate is that China’s one child policy reduced population growth over a similar period by 400 million. Combing those two numbers, 2.12 billion, plus an additional 880 million that would have been the offspring of the original 2.12 billion totals 3.0 billion additional human beings that would have been alive today. Instead of the human population being 7.3 billion, today’s best estimate, it would have been 10.3 billion. I will admit that the 880 million offspring that would have been born is my estimate (and a very conservative one) as I have never seen an estimate as to the potential offspring of those aborted. Being off a few hundred million does not change the point of this paragraph. Without those abortions and without
China’s one child policy, the human population would have exceeded 10 billion today instead of being 7.3 billion. Based on today’s population of 7.3 billion, the UN’s demographers are predicting that the population will be over 11.213 billion in 2100, an increase of 53.6 %. Apply that percentage increase to 10.3 billion, the estimated population without abortion and without China’s one child policy, would result in a population of over 15.8 billion in 2100. I leave it to your imagination as to how society would function today with 10.3 billion instead of 7.3 billion. In my best non-academic language, only a fool or an insane person can believe that the human population will reach almost 16 billion in the year 2100, after considering that the per capita usage is continuously increasing and that the resources the earth can provide to humanity are finite and limited. Collapse of society must occur prior to 2100. Since, according to the best estimates, over 40% of all pregnancies world-wide are unplanned, only a fool or a power hungry maniac (also known as a religious leader) would attempt to prevent all abortions.