

**Archive of the Population-Environment Research Network (PERN)
Cyberseminar Discussions on The Global Science Panel's Preliminary
Statement on Population and Environment for Earth Summit 2002.¹
October - November 2001**

**From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Welcome to the Population in Sustainable
Development Cyberseminar: Some guidelines
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 09:02:14 -0500**

Welcome to the second Population Environment Research Network
Cyberseminar!

This message announces the formal start of the cyberseminar on
"Population in Sustainable Development: the Preliminary Statement of the
Global Science Panel". The seminar runs from October 17 through November
30, 2001 and functions through this listserve. The purpose of this
message is to provide some substantive background and guidelines to
initiate discussion.

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.

With Maurice Strong and Nafis Sadik as patrons, the Global Science Panel
comprises about 25 distinguished international experts from various
disciplines. The Panel seeks to "assess the role of the population
variable in sustainable development and to build a bridge between the
Rio and Cairo processes".

The Panel seeks contributions from the wider research community to the
preliminary statement. This gives you a chance to influence the content
and terminology of the Statement, and ideally the substance of debate
and resolutions at the WSSD. The statement is intended to communicate
key ideas and themes emerging from decades of research into
population-environment-development relationships to the WSSD
participants, rather than to be a comprehensive science statement. (The

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

final Statement will be only 15 pages). Keep in mind the Summit is essentially a political event, so that the practical aim of the GSP Statement is to provide useful and comprehensible input from the science community to the Summit debate.

To participate in the seminar, first download and read the 12-page Preliminary Statement (in PDF format) from our www.populationenvironmentresearch.org (cyberseminar page). Post messages to this listserve to share your comments, concerns, ideas, and case studies with the other participants and Panel members. The statement already incorporates many questions to guide readers; some questions to consider include:

- What are relevant "population variables" to consider in the debate about how to achieve "sustainable development"?
- What key themes have emerged from the past decade of research about population-environment dynamics (i.e., since the 1992 Earth Summit)?
- Do you agree with the Panels' proposal to use the term Population Balance (instead of population stabilization)?
- Is the concept of "differentiated vulnerability/ responsibility" appropriate and useful?

Your comments will be read by members of the Population Environment Research Network and Global Science Panelists. We (the Network coordinators) will review and summarize periodic 'digests' of comments.

Your comments will facilitate and inform revisions of the statement in time for the January PrepCom for the WSSD. This seminar, unlike previous Cyberseminars we have managed, will function through a list-serve. Network Members are enrolled automatically, and you should have already received a welcome message with instructions (please read and save). (Non-registered members of the Network can also join the discussion; visit the cyberseminar page for instructions.) Participants can unsubscribe at anytime.

You may forward this email to others who you think might be interested in the seminar. Thank you for your participation. We are looking forward to the discussion.

Laura Murphy & Catherine Marquette
Coordinators, Population Environment Research Network
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>

To communicate with coordinators directly:
Pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org
To post messages to the listserve: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

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

From: "Angelica Almeyda" <aalmeyda@terra.com.pe>

To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERN seminar] Introduction

Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 09:35:32 -0500

Dear all,

My name is Angelica Almeyda, I am a peruvian forester.
Since March 2000 I am working for the Instituto del Bien Comun (Lima, Perú)
as Research Assistant at the ACRI (Amazon Community-based resource
management Research Initiative) Program.

This program is partnered with Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia
(IPAM-Belem do Pará, Brasil), Oxfam America (Boston EUA and Lima) and
Woods Hole Research Center-Amazon Program (Woods Hole, MA, EUA). The
central goal of this partnership is to improve the understanding and the practice
of resource management at the community level in the Amazon Basin. Through
the networks and policy work of each of the partners, the project aims to have a
positive impact on community-based conservation activities worldwide.

Working in the Peruvian team I am involved in the process of identification
of the elements of and obstacles to success in local initiatives to manage
Amazonian natural resources through case study research that implies field
evaluations and analysis work with an interdisciplinary approach.

This is the first time I participate of a list server I expect to learn and
to be able to contribute to it.

sincerely,
Angelica

Programa ACRI (Amazon Community-based resource management Research
Initiative)

Instituto del Bien Común (IBC)

Av. Petit Thouars 4377, Lima 18, PERU

Telf (511) 440-0006 / 421-7579; Fax 421-8942

www.biencomun-peru.org

From: Caycho Chumpitaz Carlos Teodoro <Ccaycho@correo.ulima.edu.pe>

To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Subject: [PERN seminar] Introduction
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 10:26:07 -0500

My Greetings.

My name is Carlos Caycho, I am Statistician and Masters in Population. At the moment work in the University of Lima like Professor of Statistic and Member of the Environmental Studies Center (CEA). In the CEA we made academic activities and projects of investigation on the relation population and atmosphere. We are on the verge of initiating a project of environmental education via Internet. Also the Center of Technological Efficiency has been started whose goal is to foment and to give the fundamental lineaments for the clean application of the production with technology. To the date, we are in total execution of an International Seminary on Quality, Productividad and Environment. It is the first time that I participate in this type of events.

CARLOS CAYCHO
Statistician and Masters in Population
ccaycho@correo.ulima.edu.pe
511 724-6408, 511 328-0867
Environmental Studies Center
Universidad de Lima.

From: murphyll@bellsouth.net
To: pernsminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN seminar] Comments of Dan Hogan on GSP Statement
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 12:02:05 -0400

I am posting here the comments of Dan Hogan, Network member, steering committee member, and Global Science Panelist. First is a brief summary of his key points in response to the GSP statement (my apologies for errors in interpretation). Please read his full comments below.

Summary: Hogan urges further distinction between "people"; who are rightly at the heart of development, vs. "population"; which should be only one dimension. The consumption vs. development argument must be superseded, as must the rich vs poor country impasse: the Cairo Action plan and its focus on the interrelationships between population, growth and development offers a model. The vulnerability/responsibility framework is useful and reflects the state of the art in sustainable development thinking. Migration and urban sprawl are among the population distribution variables which deserve more attention. Population Balance is an improvement on stabilization; but broader socio-demographic dimensions must be considered: namely, 1) household composition and differential vulnerability, 2) morbidity and mortality, and 3) spatial distribution. The

case studies approach is promising but suggests country level studies, while regional/local approaches might better capture the focus on people in relation to specific (localized) natural resources and constraints. The IPAT equation, a first approximation to the idea that environmental change involves complex interactions among several factors, perhaps receives too much attention.

Full Comments by Dan Hogan on Population in Sustainable development, Global Science Panel on Population and Environment:

1-As a point of departure, I would like to emphasize that the population/environment debate at Rio reached an impasse between rich countries (especially Bush I) and poor countries. The former insisted on including concerns for population growth rates in poor countries on the agenda but resisted the counter-demand of the latter to consider unsustainable patterns of production and consumption of rich countries on an equal basis. The result, in Agenda 21, was a chapter on demographic dynamics and sustainability and another on changing consumption patterns, neither of which said very much. The Cairo Action Program, on the other hand, resolved this impasse in a very intelligent chapter on inter-relations among population, sustained economic growth and sustainable development, where both population growth and production and consumption patterns were recognized as important factors. This point needs reinforcing in Johannesburg, where the world's environmental lobby (government agencies and NGOs) will be in full force. The Rio impasse was easier to resolve in the context of the population lobby; the Cairo formulation needs to be strengthened by endorsement in Johannesburg. What remains to be squarely faced is the relationship between these two factors: if in today's world, rich countries' production and consumption patterns have greater environmental impact than population growth of the poor, What will happen if there is development, and if this development is a mirror image of currently developed countries?

2-In the Introduction, the emphasis on people and demographic issues at the core of sustainable development glosses over the difference between the two expressions. Concern with people means that not economic indicators but social welfare indicators should be the focus of sustainable development. There is considerable consensus on this. I would argue, though, that demographic issues are an important dimension of sustainable development, but not at its core, which I would identify in such issues as processes of production and consumption, social justice, equality of opportunity and equitable trade relations. To consider demographic issues to be the core; seems to hark back to the earlier view of size and growth as the major stumbling block. An alternative formulation could be: preparatory process for the Summit do not appear to recognize and incorporate the (socio?) demographic dimension of sustainable development.

3-The human dimension should be certainly be a central focus of the Johannesburg agenda, but I have not seen the preliminary documents.

4-Rio thinking was perhaps more dominated by the idea of demographic transition and the prospect for decline of growth rates than the idea of convergence. This item raises good points but I think they represent a more recent perception and not a counterpoint to Rio thinking. The rationale is developed to identify the demographic divide, which is a good synthesis of the current situation and is useful.

5-The vulnerability/responsibility framework is the leading edge of thinking on sustainable development, and relating socio-demographic dimensions to this vulnerability will be important. (Our work at Nepo seeks to develop the idea that vulnerability is the flip side of sustainability; to the extent we can identify and reduce vulnerability, we promote sustainability. The first concept lend itself more easily to empirical verification.)

6-The discussion on kinds of consumption is a useful direction to take and could be developed further. But the treatment of consumption begs the question of the population versus consumption debate, which was so central in Rio. The better treatment given to this issue in Cairo still requires much conceptual and political development to be efficacious.

7-On IPAT: Do we really have to beat a dead horse? I have always understood IPAT in the way the box represents it as a first approximation to the idea that environmental change involves complex interactions among several factors. Maybe this point could be made without once more criticizing IPAT. (Or maybe I underestimate its continued importance.)

8-on the Population, Poverty and Differential Vulnerability item: what is left out are population distribution processes which have major impacts on environmental quality. Even with zero or negative growth, where the population lives, works and plays will be crucial for sustainability. Many forms of population mobility are increasing: seasonal migration, international migration, commuting, tourism, short-distance moves: each has distinct environmental consequences on both sending and receiving places. Population density (of cities or regions and of households) has clear implications for the pressure on natural resources; in the home, many environmental illnesses are promoted by higher density (see the World Development Report of 1993 and its chapter on environmental health, for example). Urban sprawl consumes valuable soils and vegetation cover and makes the provision of environmental services, such as water distribution, sewage collection, garbage collection, paved streets, more difficult; it also requires a transportation system which is usually automobile-dependent, contributing to air pollution.

9-Population balance is a considerable improvement over population stabilization, but it is not clear what the policy implications would be (implications which were so clear in the population stabilization framework). I prefer to look at the socio-demographic dimensions of sustainability or sustainable development:

9a. household and family composition; differential vulnerability in situations of younger households (infants and children more subject to environmental stress; adolescents subject to greater unemployment); female-headed households, where all the burden for providing sustenance falls on women's shoulders; elderly households, which also have greater vulnerability to environmental hazards and reduced means of protection.

9b. Morbidity-mortality issues. When the causal arrow is environment -> population, this is the most sensitive demographic issue. The 1990s witnessed considerable advances in our ability to synthesize and weigh the consequences of environmental change on health. Some of this work has been done by demographers, but most of it has been by epidemiologists.

9c. Population distribution processes (briefly discussed above). Such an approach seems to be in line with traditional population research, and together with the emphasis on differential impacts of/on specific population segments, may provide a framework for identifying the ways population dynamics affect environmental change and vice-versa. On the other hand, the advantage of the population balance notion which should not be underestimated is that it more clearly signals a shift from earlier positions. This is especially important for communicating with the larger scientific and political community.

10- I fully agree that the emphasis should be on differentiated vulnerabilities and responsibilities, talking about people rather than countries. But the case studies suggested take us back to countries. Wouldn't it be possible to think of case studies at the regional or local level, where population factors (or some population factor) and environmental sustainability have been resolved in particularly innovative manners? The local/regional emphasis is, I believe, important when we consider that natural resources and mutual impacts of society and nature are spatially located. Even within a country, different ecosystems are more or less vulnerable. Much more than population change (affected by society-wide factors), environmental change is for the most part localized in specific contexts. A set of case studies on a health issue (Theo Colburn's work for example), a distribution issue (sprawl, for example), age issues (vulnerability of older or younger groups), or different burdens of women and men might give more a more concrete emphasis than national case studies. Cases should be chosen which identify not only vulnerabilities but positive actions which have ameliorated the situation.

(end of comments by Dan Hogan)

From: murphyll@bellsouth.net
To: pernsminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN seminar] comments of Sylvia Karlsson on GSP statement
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 13:29:14 -0400

Comments from Sylvia Karlsson
International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change,
Bonn, Germany.

Dr. Karlsson points out that human dimensions researchers have multiple options for processes that will feed into Johannesburg, including ICSU (International Council of Science) which is the official organizer of scientific input to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. A challenge is to gain recognition for human dimensions knowledge as valid scientific input in e.g. scientific advisory processes at the global level. It would be a big step forward if it would be possible in this respect to bridge the development studies disciplines with those of environmental science and human dimensions. Currently, as evidenced by discussions in the Regional Roundtables of Eminent Persons this summer, there has been little reference to the need for more knowledge on the nature and magnitude of environmental problem in order to make progress towards sustainable development. Rather, it was issues such as poverty and lack of good governance which were listed as the major challenges. But !
for these human dimensions issues there is no reference to the value of scientific knowledge, probably because they are not interpreted as science related in the same way the natural science aspects of environmental issues are. Yet, if we could conceive of a research project which would seek to understand and evaluate the Rio process and the implementation of Agenda 21, the human dimensions community is precisely the group which could do that. In such a project we would likely have to give more attention to the deeper driving forces for the problems. Then one comes down to the world views and values which characterise societies and the role of education in shaping these. Such emphasis would also lead to the realization of the limits of scientific knowledge as the only means of ensuring enlightened decision making for sustainable development, and the importance of the value dimension. She argued that the scientific community should see the Johannesburg Summit not only as a target to influence with its knowledge, but also as a learning process where we will have the opportunity to listen to and interact with other groups.

Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 13:36:03 -0400
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN seminar] introduction and comments

Greetings,

Thanks is owed to the organizers of this cyberseminar; these are valuable tools for those humans fortunate enough to have computers and email/internet. I am Steve Kurtz, a volunteer researcher and sustainability activist in

Ottawa, Canada. While I can't contribute statistical skills or demographic expertise, I'll try to keep the ecological wholesystem perspective 'on the table'.

Feedback from human activity is complex. We are a patch disturbant species, and we displace other life forms by our very existance - no matter how simply we live. Only human parasites live on or within us. It is also true that the messes we make provide wonderful habitat for organisms that thrive in the altered environment. It should be kept in mind that we will become extinct someday; not "if", but "when" is the question.

The I=PAT discussion in the paper is inadequate in my view. The drainage of aquifers, monoculture food vulnerability, dependence on non-human calories (particularly petroleum) for agriculture, warmth, shelter, transport, etc., and forest, biodiversity, & topsoil loss are some examples of symptoms of the massive overshoot of human numbers.

Biologists would classify our 400% increase in one century as a "plague phase", as is done for similiar behavior by other large mammals in a comparable geological time frame.(See _The Spirit in the Gene_, Reg Morrison, fwd by Lynn Margulis) It is certainly desirable to seek to narrow the wealth/well-being gap. My interest is to foster less suffering in the future as well as in the present. There is a dilemma here. If access to consumption by the needy is increased, probability of sustainability (avoidance of major systemic breakdown) is reduced unless an equal reduction in consumption by others offsets it. This is proving difficult to achieve voluntarily.

Involuntary simplicity is the rule.

Facing this dilemma is emotionally difficult. With 250,000 net additional humans on earth daily, the average slice of a shrinking natural pie is smaller each day. Neither "Stabilization" nor "Balance" is likely to be acheived at anywhere near the present levels of population and average global consumption. Like it or not, rational reductions in population AND consumption per/capita over time offer the best chances for less suffering in the future.

The LDCs have sought help(largely unsuccessfully) from the wealthy nations for decades for population programs. They formed Partners in Population and Development, and later The South-South Initiative to help themselves.

Documented:

<http://www.ryerson.ca/~woc/Discussion%20Papers/kurtzpaper2.htm>

In this short paper (given to The World Congress for the Systems Sciences July 2000) womens empowerment and better wholistic education for all is suggested as of utmost importance. We indeed have a tough job ahead with religious fundamentalists (many sects) and the 'money gods' providing opposition.

As I will be travelling next week, I will be likely unable to interact much during that time. Thanks again for the opportunity to participate.

Steven B. Kurtz

--

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

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

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] An economic model for sustainability
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 06:46:57 +1000

We feel that the policy statement suffers from a lack of emphasis on economics. Surely the whole question of population in sustainable development revolves around economic factors. The paramount priority should be to put forward an economic model that will enable population and environment to coexist.

If such an economic model could be found the statement on page 5 "There does not seem to be a universal remedy against vulnerability" would not be true. This economic model would become the universal remedy.

In point of fact standard Keynesian economics provides such an economic model as soon as you factor in a situation where there is a declining population. It is a basic principle of Keynesian economics that if you take property out of circulation, the value of property which remains in the market will increase. Using this principle it is possible to construct an economic model that will produce an ever-escalating curve of prosperity for all.

This model would work for any developed country with a declining population. For the sake of demonstration let us assume that the population of the United States was in decline. This could easily happen if the government dropped all incentives and financial assistance to families to have children, and curbed immigration.

Also in the United States, as with most developed countries, the rural sector is in a bad way. It limps along with the aid of subsidies and protective tariffs and direct government assistance. The Bush administration is proposing to put through a \$79 billion dollar Farm Bill.

There are many depressed rural areas where unemployment rates are very high. Property values in depressed rural areas are in a permanent slump and properties in small country towns are worth only a fraction of comparable properties in the cities.

With the population in decline in every State of the United States the construction sector of the economy would also be depressed. The major problem when there is a declining population is that there is a decline in the demand for housing, particularly new housing. The downturn in the construction sector would flow through to all support industries. Real estate values generally would be in a state of decline, as would rental returns and occupancy rates in established housing.

If this was the actual situation in the United States where the population was in decline then obviously the economy would be spiralling into irreversible depression. So how does our economic model manage to turn this around? The answer is for the government to adopt an affirmative recycling policy.

Quite simply land is reclaimed for the purpose of regenerating wilderness. The owner of the land that is reclaimed is paid not just the market price of the land, but is paid a price that would enable him/her to buy a property elsewhere. This would mean a win-win situation for the farming community. The farmer whose property is reclaimed is paid more than market value which could not be obtained by any other means. As more and more farms are reclaimed, those farms remaining would escalate in price because there is less competition and less farms available for sale.

The same win-win situation would apply for people who live in small country towns. The owners of properties in those towns that are reclaimed will receive a sufficient price for their property to enable them to buy a comparable property in another country town should they so desire. This in turn would increase the demand for housing in remaining country towns, which in turn would escalate the values of those properties and stimulate local commerce.

Generally speaking an affirmative recycling policy means that the owner of the property that is reclaimed is paid more than market value, and the values of the remaining properties escalate because the demand for them is now greater. It is simply the Keynesian principle of taking property out of circulation, which increases the value of properties that remain in the market.

The money that is currently being channelled into assistance packages for farmers and welfare for people living in depressed rural areas would be sufficient to implement an affirmative recycling policy. Such a policy

properly implemented would actually make the United States more prosperous than it is right now.

Zero unemployment is feasible

Unemployment results from there being less jobs available than there are people to fill them. In a free-market economy where population levels are declining it would be possible to achieve the reverse situation where there are more jobs available than there are people to fill them. The demand for labor would rise, which on basic principles of Keynesian economics means that salaries would rise. The problem of unemployment would become a thing of the past.

There is a proviso here, in that this scenario is only feasible as long as real estate values are also rising. Provided the government also adopts an affirmative recycling policy to keep real estate values rising there is in principle no limit to the degree of prosperity that can be achieved with a declining population. Essentially what this means is that the more a country reduces its population the more prosperous it will become.

A solution to the 'greying' problem

The only reason why there is a 'greying' problem is that unemployment rates are so high that the concept of a compulsory retirement age was adopted to force older people out of the work force and make jobs available for younger people. This policy has worked quite well up to now but it just so happens that all the so-called 'baby boomers' are about to hit compulsory retirement age. Now all of a sudden governments are faced with the problem of having to provide pension funds for a disproportionately large sector of the population.

There is no reason in logic or in biology why older people should be forced to retire at a certain age. Indeed a compulsory retirement age is quite discriminatory against older people. They are made to feel that they are no longer wanted.

With the economic model outlined here there would be plenty of jobs for all. Older people could remain in the work force for as long as they are physically capable of performing productive work. If they can continue to support themselves then obviously there is no reason why they should need a pension. They can retire at any age as long as they are capable of supporting themselves which is the way it has always been. Once people get so old that they are no longer capable of performing productive work then they would be entitled to welfare as a matter of right.

Relevance to the policy statement

We are proposing that the economic model outlined above is relevant to the policy statement in two principle areas. Firstly it presents a universal remedy against vulnerability in that this economic model offers a positive inducement to free-market countries that their citizens will become more prosperous across the board if they bring about population reduction. Indeed the more countries reduce their population the more prosperous they will become. Obviously with declining numbers of human beings and with ever-increasing tracts of wilderness being regenerated, the environment is going to become less and less vulnerable to degradation. The situation is attainable where human population and the environment could truly coexist. Secondly this economic model has relevance to the concept of 'population balance' in developed countries. Two of the major categories of people to be considered disappear from the equation altogether, namely ever increasing sector of the population who have been forced to retire on account of their age and the always considerable numbers who are unemployed. Obviously there would remain a small proportion of the population who, because of age, illness or infirmity, are physically or mentally incapable of holding down a job. Such people would receive welfare payments which actually could be quite generous in as much as their numbers would not be great and they would be genuinely deserving of welfare.

The very fact that there is to be a World Summit on Sustainable Development next year means that there are very real problems that the world is facing. Certainly efforts to educate people in Third World countries and to raise their living standards should be put forward as an absolute priority. We would like to see the policy statement go much further than making a reference to "the deteriorating situation in Africa." It is time for wealthy western countries to be told that for them to allow this appalling situation in Africa to continue is no more nor less than a crime against humanity.

Western countries have to profoundly change their attitude towards the poor and needy in all Third World and Islamic countries. What is required is comprehensive and well funded family planning programs. The poor and needy should be given substantial sums of money to enable them to make lifestyle changes and avail themselves of family planning options. They should receive ongoing education and counselling on how to spend that money wisely. What is required is for wealthy western countries to make a REAL effort to solve these problems.

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org
email: webadmin@scientists4pr.org

From: "Catherine M Marquette" <cmarquette@earthlink.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Comments by Dr. William Clark, Kennedy School of Government
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 22:23:48 -0400

(The following comments are from Dr. William Clark, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, USA.)

There was much good in the draft but also real danger, in particular because the draft combines different agendas in a confusing way. There are three voices in the draft, one for the population community, one aimed at achieving particular social goals, and one for human dimensions research. The confusion of the three could be deadly. The next draft should strive for cohesion, and he suggested the following structure: (1) a re-emphasis on what the goals of Johannesburg should be (putting human welfare at the center); (2) the kinds of policies that would be necessary to achieve these goals (education, institutional development); (3) the causal understanding of links between population and environment, and also the importance of interaction between societies and the environment at multiple scales. The draft should be seen as the population community leading the way for the human dimensions community, arguing for a human welfare-centered vision of sustainable development. The community working in population - environment - development issues should be encouraged to join the broader discussion of related issues underway in the international "Forum on Science and Technology for Sustainability" at <http://www.sustainabilityscience.org>.

Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 08:20:38 -0400
From: "Dr. Nafis Sadik" <sadik@unfpa.org>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN seminar] Comments by Dr. William Clark, Kennedy School of Government

I agree totally with Dr William Clark's critique and his recommendations . The draft which has excellent parts needs more coherence and fusion of the different strands of thought .

Nafis Sadik

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] comments of Dan Hogan (reposting)
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 09:44:23 -0500

(I am reposting these comments due to previous errors in transmission.
If you have any trouble reading messages, please let us know.)

Comments by Dan Hogan (network member, Global Science Panelist, steering committee member) Brief summary (my apologies for errors in interpretation) followed by his comments in full below.

Summary: Hogan urges further distinction between the 'people' who are rightly at the heart of development, vs. 'population' which should be only one dimension. The consumption vs. development argument must be superseded, as must the rich vs. poor country impasse: the Cairo Action Plan section on inter-relationships between population, development and environment offers a starting point. The vulnerability/responsibility framework is useful and reflects the state of the art in SD research. Migration and urban sprawl are among the population distribution variables which deserve more attention. Population Balance is an improvement on 'stabilization' but Hogan urges considering broader socio-demographic dimensions: household composition and differential vulnerability, morbidity and mortality, and spatial distribution. The case studies approach is promising but suggests country level studies, while regional/local approaches might better capture the focus on people in relation to specific (localized) natural resources and constraints. The IPAT equation is a "first approximation to the idea that environmental change involves complex interactions among several factors".

Full comments by Dan Hogan on Population in Sustainable development, Global Science Panel on Population and Environment:

1.. As a point of departure, I would like to emphasize that the population/environment debate at Rio reached an impasse between rich countries (especially Bush I) and poor countries. The former insisted on including concerns for population growth rates in poor countries on the agenda but resisted the counter-demand of the latter to consider unsustainable patterns of production and consumption of rich countries on an equal basis. The result, in Agenda 21, was a chapter on demographic dynamics and sustainability and another on changing consumption patterns, neither of which said very much. The Cairo Action Program, on the other hand, resolved this impasse in a very intelligent chapter on inter-relationships among population, sustained economic growth

and sustainable development, where both population growth and production and consumption patterns were recognized as important factors. This point needs reinforcing in Johannesburg, where the world's environmental lobby (government agencies and NGO's) will be in full force. The Rio impasse was easier to resolve in the context of the population lobby; the Cairo formulation needs to be strengthened by endorsement in Johannesburg. What remains to be squarely faced is the relationship between these two factors: if in today's world, rich countries' production and consumption patterns have greater environmental impact than population growth of the poor, What will happen if there is development, and if this development is a mirror image of currently developed countries?

2.. In the Introduction, the emphasis on "people and demographic issues at the core of sustainable development" glosses over the difference between the two expressions. Concern with "people" means that not economic indicators but social welfare indicators should be the focus of sustainable development. There is considerable consensus on this. I would argue, though, that "demographic issues" are an important dimension of sustainable development, but not at its core, which I would identify in such issues as processes of production and consumption, social justice, equality of opportunity and equitable trade relations. To consider "demographic issues" to be the "core" seems to hark back to the earlier view of size and growth as the major stumbling block. An alternative formulation could be: ".preparatory process for the Summit do not appear to recognize and incorporate the (socio?) demographic dimension of sustainable development."

3.. The human dimension should be certainly be a central focus of the Johannesburg agenda, but I have not seen the preliminary documents.

4.. Rio thinking was perhaps more dominated by the idea of demographic transition and the prospect for decline of growth rates than the idea of convergence. This item raises good points but I think they represent a more recent perception and not a counterpoint to Rio thinking. The rationale is developed to identify the "demographic divide," which is a good synthesis of the current situation and is useful.

5.. The vulnerability/responsibility framework is the leading edge of thinking on sustainable development, and relating socio-demographic dimensions to this vulnerability will be important. (Our work at Nepo seeks to develop the idea that vulnerability is the flip side of sustainability; to the extent we can identify and reduce vulnerability, we promote sustainability. The first concept lend itself more easily to empirical verification.)

6.. The discussion on "kinds of consumption" is a useful direction to take and could be developed further. But the treatment of consumption begs the question of the population versus consumption debate, which was so central in Rio. The better treatment given to this issue in Cairo still requires much conceptual and political development to be efficacious.

7.. On IPAT: Do we really have to beat a dead horse? I have always understood IPAT in the way the box represents it - as a first approximation to the idea that environmental change involves complex interactions among several factors. Maybe this point could be made without once more criticizing IPAT. (Or maybe I underestimate its continued importance.)

8.. on the Population, Poverty and Differential Vulnerability item: what is left out are population distribution processes which have major impacts on environmental quality. Even with zero or negative growth, where the population lives, works and plays will be crucial for sustainability. Many forms of population mobility are increasing: seasonal migration, international migration, commuting, tourism, short-distance moves: each has distinct environmental consequences on both sending and receiving places. Population density (of cities or regions and of households) has clear implications for the pressure on natural resources; in the home, many environmental illnesses are promoted by higher density (see the World Development Report of 1993 and its chapter on environmental health, for example). Urban sprawl consumes valuable soils and vegetation cover and makes the provision of environmental services, such as water distribution, sewage collection, garbage collection, paved streets, more difficult; it also requires a transportation system which is usually automobile-dependent, contributing to air pollution.

9.. "Population balance" is a considerable improvement over "population stabilization," but it is not clear what the policy implications would be (implications which were so clear in the population stabilization framework). I prefer to look at the socio-demographic dimensions of sustainability or sustainable development:

1.. household and family composition; differential vulnerability in situations of younger households (infants and children more subject to environmental stress; adolescents subject to greater unemployment); female-headed households, where all the burden for providing sustenance falls on women's shoulders; elderly households, which also have greater vulnerability to environmental hazards and reduced means of protection.

2.. Morbidity-mortality issues. When the causal arrow is environment -> population, this is the most sensitive demographic issue. The 1990's witnessed considerable advances in our ability to synthesize and weigh the consequences of environmental change on health. Some of this work has been done by demographers, but most of it has been by epidemiologists.

3.. Population distribution processes (briefly discussed above). 20 Such an approach seems to be in line with traditional population research, and together with the emphasis on differential impacts of/on specific population segments, may provide a framework for identifying the ways population dynamics affect environmental change and vice-versa. On the other hand, the advantage of the "population balance" notion - which should not be underestimated - is that it more clearly signals a shift from earlier positions. This is especially important for communicating with the larger scientific and political community.

10. I fully agree that the emphasis should be on differentiated vulnerabilities and responsibilities, talking about people rather than countries. But the case studies suggested take us back to countries. Wouldn't it be possible to think of case studies at the regional or local level, where population factors (or some population factor) and environmental sustainability have been resolved in particularly innovative manners? The local/regional emphasis is, I believe, important when we consider that natural resources and mutual impacts of society and nature are spatially located. Even within a country, different ecosystems are more or less vulnerable. Much more than population change (affected by society-wide factors), environmental change is for the most part localized in specific contexts. A set of case studies on a health issue (Theo Colburn's work for example), a distribution issue (sprawl, for example), age issues (vulnerability of older or younger groups), or different burdens of women and men might give more a more concrete emphasis than national case studies. Cases should be chosen which identify not only vulnerabilities but positive actions which have ameliorated the situation.20

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

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Sylvia Karlsson (reposting)
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 10:50:53 -0500

(reposting these comments because of earlier errors in transmissstion.)

Sylvia Karlsson, International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change, Bonn, Germany

Dr. Karlsson points out that human dimensions researchers have multiple options for processes that will feed into Johannesburg, including ICSU (International Council of Science) which is the official organizer of scientific input to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. A challenge is to gain recognition for human dimensions knowledge as valid scientific input in e.g. scientific advisory processes at the global level. It would be a big step forward if it would be possible in this respect to bridge the development studies disciplines with those of environmental science and human dimensions. Currently, as evidenced by discussions in the Regional Roundtables of Eminent Persons this summer, there has been little reference to the need for more knowledge on the nature and magnitude of environmental problem in order to make progress towards sustainable development. Rather, it was issues such as poverty and lack of good governance which were listed as the major challenges. But for these human dimensions issues there is no reference to the value of scientific knowledge, probably because they are not interpreted as science related in the same way the natural science aspects of environmental issues are. Yet, if we could conceive of a research project which would seek to understand and evaluate the Rio process and the implementation of Agenda 21, the human dimensions community is precisely the group which could do that. In such a project we would likely have to give more attention to the deeper driving forces for the problems. Then one comes down to the world views and values which characterise societies and the role of education in shaping these. Such emphasis would also lead to the realization of the limits of scientific knowledge as the only means of ensuring enlightened decision making for sustainable development, and the importance of the value dimension. She argued that the scientific community should see the Johannesburg Summit not only as a target to influence with its knowledge, but also as a learning process where we will have the opportunity to listen to and interact with other groups.

Laura Murphy, PhD
Clinical Assistant Professor

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

Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 15:00:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Introduction by Dr. Madulu

My Greetings.

My name is Ndalakwa Faustin Madulu, I am Demographer working with the Institute of Resource Assessment (IRA), University of Dar es salaam. For a number of years I have worked on the Population - Environment Field. My major activities in IRA are research and teaching. IRA is a multi-discipline and inter-discipline research Institute within the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. We work on natural resources and environment, water, agricultural systems, socio-economic aspects, population related issues, and environmental impact assessment. We use remote sensing and GIS as working tools in our day to day activities.

I hope to benefit more from the cyberseminars.

Prof. N.F. Madulu
Institute of Resource Assessment
University of Dar es Salaam
P.O. Box 35097 Dar es Salaam
Tanzania
Tel. +255 22 2410144
Fax. +255 22 2410393

Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 09:52:21 -1000
From: Vinod Mishra <mishra@hawaii.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Population balance concept
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Hello everyone,

The 'population balance' concept provides a better framework than 'population stabilization', but I think it should be broadened to include population distribution. This is particularly important when we relate

population to resources and sustainable development. I want to hear what others think of the 'population balance' concept as a defining framework in the document.

A related subject is unplanned urbanization, which poses some of the most pressing sustainable development and environmental challenges in many countries. I feel that the document should include some discussion about migration and urbanization. Rapid, largely unplanned urbanization occurring in many parts of the developing world has implications for both heavily polluted urban environments (and for people living in those environments) and for rural environments which face resource demands/pressures from urban centers where people have disproportionately higher consumption levels.

Vinod

Vinod Mishra, Ph.D.
Fellow, Population and Health Studies
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601

Phone: (808) 944-7452
FAX: (808) 944-7490
Email: mishra@hawaii.edu

Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 10:11:06 -1000
From: Vinod Mishra <mishra@hawaii.edu>
Subject: [PERN seminar] Media explosion and sustainable development
To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Hello everyone,

The document talks about knowledge revolution and a growing knowledge divide. A related concern is explosion of mass media (mainly TV) in the last few years in many parts of the developing world and consequent rapidly growing exposure to western lifestyles and consumption patterns. This is raising people's expectations for a material lifestyle much faster than their economies can cope with, which has implications for resource demands and sustainable development. There are also cultural implications of the media explosion that are affecting youth behavior and causing other social problems, too fast for many of these societies to cope with.

I understand that we live in the age of globalization and that knowledge revolution and media explosion have many positive effects, but what can the governments do to minimize their negative impacts?

Vinod

Vinod Mishra, Ph.D.
Fellow, Population and Health Studies
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601

Phone: (808) 944-7452
FAX: (808) 944-7490
Email: mishra@hawaii.edu

Date: Sat, 20 Oct 2001 05:35:57 +0530
From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>
To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN seminar] Population balance concept

Dear friends,

Greetings from Nepal. I agree with Binod Jee but at the same time migration is terribly an important component for population distribution and balance. Whether it is a balance or stabilization depends largely upon which country context we are talking about in terms of population and resource relationship. It is difficult to generalize globally.

Dr. Bal Kumar KC

Date: 19 Oct 2001 23:58:19 MDT
From: earth care <careearth@usa.net>
To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [Re: [PERN seminar] Welcome to the Population-Environment

Dear Colleagues,

We are researchers from south India working in the area of Human Ecology and Biodiversity for quite some time now - mainly within the

tropical forest ecosystems. We find the discussion quite stimulating and our initial responses are as follows:

The fact that improved conditions of literacy and health - especially for women, achieve what 'population control' programmes could not, has been successfully demonstrated in the south Indian states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

Interestingly, these two states also harbour the highest diversity of ecosystems and species representing many groups of plants and animals in India.

While the concept of population balance is well taken - it does need to include other social dimensions that have a strong bearing such as caste and tribal identity. This is especially valid for south Asian countries.

On the issue of people and environmental degradation - while it is true that different groups of people get affected differently, the fact that different people also have different orientation towards environment and conservation needs to be recognised. This is best illustrated by the case of Green (and other colored) revolutions in India - which not only bypassed (or was bypassed) by the poorer states of India but also led to the current scenario where there is a lot of grain - but people continue to be hungry. This also brings up another relevant question - how do we define hunger ?

One of the factors that needs to be addressed in the issue of Vulnerability is access to common lands / common buffer food stocks and for women - the question of land rights.

Finally, case studies of ecoregions that surpass political boundaries could also be considered - instead of countries or states.

Best wishes. Jayshree Vencatesan and Ranjit Daniels

From: "Xiaoling Chen" <cxl@hp01.wtusm.edu.cn>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: Re: [PERN seminar] Introduction by Dr. Madulu
Date: Mon, 22 Oct 2001 14:56:36 +0800

Dear Prof. N.F. Madulu and all,

I am Xiaoling Chen from China. Here is the National Lab for Information Engineering in Surveying, Mapping and Remote Sensing, Wuhan University. The main targets of our research basically focus on the technology of GPS, Remote Sensing and GIS. As my background is geography, my major concern is the application of RS and GIS on environment and resources, especially on the coastal environment, Integrated Coastal Zone Management, Land Use and Land Cover Change.

Now I need to go out for several days. Hope to join your discussion after I come back.

Cheers!

Prof. & Dr. Xiaoling Chen
National Lab for Information Engineering
in Surveying, Mapping and Remote Sensing
Wuhan University
Wuhan, 430079
P.R.China
Tel:+86-27-87881292
Fax:+86-27-87643969
Email: cxl@hp01.wtusm.edu.cn

Date: 22 Oct 2001 14:16:09 -0000
From: "R.B.Bhagat" <bhagrb1@rediffmail.com>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Cyber Seminar

Dear Colleagues

It interesting to see the debate on population and environment unfolding complexity of issues related to it. I would like to share the following of my views on the outline draft.

1. Population Balance is apparently a fine concept as it incorporates size, growth, distribution and age-structure and composition of population (social and economic) than population stabilisation. But the concept is elusive. It also implies virtually a balance between population and resources- the old Malthusian doctrine. As we know that resource is not a fixed entity but dynamic one. It could increase tremendously with advancement of technology (e.g. potential of solar energy). On the other hand, the depletion of non-renewable resources like coal, crude oil etc. is a serious problem which could be looked from Population Balance point of view. This raises the issues of nature of development and use of technology.
2. The concept of Population Balance is appropriate for smaller countries like Finland or Mauritius, but for large country like India and China it requires a disaggregated conceptualisation at varied geographic and administrative scale.
3. Population stabilisation vis-a-vis Population Balance is easier in terms of setting population goals.
4. Population Balance conversely implies Population Imbalance also. It has strong implication for relatively high fertility populous countries to invoke fascist measures of population control in the name of environment conservation.

5. Differentiated responsibility and differentiated vulnerability basically perceives population as not homogeneous single factor in both cause and outcome of environmental degradation. This is a very relevant concept. It is also linked with parameters of Population Balance. Therefore, Population Balance is also a differentiated concept related to different population and social groups in the scale of being responsible to vulnerable.

R.B.Bhagat, Ph.D
Associate Professor
Department of Geography
Maharshi Dayanand University
Rohtak-

Date: Mon, 22 Oct 2001 20:33:12 +0530
From: "Dr. Bal Kumar K. C." <cdps@wlink.com.np>
To: up Population Institute <popinst@up.edu.ph>
CC: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Re: [PERN seminar] Population balance concept

Dear friends,

Greetings from Nepal. I agree with many friends about the overflow of the mail. But right now you may just delete it until you select to choose to participate in a meaningful way.

I have the observation that population balance and population stabilization should go hand in hand. The reason being is that some countries have more resources than they need with respect to population, Brazil for example. Some countries have more population than resources, Nepal being the example. In this situation the ultimate objective is to stabilize population growth rate at the replacement level keeping in view of the concept of balance at the same time by means of not only reducing fertility and mortality but also balancing spatial distribution of population and migration. The discrepancy between haves and have-nots has also to be minimized to a large extent.

What I am worrying about is the fact that we always talk about the relationship between population and environment and create a lot of equation and theory with charts, maps and graphs. But what is missing is that population can be measured at the individual level and the environmental impact of an individual can not be measured empirically at the individual level. Environmental impact is generally the affect of surrogate of individuals consisting of community, institutions and functionally organized space. Empirical examination of these factors is difficult and a lot of times misleading even with the help of GIS and many other tools. Moreover, even at the meso level a perfect equilibrium is only a rhetoric than reality.

Examination of the interrelationships between population and environment has also to be assessed across the international boundary where the flow of goods is relatively easier than the flow of individuals.

Finally I would like to see literature if there is any about how an increasing population is increasing or decreasing the quality of environment of an individual country and that within this context how to go about balancing and stabilizing. How about the resources required to do so? Who gives the money to the developing countries where a large majority of people are below the absolute poverty line like in Nepal (Above 50%). As long as people have the problem of hand to mouth, they care less about the conservation of resources and management of environment. Attempt to alleviate poverty in many countries has been unsuccessful. The gap between the rich and the poor is increasing and the government is not capable of supporting programs for balance and stabilization. These programs are merely on papers without any tangible result. In this situation local level participation and mass awareness is inevitable to sustain the relative balance between population and environment even at the lower threshold level.

With best wishes,
Dr. bal Kumar KC

Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 08:58:24 +0530
From: Vishwas Chavan <vishwas@ems.ncl.res.in>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Museums....

Dear Dr Sarkar :

My name is Vishwas Chavan, Scientist at the National Chemical Laboratory, Pune. We at NCL has developed SAMPADA, software for automation / digitization of Herbariums and Museum specimens i.e. Biological Collections. I am seeking your help in suggesting me major collection facilities within University of Calcutta and in West Bangal. Do let me know the detailed addresses of the curators / incharges of such facilities.

With warm personal regards,

vishwas

From: "Nguyen The Chinh" <thechinh@fpt.vn>
To: "Vishwas Chavan" <vishwas@ems.ncl.res.in>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Re: Nguyen The Chinh - viet nam.
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 21:07:04 +0700

Dear Dr. Sarkar :

My name is Nguyen The Chinh, Scientist at the National Economic University, Vietnam. I would like the member of Population-Environment Research Network, now I'm teaching and studying in my university
Thank you very much for your information
With regards,

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Nguyen The Chinh

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] On people vs population in sustainable development
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 09:58:33 -0500

I appreciate the many substantive contributions of participants, and find that I agree with many commentators on 'population balance' and the importance of migration and urbanization, among the other population variables that need attention in the statement. In addition, I urge clarity on the use of terms: "People" vs "Population": In the Preliminary Statement, these terms are used almost interchangeably. These should instead be carefully distinguished. "Putting people at the core of sustainable development" seems a good thing from an ethical point of view (as well as practical efficiency); whereas putting demographic issues and population at the center of discussion would be inappropriate, at least according to much of the research on 'population and environment'. "Population" per se should correctly take its place with a host of other interacting factors --poverty, international trade, human rights, rising consumption --as one cause of environmental degradation (as well as being a factor in the other dimensions of sustainable development: the economic and social). I believe these thoughts are in line with Dan Hogan's comments on the first day.

I wonder: is the Global Science Panel statement to be specifically about the role of "population" in sustainable development? Or is it more broadly about "People"? If the former is the case, then the statement

should clearly specify the limits of this approach, what we have learned from research in the field, and the importance of acknowledging demographic trends beyond size to age structure, household composition, migration and urbanization. If the latter, then beyond strictly demographic factors, in the discussion of 'people', then other topics of 'culture' (to echo Joel Cohen), values, human rights, and capabilities are important concepts to mention.

thank you.

Laura Murphy, PhD

Clinical Assistant Professor

Department of International Health & Development, School of Public =
Health and Tropical Medicine=20

Stone Center for Latin American Studies

From: "Catherine M Marquette" <cmarquette@earthlink.net>

To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERN_seminar] critique of use of population balance, sustainable development and gaps

Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 12:10:07 -0400

My comments focus on looking critically at some of the pivotal concepts presented (or which fail to be presented) in the statement as it stands.

(1) The notion of "population balance" referred to in the statement seems a vague, confusing and normative term that should be rethought ---particularly since similar notions (e.g. carrying capacity) have been fairly fruitless in terms of actually driving solid verifiable and reliable research. The term also seems to include certain implicit neo-Malthusian assumptions (i.e. of pop and environment dynamics are characterised by some type of threshold relationship) which are open to debate and certainly do not reflect any kind of research consensus. It is probably better just to avoid the term 'population balance' and simply state specifically age-structure and key socioeconomic population characteristics (education, gender, health poverty) as important variables to consider rather than lumping them under a vague term like "population balance". This is a scientific statement and policy makers will look to it for specification not generalization.

(2) The statement should not unquestionably accept the concept of 'sustainable development.' This concept has been critically approached and questioned in both environmental and social studies in the past decade-particularly when it comes to operationalizing it in terms of both research and policy. The panel should reflect its awareness of this

on-going critical analysis otherwise it sounds like their are simply out of touch with current discourse in development studies as well as many other social sciences. Like 'population balance', the term 'sustainable development' is often used a shorthand for things that could be more clearly specified. Again, this is a scientific statement based on current knowledge and is obligated to be specific and up-to-date.

(3) There is little mention of migration in the statement as a population dynamic even though it is a a central one in the p and e context (e.g. in terms of environmental change and migration, impacts of migrants on environment etc...). It's highlighted later in the document but needs some statement as well upfront. Relatedly, urbanization needs to highlighted more-afterall it is the major global demographic dynamic of our time and a major force driving environmental change from the global to local level.

(4) The introductory statement and thus the entire statement might be much more straight-to-the-point in tackling population and environment issues and linking this combined field of study to Cairo and Rio-as it stands the statement in its introduction and throughout mainly addresses population issues in general and only gets to the environmental link at the end via Agenda 21. I strongly second Dr. Clark's observations regarding the confounding objectives of the document as it stands which I believe is most evident in this introduction. I would strongly urge re-evaluation and redrafting with this in mind.

Catherine M. Marquette
Co-Coordinator Population Environment Research Network

Date: Wed, 24 Oct 2001 13:19:20 +0200
From: "Marcoux, Alain (SDWP)" <Alain.Marcoux@fao.org>
Subject: RE: [PERN_seminar] On people vs population in sustainable development
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Laura is right on the need to distinguish "people" and "population". But I think that "population and environment" must, if we want to avoid confusion and an impractical broadening of the debate, mean "demographic dynamics and environmental change".

That demographic dynamics is not the only factor in environmental change -- and probably not a major factor in many settings -- is clear, but does not matter in the least. What could conceivably be the harm in an individual or group from focusing their attention on part of the linkages between phenomena, and trying to understand at least that part? Indeed, social and

other sciences do just that all the time.

Alain Marcoux
Senior Officer
Population Programme Service
Tel: 3906 5705 3201
Fax: 3906 5705 5490

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Summary of Discussion, Week One
Date: Wed, 24 Oct 2001 18:05:11 -0500

Summary of Discussion on Population in Sustainable Development, Oct
17-24, 2001
Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and
Environment

(Please save this message!)

Note: You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute:
send your comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org. Read
remarks online at www.populationenvironmentresearch.org
<<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>> (Go to Cyberseminars).

This message includes

- 1) A brief summary of the substantive remarks Oct
17-23, 2001;
- 2) Recommendations to the statement authors (to date); and
- 3) A reminder of commands and ways to access the listserve.

- 1) Summary of Discussion October 17-23

The context is the preparation of a formal Statement on "Population in
Sustainable Development" by the Global Science Panel on Population and
Environment (GSP). The Preliminary Statement is downloadable from
www.populationenvironmentresearch.org
<<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>> (Go to Cyberseminars).
The final statement will be presented and discussed at the WSSD/Earth
Summit 2 in Johannesburg, September 2002, after undergoing review
(through this cyberseminar series and at PrepCons) and further
revisions. Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>.
Learn more about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting
www.earthsummit2002.org.

Participants from Nepal, Brazil, Germany, India, the US and other countries contributed comments or introductions in the first week, addressing key themes in the GSP statement and additional issues (contributors name in parentheses: look up the full remarks on the website):

What are relevant population variables? Many commentators urge consideration of population distribution measures: migration and urbanization receive most comment (Hogan, Bal Kumar, Mishra, Murphy, Marquette) plus unplanned urbanization (Mishra). Scale was introduced as an organizing principle linking population-environment interactions (Clark). The statement mentions age structure, but needs to go much further. Caste and tribal identity emerge as important variables in India ('Earth Care'). Ecological concepts and variables are not handled well in the statement (Kurtz). Others note the difficulty of capturing environmental impact: " ..population can be measured at the individual level [but] the environmental impact of an individual can not be measured empirically ." (Bal Kumar)

The proposal to use population balance (vs. population stabilization) has received a mixed response. For some the term is an improvement on population stabilization, incorporating as it does age/sex/education composition. For others the concept is too ill-defined to serve as a conceptual model (Marquette)-it might be better to avoid the term altogether. As elaborated it does not address environmental concerns, a theme expanded on in depth from an ecologists perspective (Kurtz). Country-level variation in feasible 'balance' is wide; it may be more appropriate for smaller than for larger countries, and perhaps might be resource-specific as well (Bhagat). The phrasing implies 'imbalance' are present, which has ethical implications (i.e., use of coercion to regain balance). Echoes of Malthusian approaches remain (Bhagat). Balance and stabilization can go together ".the ultimate objective is to stabilize population growth rate .but also balancing [the] spatial distribution of population and migration." (Bal Kumar) is there any literature about "how an increasing population [affects] the quality of environment of an individual country and . how to go about balancing and stabilizing?"

(Bal Kumar)

The vulnerability/differential responsibility framework received positive feedback. It is considered 'state of the art' (Hogan) and relevant for India, although different perspectives on the environment and conservation must be considered, for example, in explaining the failure of the green revolution (Earth Care)

The case studies approach is welcome, but a concern is that the country

or nation is not the appropriate unit of analysis. Instead they should be at the level of the sub-region or ecosystem (Hogan, 'Earth Care').

Thoughtful comments by Human Dimensions researchers (Karlsson and Clark) address multiple aspects of research, epistemology, and policy formation, suggesting re-organization of the Statement to make it more effective. Karlsson, of the IHDP raises concerns about the role of scientific knowledge in the WSSD, recognizing "the limits of scientific knowledge as the only means of ensuring enlightened decision making for sustainable development". "If we could conceive of a research project which would seek to understand and evaluate the Rio process and the implementation of Agenda 21, the human dimensions community is precisely the group which could do that.". William Clark observes 'three voices in the draft, one for the population community, one aimed at achieving particular social goals, and one for human dimensions research', which combination can be "deadly". Reorganization of the document is needed (Clark, Marquette)

Finally, additional concerns and questions raised by participants touch upon consumption and policy, research paradigms and conceptual approaches, and the need for more semantic/conceptual precision:

How can media (and the expected negative consequences of rising consumption and social change be handled by governments (if at all)? (Mishra) Economic perspectives are lacking in the Statement: Keynesian economic theory offers a useful framework ('Scientists'). Attention to the IPAT theory is misplaced; it is not necessary to highlight it only to criticize it (Hogan, Bhagat). Semantic and conceptual clarity are called for: 'people' are not the same as 'population' (Murphy); Population and Environment is about demographic factors and environmental change (Marcoux). Sustainable Development is a widely debated concept, but the debates and issues in operationalizing the concept are not recognized in the statement (Marquette)

2) Recommendations to the authors of the Statement. Based on participants' comments so far, the main recommendations to the Panel are as follows (We have an expanded version of these recommendations which we are sharing with the Panelists-available upon request):

Retain the differentiated vulnerability/responsibility framework
Expand the promising case studies component, but focus on regions and ecosystem (vs. countries)
Clarify the objectives and focus of draft
Clarify key terms: people v. population, population balance, sustainable development
Expand discussion of migration, urbanization, and environmental

change

3) Review of commands and ways to access the listserv

You do not have to be subscribed to the listserv to contribute your thoughts: send comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org and we will post them to the listserv on your behalf.

You can view all the postings to date online at our website:

www.populationenvironmentresearch.org

<<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>>;

Visit the Cyberseminars page and View Comments.

If you are presently subscribed to 'pernseminars' and wish to unsubscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature, please)

unsubscribe pernseminars

If you wish to subscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature):

subscribe pernseminars

(end of summary of pernseminars, Oct 17-23, 2001)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

Laura Murphy, PhD

Clinical Assistant Professor

Department of International Health & Development, School of Public

Health and Tropical Medicine

and Stone Center for Latin American Studies

Tulane University

From: Hassan Yousif <hyousif@ufr-futures.ci>

To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Subject: [PERN_seminar] RE: [PERN seminar] Media explosion and sustainable development

Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:24:46 -0000

Dear Vinod Mishra

I agree with you that mass media is augmenting the demand in developing countries at a much faster rate than what their governments and economies can provide. The rise in people's expectations is clearly

reflected in their aspirations and wishful thinking expressed in vision 2020s. These are long term visions conducted during the last decade in many countries in Africa. Most of them dream of a high level of welfare in a short period of time. These same people are also aware of the fact that the current welfare in the west originated from their once prosperous localities.

We usually underestimate the impacts of such high level expectations on stability and peace, and on sustainable development. A large number of unemployed youth in Africa are well informed through the media and other means of communication. Many of them may be illiterate, but still well informed and aspire for western life style. They sell diamond and modern technology equipment on the streets of cities like Abidjan. They work in what I would like to call the "modern informal sector". In my opinion, these are the people who destabilize their governments, damage the economies and misuse the environment to achieve high economic gains in the shortest possible period of time. Many of them take the risk of crossing the Sahara by foot to reach cities like Tangier in Morocco, and look for an opportunity to cross to Europe. People with high expectations are likely to move to where they think they can make money in a short period.

As you know, Vinod, behavioral problems take time to address them and achieve tangible results. Also, behavioral change is not part of planning in developing countries. Moreover, this particular issue cannot be solved by the private sector or NGOs. The governments are weak, the private sector is not forward looking and the NGOs are inefficient. The solution rests with changes in the global markets for cotton, coffee, cocoa, etc. If the global prices of products which originate from developing countries are in favor of the local people, then these people would see high value in staying at home than in migrating to other places. The international companies for cocoa, cotton and coffee make much higher money than the farmers who grow the same products. I think globalization is leading to considerable imbalances.

To: Hassan Yousif <hyousif@afr-futures.ci>

Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] RE: [PERN seminar] Media explosion and sustainable development

Date: Fri, 26 Oct 2001 08:02:59 +0800 (HKT)

From: up Population Institute <popinst@up.edu.ph>

Cc: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

dear friends,

I agree with hassan.

Josefina

Date: Fri, 26 Oct 2001 14:12:10 -1000
From: Vinod Mishra <mishra@hawaii.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] human welfare-centered approach
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Hello everyone,

I agree with Dr. Clark that we need to seek a "human welfare-centered vision of sustainable development." The draft document already attempts to do so to some extent by emphasizing the role of education. While education is a very important variable and it is closely related to other aspects of human welfare, I think a more holistic approach to human welfare is required. An approach that emphasizes not only education, but also health care, nutrition, housing, employment opportunities, etc. Without such an approach it would be difficult to promote sustainable development. For instance, a system that vigorously promotes education without simultaneously providing appropriate job opportunities cannot be sustainable.

Vinod

Vinod Mishra, Ph.D.
Fellow, Population and Health Studies
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601
Phone: (808) 944-7452
FAX: (808) 944-7490
Email: mishra@hawaii.edu

Date: 28 Oct 2001 09:14:30 -0000
From: "R.B.Bhagat" <bhagrb1@rediffmail.com>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Population Indicators

Dear Colleagues

1.I feel that the concepts like population and people needs more clarity in relation to environment.How these concepts could be incorporated in environmental management, planning and monitoring or in sustainable development? Population is obviously a narrow demographic concept and the people is a broader concept entails consumption behaviour, employment, poverty, culture and values etc.But to what extent these variables could be

operationalised from demographic point of view in sustainable development is a serious question? Would n't we miss the woods in the search of forests?

2. The problem lies in the concepts of population and sustainable development also which is much in currency. It must be looked from Human Development point of view. The concept of people is much closer to Human Development than sustainable development. I, therefore, feel that the discussion on population variables should extend conceptually to Human Development and operationally to the debate on the inclusion of the indicators like per capita emission of Carbon Dioxide, CFC or per capita decline in forest cover or etc. in the construction of Human Development Index, apart from life expectancy, literacy and enrollment ratio already included at the global level. At the local level, on the other hand, migration to fragile areas, displaced migration, refugees, size of poor and unplanned urban growth etc. are more important demographic indicators having implication for Human development.

R.B.Bhagat, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Geography
M.D. University
Rohtak (INDIA)

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] comments from Dr. Akin Mabogunje
Date: Sun, 28 Oct 2001 10:34:35 -0600

(this is a summary of comments made at session on the Global Science Panel Statement during the recent IHDP Open Meeting in Rio de Janeiro)

Prof. Akin Mabogunje, Development Policy Centre, Ibadan, Nigeria

Dr. Mabogunje agreed that population issues should be included in the agenda for sustainable development. He said that for developing countries, all talk about sustainable must begin from the need to moderate the very rapid rate of population growth arising from improved medical science and environmental sanitation. Although this rate is slowing down in most developing countries, population momentum remains a critical factor to watch. He also emphasized two themes that should be addressed in the statement. First, information technology and communications affect how people relate to the environment and therefore should be taken into account. Second, population distribution should

receive more attention. Urbanization was a struggle to get onto the Rio agenda; since the world will soon be more than half urban, and since an even higher proportion of the world's poor will be urban, this topic is a priority for Johannesburg.

Laura Murphy, PhD
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

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
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Russia: A Case Study
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 18:39:46 +1000

RUSSIA: A CASE STUDY

If a theory is good it should be able to solve the hardest problems, and the environmental and social problems in Russia are the hardest by anyone's standards. 15% of Russia consists of ecological crisis zones. The major problems are the declining quality of drinking water, radioactive waste/pollution, air pollution in major cities and industrial centers, household waste disposal, toxic waste disposal and industrial accidents.

The economy is in a state of depression evidenced by a falling GNP and falling industrial production over the past decade. There was some improvement with the rise of oil prices in the year 2000 but in general terms the indicators of a robust economy are all negative. What is seen as the most serious problem for the economic outlook is depopulation. In recent years the population has been declining by almost a million persons a year. The causes of depopulation are said to be a low fertility rate and a high mortality rate due to a toxic environment, infectious diseases and

substance abuse.

With the economy in depression a robust shadow economy has evolved which accounts for up to 40% of GNP. Corruption is endemic. Criminal activities and drug-trafficking are on the increase. There has been a massive injection of foreign aid monies in an effort to prop up the economy (the US alone since 1992 up to the end of the Clinton Administration allocated \$8.2 billion) however it seems that this aid has not been effective largely due to graft and corruption at all levels of government. The monies simply do not go where they are intended.

The ailing economy is compounding the country's environmental problems. Many of the nuclear reactors are obsolete and are not receiving proper maintenance and safety checks because of insufficient funds. Corners are being cut in the treatment and disposal of radioactive and toxic waste. Industry is able to subvert whatever environmental regulations that are in place for waste disposal by bribing local officials. The pipelines to the northern oilfields are not being maintained adequately and in addition they are being tapped into by racketeers which is causing alarming leakage and spillage. In addition, in an effort to obtain foreign currency, the government even allows Russia to act as a dumping ground for toxic waste from other European countries.

The agricultural sector is in a bad way. Because of the harsh climate and inconsistent rainfall a relatively small portion of the country is available for agriculture. The bulk of the farms are collective farms which are a carryover from the Communist era. These farms are barely functioning as a result of dwindling state subsidies and young people leaving. Older people find themselves trapped in a subsistence level lifestyle. Private farms and garden plots of individuals, although only approximately 25% of total agricultural area, account for over one-half of all agricultural production.

All agricultural land is state owned and even the private farmers do not have the right to sell or mortgage their land. Approximately a million hectares of agricultural land is lost to soil degradation, erosion, desertification and salinization etc each year. During the 1990s the total land under agricultural production declined by more than one quarter.

The government recently passed the Land Code which allows householders and owners of commercial buildings to actually sell and mortgage their land. This was passed with much opposition from the Communist Party and still does not apply to agricultural land. The government is going to attempt to bring agricultural land under the Land Code in the future. Privatizing land ownership has been hailed as a great step towards economic recovery by the government however it seems that the average land owner is far from convinced. As they have to pay land tax based on the market value of their

land they regard the reform with suspicion.

The main problem here is depopulation. With the population of Russia declining by a million persons a year the real estate market is going to remain in the doldrums notwithstanding private ownership. There is no joy for a property owner if the value of the property is declining and there is no-one wanting to buy anyway. This coupled with the duty to pay land tax will make the average property owner look upon ownership as a burden.

In parts of the major cities property values will no doubt rise but in the smaller cities and country towns the real estate market will remain depressed. For the same reason there is unlikely to be any major demand for new housing so the reforms will not mean any upturn for the construction sector. For property owners in cities and towns that are so polluted that people are dying prematurely the situation will remain hopeless.

A solution for all these problems would be for the government to adopt an affirmative recycling policy. Foreign aid money should be given specifically to the government to reclaim the cities and towns with the most serious problems of environmental toxicity. All the property owners should be paid not just the market value, but sufficient for them to buy a comparable property in another town and relocate. They themselves will be completely free to decide where they want to live. This will have the effect of actually increasing the demand for housing in other cities and towns. With the demand for housing rising the construction sector will also be revitalized.

This would be a gradual process. The yardstick would be to decide how many houses would be purchased and new houses built directly attributable to a population increase of say 3% per year. In other words the figure would not take into account the normal buying and selling of the existing population. Whatever that figure may be the government should reclaim that many houses in one of the cities or towns with serious problems. The houses reclaimed are simply demolished and the land reverted to open space/wooded parkland.

When the government gets around to privatizing agricultural land the affirmative recycling policy will also be beneficial both to farmers themselves and the economy in general. Farms with the most serious degradation problems should be reclaimed and reverted to wilderness. The owners of private farms should be paid more than the market value so that they can buy another farm elsewhere if they want to or can buy a property in a city.

Persons on collective farms should be paid sufficient monies to buy a private farm of a size equal to their share of the collective farm. For instance if the collective farm is 1,000 hectares and there are fifty

couples living on the farm then each couple would be paid sufficient to buy a 20 hectare private farm. The real problem with privatizing collective farms has been how to divide up the farm amongst the occupants. Not all land on a farm is suitable for agriculture so some will get good land and others will get useless land.

The affirmative recycling policy outlined above would have numerous beneficial effects both socially and economically. For a start people who live in heavily polluted toxic environments will be able to relocate to places more conducive to their health. With the revitalization of the agriculture and construction sectors, and the real estate market generally, the public economy could regain ascendancy over the shadow economy and there would be less opportunity for racketeering. Property owners would be much more willing to pay land tax if they could see the values of their properties are actually rising. And perhaps most importantly a government with a robust economy would be able to allocate much more funding to proper safeguards against nuclear catastrophes.

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org
email: webadmin@scientists4pr.org

Reference: Much of the material for the above case study was taken from an article in the PERN database Russia: New Dimensions of Environmental Security <http://www.gechs.org/AvisoEnglish/nine.shtml>

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] on the human welfare approach
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 11:39:45 -0600

The authors of the preliminary statement ask us (reviewers) to address several questions, including this one: To what extent do you agree that the human dimension is missing from the Johannesburg agenda, and that it should be a central focus?" (page 2 of the Statement).

The "human dimension" of sustainable development has received attention from several commentators on this listserve, and I wanted to add to it. Several issues emerge relating to concepts and ethical approaches and the aim of the statement.

The agenda or platform for the summit is not readily accessible to non-participants in the conference preparations, so it is difficult to judge whether the agenda does adequately put the focus on people and

their concerns (vs. the environment?) or whether "the human dimension is missing from the Johannesburg agenda". From examination of documents from recent regional conferences preparing for the next PrepCom (these can be found online at www.earthsummit2002), I find plenty of mention of education as well as human rights, HIV/AIDs and other 'human' concerns. Thus:

First, for the statement to overemphasize this argument would waste an opportunity to argue for something more specific, beyond the conventional wisdom of promoting 'education'. Also, it may in fact be a straw man argument if the real agenda is already focused on these concerns. Neither is a strategically wise use of the opportunity presented by the Statement.

Secondly, ethically, for many, it is correct to put 'people first' as a fundamental principle of development, and this is implicitly true of "sustainable development" (with its ecological and economic dimensions, as well as social). It is not clear, however, what specific additional policies or approaches are being called for in the statement, beyond "Education" (Perhaps is not even clear what they are, but we need to debate that!). Many listserv participants are arguing for even broader concerns than education, and a holistic "human welfare centered vision of sustainable development" (Clark, Mishra). Also, with urbanization and migration mentioned repeatedly as major population trends that must be accounted for in the statement, the idea of 'education' emerges as vague and inadequate to the task of accommodating still-rising numbers of humans (distributed in space) and their rising/changing consumption patterns to the constraints of environmental systems and resources at many different levels.

The statement could be made broader, more comprehensive (as a lay summary of knowledge about demographic dynamics and environmental change and vice versa) and more specific --in the types of policy decisions that will be needed given a specific ethical orientation. Orientation around concepts of space, scale and 'human-welfare-oriented sustainability' might help structure the Statement.²⁰

thank you for your attention.

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: jcoon@tulane.edu

To: perNSEMINARS listserve <perNSEMINARS@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERN_seminar] PERN seminar: Introduction and some thoughts

Date: Tue, 30 Oct 2001 10:45:18 -0600 (CST)

My name is Jeremy Coon and I am currently a graduate student at Tulane University. My current focus is on natural resource development and how development policy has addressed or failed to address the impacts on society and the economy at multiple levels. Certainly the pop/env debate is an important part of my research as is "sustainable development." I have also worked on population policy and what pop. stabilization meant for US NGO and grassroots prior to the CAiro 1994 conference and have worked on projects dealing with urbanization and addressing the rural/urban issues in Latin America. I've enjoyed many of the comments so far and am looking forward to more discussion.

A few thoughts...

The terminology that we are using seems to be placed out of Cairo 1994. Not unexpected and maybe needed. However, I thought that one of the goal's of this forum was to highlight the "state of the art" regarding population/environment research. I'm thinking of Bilborrow and Carr in West AFrica, Boesrupian evidence in Kenya, or similar findings in the Amazon or the Yucatan that point to empirical evidence contrary to the conventional wisdom of Neo-Malthusian (IPAT-like) increased pop. equals increased environmental degradation. Much of this is also not "new" so am wondering if current research is supporting/dismissing these findings.

The key, as several people have mentioned, is that population is one of many variables and that within population we have growth, age, distribution, migration, etc. These interact with a host of economic, social, and political variables with a variety of outcomes. A potential difficulty in crafting a short policy statement.

However, if this is the case then we need to lead them to the water. To do so, we'd want empirical evidence and cases of where the neo-malthusian concepts work and don't work. Showing differences from scale will help.

In this vein I agree with those that mention population balance as an improvement but still appears to conform to the same line of Neo-Malthusian thought process. If we want to move past this, then we need to give evidence and see where the "scientific" consensus is. Then we can work on terminology and selling it as a platform to be adopted as policy.

This of course begs the question of our audience (ie. those participating and writing policy for Johannesburg 2002. Global Science Panel would be our first audience but ultimately our audience will be those at the 2002 conference. Many of you may already have a better understanding of this and I would appreciate illumination either in the listserve or to me personally)

If we are too far ahead of our audience, especially if it may counter current thinking our job will be very hard. BUT, if we can give a strong case with empirical evidence from many of you who are doing that research, then we can at least act a foil to push the overall agenda to where the research is already taking us.

Therefore, we need to understand our audience, the background of the panel and how it really fits in to the overall agenda. If our audience is at "Cairo +" and conventional wisdom is that population in sustainable development is malthusian in nature then looking at pop. stabilization and moving away from that may be more important. In that case population Balance may be acceptable. Then the document should address the pros/cons of that and demonstrating the inadequacies given current research. Then give some recommendations on where to go/or where pop/env. is with relation to sustainable development. The first will be what we push for, the recommendations are what we'd like, but most likely will have to push for in the coming 10 years.

Several people have mentioned the vulnerability/ responsibility framework. This may be a way to move past population balance and provide a way to give support to our arguments that could be more easily interpreted and used. Also the issue of scale should be stressed. SEveral comments on the case studies highlight the need for understanding different responses at different levels.

Date: Tue, 30 Oct 2001 11:50:31 -1000
From: Vinod Mishra <mishra@hawaii.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Technology paradox
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

The document emphasizes the role of technological progress in transition to sustainable development. But looking back in time, hasn't this very 'technological progress' also been a cause of many of the environmental problems in today's world? I am not trying to undermine numerous benefits of technological progress, but simply want to emphasize that technological progress is no panacea. Technology is both a cause and potential remedy of environmental problems. Whether technological progress will lead to sustainable development will depend on how and for what purposes the new

technologies are used.

Role of technology transfer in sustainable development is another important issue. Much can be achieved in promoting sustainable development by promoting a more rapid transfer of cleaner and more efficient technologies from developed countries to developing countries, but for various reasons these transfers are not occurring fast enough. Here again, one has to be careful in assuming that technology transfer will necessarily promote sustainable development.

Waste management and recycling are other important technology-related issues that deserve more attention.

Vinod

Vinod Mishra, Ph.D.
Fellow, Population and Health Studies
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601

Phone: (808) 944-7452
FAX: (808) 944-7490
Email: mishra@hawaii.edu

Date: 31 Oct 2001 14:12:23 -0000
From: "R.B.Bhagat" <bhagrb1@rediffmail.com>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Human Dimension

Dear Colleagues

While discussion in the last few days have been enriching towards understanding the relationship between population and environment, I however feel that we should not shy away debating the issues population vs people or sustainable development vs human development (Welfare) rightly brought to the fore by the comments of Clark, Mishra and Murphy. The event of Johannesburg could be a turning point in safeguarding our environment so crucial for the survival of mankind.

I strongly feel that a conceptual clarity is must for strategy and action. I further feel that the concepts like population and sustainable development are premised on

Malthusian vision and there is a need to go beyond it. On the other hand, the concepts like people and human development (welfare) are extremely important in view of the fact that each of the concepts as defined and understood is related with the fate of marginal and poor communities. Further, I would like to add that human dimension as envisaged should not be only the inventory of population issues, but how each dimension is related, and their synergy with environment. This will help us in finding suitable indicators for planning and monitoring environmental management.

R.B. Bhagat, Ph.D
Department of Geography
Maharshi Dayanand University
Rohtak-India

Date: Wed, 31 Oct 2001 11:12:47 -0500
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
CC: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] Human Dimension

Greetings all,

Since my post at the start of the seminar there have been many interesting and diverse views expressed. Those few of us who are indirectly labeled 'Malthusian' merit direct replies to our points rather than insinuations and references to localized studies (usually without url links or specific references). Overpopulation is a species/globe issue as well as a regional one. Overconsumption, 'dirty' and dangerous industrial & agricultural practices, waste, and violent conflict are all legitimate problems. But who among you will deny that the 400% increase in human numbers in the 20thC is a problem as well?

I urge you to examine the Peace and Conflict Studies *Research Projects* section at the Univ of Toronto: <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/pcs/>

Overpopulation is only one factor, but it is real.

I also wonder how social scientists can dismiss (without evidenced rebuttal) the work of ecologists, biologists, socio-biologists like E.O. Wilson, anthropologists, and other multidisciplinary 'hard scientists' who point to humans as not outside of (natural) living system dynamics. We are mammals. The chart of our population indicates that we are in what biologists call "plague phase". A handicapper's odds would indicate a high probability of problem

exacerbation as the graph climbs towards a Nasdaq like apex.

So I urge us to work together, and to avoid political correctness and idealistic sidestepping of the tough issues. Intergenerational justice is about the well-being potential for our progeny. The "human dimension" must deal with the future as well as with today. Tomorrow there will be 250,000 or so NET additional humans. (Births minus deaths) The majority of new babies (much higher than 250,000) will face unhealthy conditions, and many of them will be unintended consequences of unwanted impregnation. Suffering in the future will continue to grow if women aren't given control over the timing and numbers of their children.

With hope,

Steve Kurtz
Ottawa

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

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

Date: 1 Nov 2001 00:11:06 MST
From: earth care <careearth@usa.net>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [Re: [PERN_seminar] Human Dimension]

Dear all,

The views are indeed interesting - the diversity of view indeed helps. We agree with Steve Kurtz that evidence from ecologists and others who are working with a multi-disciplinary approach in regions that not only harbour large human populations but are also endowed with species richness needs to be considered.

Best wishes. Jayshree Vencatesan and Ranjit Daniels

Date: Thu, 01 Nov 2001 10:47:18 +0100
From: "Arcarese, Francesco (SDAR)" <Francesco.Arcarese@fao.org>

Subject: [PERN_seminar] Pern Seminar
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Greetings all,

I'm new to the seminar, but I've immediately detect the 200 years old Malthusian-AntiMalthusian querelle. Why there are always polemics? There is no need of 'academic war' like Economy vs Biology. It's childish. I guess it's clear that overpopulation it's a big problem bit I think it's a relative concept. Peoples aren't poor only because "they are too many", in Middle Age the world population was few hundreds of millions and most of the people was "absolutely poor". I mean there is not any preterdetermined limit to the human population; poverty is the real big threat, and there are many inter-related causes for the persistence of it. Sure, how to do a 'sustainable development' is an open matter and different points of view are absolutely necessary, but please stop spread anguish, I think face that kind of problems having fear it's the worst thing.

Francesco Arcaese
Rome Italy

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2001 11:30:03 -0500 (EST)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Poverty-environment interactions]

(Message posted for Dr. Bill Moseley)

Dear All:

An issue given passing reference in the draft outline of the science policy statement is the nature of poverty-environment interactions (an important dimension of the population-environment debate). This is an issue to which an entire chapter of Agenda 21 was devoted. The conventional wisdom is that the poor and hungry will often destroy their immediate environment in order to survive, and that this group is most directly affected by environmental change. A number of studies over the past 10 years have questioned this overly simplistic characterization, including, among others:

Broad, R. 1994. The Poor and the Environment: Friend or Foes?" World Development. 22(6): 811-812.

Moseley, W.G. 2001. "African Evidence on the Relation of Poverty, Time Preference and the Environment." *Ecological Economics*. 38(3): 317-326.

Reardon, T. and Vosti, S.A., 1995. "Links between rural poverty and the environment in developing countries: asset categories and investment poverty." *World Development*. 23(9):1495-1506.

Scherr, S. 2000. "A downward spiral? Research evidence on the relationship between poverty and natural resource degradation." *Food Policy*. 25: 479-498.

My own dissertation research in southern Mali revealed that the vulnerability of the relatively wealthy (small-hold) farmers has been affected more greatly by environmental change than that of the poor over the past 15 to 20 years. The two major components of vulnerability, exposure to shocks and ability to recover, had both been eroded. It was also found that soil quality measures on the farms of the rich and the poor were not significantly different, refuting the conventional wisdom that the wealthy are better managers of the environment. Finally, a variety of environmentally deleterious cultivation practices were associated with export-oriented cotton production, an activity more vigorously pursued by wealthy than poor farmers.

I would be pleased to see a more sophisticated/questioning treatment of poverty-environment interactions in the science policy statement.

Respectfully yours,

William Moseley, Assistant Professor
Department of Geography
Davis Hall, Rm. 118
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115-2854 USA
Email: moseley@geog.niu.edu
Tel: 815-753-6839, Fax: 815-753-6872
<http://globe.geog.niu.edu/faculty/moseley/moseley.htm>

From: "Catherine M Marquette" <cmarquette@earthlink.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Week Two Summary
Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2001 16:21:16 -0500

Week Two Summary: Discussion on the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment

(Please save this message!)

Note: You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute: send your comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org. Read remarks online at www.populationenvironmentresearch.org <<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>> (Go to Cyberseminars).

This message includes

- 1) A brief summary of the substantive remarks Oct 14-31, 2001;
- 2) A reminder of commands and ways to access the listserve.

1) Summary of Discussion October 24-31.

Reminder: The context is to solicit feedback from the population-environment research community to facilitate revision of the preliminary policy statement on "Population in Sustainable Development", prepared in September by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP). The Preliminary Statement is downloadable from www.populationenvironmentresearch.org (Go to Cyberseminars). The final statement will be presented and discussed at the WSSD/Earth Summit 2 in Johannesburg, September 2002 (after review and further revisions). Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>. Learn more about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting www.earthsummit2002.org. Members of the GSP are presently reviewing last week's comments and recommendations, so we expect to hear from them by next week with rebuttals and clarification.

Thanks to all the participants from Italy, India, Northern Africa and the US who commented on varied topics last week: On the relevant population variables, scale was again mentioned, and population growth/size received more attention than distribution, while consumption and rising expectations were again emphasized. Population balance is an improvement on population stabilization but echoes neo-Malthusianism, and a debate ensued. The vulnerability/differential responsibility framework, one core theme of the Statement, received more positive feedback but no explicit attention or elaboration. The challenge last week to focus case studies at sub-region or ecosystem was not (yet) picked up on, but Russia was introduced as a possible --unique and depressing --case. Selected quotes follow (with contributors name in parentheses so you can look up the full remarks.)

Continued debate on people vs. population in sustainable (or "human") development: "population and people needs more clarity in relation to environment... [how to] incorporate in environmental management, planning and monitoring or in sustainable development? .discussion on population should extend operationally to the debate on the inclusion of

the indicators like per capita emission of Carbon Dioxide, CFC or per capita decline in forest cover or etc. in the construction of Human Development Index ..(Bhagat)

It is not clear that "the human dimension is missing from the Johannesburg agenda" from examination of documents online at www.earthsummit2002 .. [which] mention of education as well as human rights, HIV/AIDs and other 'human' concerns. ...for the statement to overemphasize this argument would waste an opportunity to argue for something more and it may be a straw man argument. Building on the idea of putting 'humans/people' into sustainable development: what specific additional policies or approaches are being called for in the statement, beyond "Education"? With urbanization and migration, 'education' is inadequate to the task of accommodating still-rising numbers of humans (distributed in space) and their rising/changing consumption patterns to the constraints of environmental systems and resources at many different levels . (Murphy)

The terminology that we are using seems to be placed out of Cairo 1994. I thought that one goal of the forum was to highlight the "state of the art" regarding population/environment research...population is one of many variables and that within population we have growth, age, distribution, migration, etc. These interact with a host of economic, social, and political variables with a variety of outcomes. A potential difficulty in crafting a short policy statement. .(Coon)

The role of Technology .technological progress is no panacea; [it] is both a cause and potential remedy of environmental problems. Promoting a more rapid transfer of cleaner and more efficient technologies from developed countries to developing countries [is part of the solution] (Mishra)

On "Malthusian vs. anti- Malthusians"

Those few of us who are indirectly labeled 'Malthusian' merit direct replies to our points rather than insinuations and references to localized studies . Overpopulation is only one factor, but it is real. [Can social scientists dismiss the work of] ecologists, biologists, socio-biologists like E.O. Wilson, anthropologists, and other multidisciplinary 'hard scientists' who point to humans as not outside of (natural) living system dynamics. We are mammals .I urge us to work together. The "human dimension" must deal with the future as well . The majority of new babies will face unhealthy conditions. Suffering will continue if women aren't given control over the timing and numbers of their children. (Kurtz)

.evidence from ecologists and others who are working with a multi-disciplinary approach in regions that not only harbour large human populations but are also endowed with species richness needs to be considered.(Vencatesan and Daniels)

Johannesburg could be a turning point in safeguarding our environment . but population and sustainable development are premised on Malthusian vision and there is a need to go beyond it.. people and human development (welfare) are defined and understood in relation to fate of marginal and poor communities (Bhagat).

[I] detect the 200 years old quarrel . There is no need of 'academic war' (Economy vs Biology) .. overpopulation is a big problem but a relative concept . there is no predetermined limit to the human population; poverty is the real big threat, and there are many inter-related causes for the persistence of it . (Arcarese) .)

[We need to show] empirical evidence where the neo-malthusian concepts work and don't work [at different scales] . population balance as an improvement but conforms to Neo-Malthusianism.to move past this we need {to show} the "scientific" consensus (Coon)

Case Studies: Russia was introduced as a case study, drawing from a report in AVISO (Russia: New Dimensions of Environmental Security <http://www.gechs.org/AvisoEnglish/nine.shtml>) (this reflects a scenario far different from the 2 model/positive cases in the GSP Statement): . the most serious problem for the economic outlook is depopulation. In recent years the population has been declining by almost a million persons a year. . The ailing economy is compounding the country's environmental problems. The agricultural sector is in a bad way. Privatizing land ownership has been hailed as a great step towards economic recovery [but people are] far from convinced. The main problem here is depopulation. the real estate market will remain depressed. [The solution might be] to adopt an affirmative recycling policy.. ("Scientists").

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] UNFPA SWP report focuses on population and environment
Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2001 08:59:55 -0600

Dear list serve participants, this publication may be of interest:

The State of World Population 2001 report, Footprints and Milestones: Population and Environmental Change will be released on 7 November 2001. It will be available on the UNFPA web site in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Russian. "Increasing population and consumption are altering the planet on an unprecedented scale. Signs of stress are everywhere - destroyed natural habitats, threatened species, degraded soil, polluted air and water, and melting icecaps ..."

Find the press kit and get access to the full report (after November 7) at the UNFPA site: <http://www.unfpa.org/swp/swpmain.htm>

Laura Murphy, PhD
Clinical Assistant Professor
Department of International Health & Development, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine
and Stone Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net

Date: Fri, 02 Nov 2001 16:35:29 -0500
From: pern-m <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Population Environment Research Network Issue 15.2001

WHAT'S NEW?

1 November 2001

There are five items in this update:

1. Upcoming Meetings: Annual Meeting of the African Population Association; Population Geography; Native Nations and Resource Use
2. New publications: Asian MetaCentre Working Paper Series, Woodrow Wilson Center Environmental Change and Security Project Report

3. Job Positions: Research Associate/Rappaport Institute/Harvard University; Economist Researcher Scholar IIASA LUC Project; Director IIASA; Director of Research Program, Institute of Behavioral Science University of Colorado

4. Funding Opportunities for Research on Global Security and Cooperation

5. Update on Current Cyberseminar: Statement on Population and Environment for next Earth Summit

1. The following Conferences or Workshops are coming up:

- Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, will be held November 15-18, 2001 in Houston, Texas USA. Sessions and conference info available at website

<http://www.africanstudies.org/PreliminaryProgram100901.pdf>. Many sessions will address human-environment issues including: (Inter)national Political Economies and Local Ecologies: Rural African; Livelihoods in a Political Ecology Context (Parts I, II, and III); Agricultural Maneuvers in Zimbabwe and Its Hinterland: Latent and Emergent Agrarian Contexts; Shifting Ground: Land Reform, Migration, and Agricultural Transformations; Are Resources Natural? Indigenous Ecologies and Cultural Landscapes in Eastern and Southern Africa (Parts I and II); Population Processes and African Communities: Perspectives from Anthropological Demography.

- The First International Conference on Population Geographies is to be held in the University of St Andrews, Scotland on 19-23 July 2002. The conference is organised by the Population Geography Research Group (PGRG) of the Royal Geographical Society - Institute for British Geographers (RGS-IBG). Deadline for submission of abstracts and registration is 30 April 2002. For enquiries, please contact: Conference Officer at email: gg-conf@st-andrews.ac.uk

- Conference on "Building Native Nations: Environment, Natural Resources, and Governance," to be held at Udall Center and its Native Nations Institute, December 11-13, 2001, in Tucson, Arizona. Aim of conference is to seek recommendations for possible presentations on tribal projects related to environmental and natural resources management. The conference, expected to attract some 300 participants from Native nations in the United States, Canada, and abroad.

Conference will include a series of plenary and concurrent presentations sessions addressing issues related to the science, politics, economics, and cultural aspects of Native nations natural resources management, environmental protection, and self-governance. Some travel and per diem support available. Please contact: Robert Merideth at the Udall Center at merideth@u.arizona.edu. For more information about the Building Native Nations conference, including visit the Udall Center's Web site at: <http://udallcenter.arizona.edu/conference/bnn2.htm>.

2. We alert members to the following new publications:

- The Asian MetaCentre has initiated a working paper series entitled the "Asian MetaCentre Research Paper Series" under its purview. The aim is to advance understanding of population and sustainable development issues in the Asian context, particularly those related to population-environment interactions, population forecasting, and migration and families. The Asian MetaCentre Research Paper Series is a forum for the presentation of scholars working on a range of diverse issues in the Asian context. All contributions should be sent to popnasia@nus.edu.sg

- The new issue of the Environmental Change and Security Project Report of the Woodrow Wilson Centre is available. The full Report is available in .pdf format at http://ecsp.si.edu/Ecsp_pdf.htm. It includes an article on "Environmental Stress and Human Security in Northwest Pakistan" that addresses among other things the environmental impact of population growth due to Afghan refugees, an analysis of African hunger and conflict cycles over the last 25 years, debate among leading population activists and scholars over population implosion, recommendations for effective conservation tactics in the Brazilian Amazon, discussion on Brazil's new Amazonian environmental monitoring system, and commentaries from around the world on the National Intelligence Council's Global Trends 2015 report.

3. The following job positions are announced:

- HDGEC Research Associate Position at the Rappaport Institute for Greater Boston Harvard University. The Rappaport Institute for Greater Boston at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University seek an individual to create a set of information resources documenting geographic, economic, and social change in the several neighborhoods that border a set of contiguous parks and open spaces in the City of Boston. These resources should be designed to help planners and neighborhood stakeholders come to a common understanding of the causes of present conditions and work together to develop long-term visions and strategies

for the area. This position will be based at the Rappaport Institute and reports to the Institute's Director, Dr. Charles C. Euchner. For further information contact: Charles C. Euchner, Executive Director, Rappaport Institute of Greater Boston, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA, Tel: 617-496-3155; Fax: 617-496-1722; rappaport_institute@ksg.harvard.edu

- Economist Research Scholar/ Land Use Change Project IIASA. In order to carry out research as part of a team in charge of coordinating a China WTO study, jointly implemented with Chinese and European partner institutions and funded under the EU 5th Framework Programme, the LUC Project is recruiting an Economist/Research Scholar. General objectives of the research include (i) to undertake a thorough policy analysis in the context of China's integration into the world food system and (ii) to engage in an informed policy dialogue between institutions in China and the EU on the realization of the main goals of agricultural development as specified in China's Agenda 2. Candidate should have a degree in quantitative economics (mathematical economics, econometrics, or operations research). To apply, send a cover letter, resume, plus names, addresses, telephone and fax numbers of three work-related references to: Walter Foith, Personnel Administrator, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria, E-mail: foithw@iiasa.ac.at For further information about the project, please visit the LUC homepage or contact the Project Leader, Dr. Günther Fischer, E-mail: fisher@iiasa.ac.at

- Director, IIASA. IIASA is seeking a highly qualified scientific leader for the position of Director. The IIASA Director oversees and guides a diverse research program combining natural and social science to produce scientifically based policy guidance on issues related to global change. Candidates should combine a vision for IIASA with scientific excellence, management and diplomatic skills, and broad experience in interdisciplinary research and policy applications in the international arena. Submit letter of application, CV, bibliography, and contact information for three references, to: Professor M.J. Mossakowski, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, IIASA -- Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria. Deadline for applications is December 31, 2001.

- Director of the Research Program, The University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science/Department of Economics and the Environmental Studies Program. The Institute invites applications from Economists for the position of Director of the Research Program on Environment and Behavior in the Institute of Behavioral Science. Recruiting is targeted at the advanced Associate Professor level; however, individuals at a higher rank may be considered. More

information concerning the Research Program on Environment and Behavior can be found in the Institute of Behavioral Science's brochure, available on-line at www.colorado.edu/IBS/brochure/. Send applications to: Dr. J. Terrence McCabe, Search Chair, Research Program on Environment and Behavior, Institute of Behavioral Science, 468 UCB, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309-0468. E-mail: tmccabe@spot.Colorado.edu

4. Funding for Research and Training on Issues of Global Security and Cooperation. (Multiple Deadlines between 3 Dec 2001 and 3 February 2002). The Global Security and Cooperation (GSC) Program of the Social Science Research Council in New York is pleased to announce 4 new funding opportunities for research and training on the underlying causes and conditions of conflict and insecurity. There are no citizenship or nationality requirements. The GSC program offers a number of fellowships and research grants to help enable these collaborations and is particularly keen to increase the number of qualified applications from scholars and practitioners from Africa, Asia and Latin America. Grants to be made in the areas of collaborative research on Conflict Zones, Research Fellowships for Professionals Working in International Affairs, Postdoctoral Fellowships on Global Security and Cooperation, and Dissertation Fellowships on Global Security and Cooperation: For more information and application forms please contact GSC at: Social Science Research Council, Email: gsc@ssrc.org; Web: www.ssrc.org

5. Update on Cyberseminar on Preliminary Statement by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP) to Earth Summit. This seminar is currently on-going through our seminar-listserve. Participants from Nepal, Brazil, Germany, India, Tanzania, the US among others have urged attention to space and distribution variables: i.e., migration and urbanization. Scale was emphasized as an organizing principle. Population balance as an alternative to 'stabilization' received mixed responses; incorporating age/sex/education composition is an improvement, but others argue the concept is too ill-defined. Distinction between terms such as 'people' versus 'population' and 'sustainable development' versus 'human welfare' were raised. The vulnerability/differential responsibility framework received positive feedback, as did the case studies approach, although ecosystems/regions would be better than country-level studies. Re-organization of the Statement was recommended to clarify the multiple messages/audiences (i.e., social policy, population, and human dimensions communities). To review or participate in the discussion to date go to www.populationenvironmentresearch.org and follow the 'Cyberseminars' link. You do not have to join the listserve to participate in the seminar.

Your Research

Our database needs your contributions to stay current and useful so please send us your abstracts and bibliographic citations, as well as reviews of resources. We aim to provide comprehensive coverage of gray (unpublished) materials, and citations for major journals and books from 2000 forward.

New Members Welcome!

If you are not already a member and wish to become one, please visit the website at www.populationenvironmentresearch.org and continue to the "Sign Up for Membership in the Network" link. Members will continue to regularly receive the "What's New?" digest of events and updates to the database, and announcements of cyber seminars and other news and opportunities.

For more information about the project, or to REMOVE yourself from this list or CORRECT your email address, send an email to the Population-Environment Research Network coordinators at pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org (To REMAIN on our mailing list for occasional announcements, do nothing.)

Thank you.

Laura Murphy and Catherine Marquette
Co-coordinators
pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Correct reference - Russian case study
Date: Sat, 3 Nov 2001 11:39:55 +1000

The reference we gave in our Russian case study was wrong. The article in the PERN database is entitled 'Russia: New Dimensions of Environmental Insecurity' and the hyperlink is <http://www.gechs.org/aviso/AvisoEnglish/nine.shtml>

We apologize to the authors. We have put a link to this article on our website and the reference is correct there.

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org

Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2001 10:23:03 -0500 (EST)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] for GSP discussion

(message posted for Dr. Daniel Hogan)

The discussion on the Global Science Panel's statement has been an enlightening view of the "population and environment community." As a member of the PERN advisory board and the Global Panel, I would like to express some of my concerns about this exchange of views.

Although the statement and the network have demographic science as the motivating force (it is sponsored, let us not forget, by the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population and the International Human Dimensions Program- also an academic program), the participants who have sent comments and the content of these comments clearly suggest that the public reached by the network represents a broad array of scientists and environmental militants whose interest in population does not originate in demographic science, but in a generic concern for the relations among population change, environmental change and development. For those of us who have spent one or two decades trying to go beyond the idea of population as people, and population as "population explosion," to develop a demographic approach to environmental change, this exchange is not encouraging.

The association of non-demographers to this forum is an indication of (1) the lack of other fora on these issues and (2) a persistent view of population-environment issues which conceives the problem as basically one of over-population. I believe the panel will have to consider its goal of expressing a more focused view of population dynamics and environmental change, and ask whether this is the

appropriate forum for expressing a position on a people-centered position on sustainable development. While I believe that it would be extremely useful to have a more specific demographic view, the decision on the general orientation of the final document will have to be based on an evaluation of other contributions to the Johannesburg preparatory documents.

I include here a citation from an earlier text on the population/environment question, considering that the general debate has taken this direction. This text was presented to the 2000 International Rural Sociology Congress in 2000 in Rio de Janeiro (special ISA mini-conference on Sustainability), and is to be published in Timmons Roberts, Eduardo Viola, and Frederick H. Buttel (eds.), *Sustainability and Unsustainability on the Road from Rio* (more academic version) and in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*.

Paris: Unesco, 2001 (more general version):

"One of the first challenges for demographers, when they identified a place in the environmental debate that was not limited to the neo-Malthusian polemic, was to confront the near unanimity of environmental activists and environmental scientists as to the "population explosion." While this is not an irrelevant issue, the exclusive focus which it has received left population specialists at the margin of the debate. For them, both causes and consequences of rapid population growth were complex phenomena. To attribute the environmental crisis to this factor was to simplify demographic analysis. It would take many years for the discipline to see that it had a contribution which went beyond this issue. The reciprocal impacts between environmental factors and health or between resource use and population distribution processes would come to be recognized as important issues with demographic content. Efforts to deal with these issues in the nineteen nineties have led demographers to question their theories and research techniques. ...

What we have observed over the last few decades, then, is that concern with the pressure of numbers on resources first grew and later declined among population specialists at the international level; set down roots among neo-Malthusianists; and was acritically appropriated by environmentalists. Many

studies and the experience of developing countries have contributed to transforming the question of "rapid population growth as the greatest obstacle to development" to "rapid growth as one among other factors which make development more difficult." This difference in emphasis has been accompanied by efforts to determine the mechanisms by which growth affects development. ...

To the extent that the seriousness of environmental limits came to be better understood, however, relations with demographic dynamics again became the object of attention, this time from a different perspective. Considering the size of (Brazilian) national territory and the present state of the demographic transition, this new attention does not emerge in terms of the volume or growth rates of population, but directed to questions of health and population distribution. The relations between environmental change and fertility (the other component of demographic dynamics) are identified as important, but not yet objects of intense research. This change of emphasis occurred in parallel with the change mentioned above in thinking on population and development at the international level. All segments of the "population community" have not absorbed this evolution, however, and the more simplistic version survives in statements of both environmentalists and birth control advocates. Each uses the relationship in its own way and for its own ends, without examining the possible mechanisms involved. ...

It is no longer population size or growth rates which will occupy the center of attention. The prudent husbandry of sustainability implies, for demographic dynamics, a careful adjustment of population distribution to a given territory's resource base. This adjustment will not be made only on technical considerations of these resources, but on the societal definition of the role of each unit of the mosaic of ecosystems of which it is composed. All of the factors which contribute to an understanding of the dynamics of population mobility must receive greater attention if this fine tuning of population distribution is to be achieved.

Regards,
Daniel Joseph Hogan

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] on population-environment research, Dan Hogan's comments
Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2001 10:58:42 -0600

I appreciate the comments of Dan Hogan. His comments challenge the authors of the Statement to think about a feasible focus ('population dynamics and environmental change' or 'human welfare centered development').²⁰

It is also a challenge to social scientists in the 'population-environment' research community to better articulate and more widely communicate the substance, approach and directions of research to the environmental research community.

One of the goals of the Network is to better communicate diverse perspectives and to cross the 'disciplinary boundaries' to improve research on critical social, demographic and environmental trends. This cyberdiscussion is a relevant forum to share your comments on the state of research --recognizing it tends to start from one perspective (i.e., the 'social' or environmental). The Statement itself, I believe, has the much narrower goal of trying to synthesize key findings from social science research that translates into policy recommendations for communication to the Earth Summit 2002 audience.²⁰

To make a modest contribution on the goal of communicating research findings, here are a few insights/offerings:²⁰

1-The last cyberseminar on "Population Environment Dynamics in Coastal Areas" (in April, visit www.populationenvironmentresearch.org -->Cyberseminars for archives) highlighted the need to better understand 'migration' as a factor in resource use, management and degradation, for example. Migration is not only a dynamic contributing to population growth in coastal areas, but brings with it changes in behavior, social networks and income sources. ²⁰

Surveying the range of literature and projects in the Population Environment Research Network database, current research covers a wide range of conceptual and methodological approaches and scales, making it hard to find common ground. I would agree with Hogan however, and other commentators here, that one common theme in the social sciences research are to go beyond 'size' (not to ignore it completely) to composition, migration, urbanization and consumption and their impacts on the environment at different scales. At the same time, impacts of the changes in the natural environment at many scales affect human fertility, health, mobility, livelihoods and vulnerability. Systems

models and feedback loops between natural and human systems are a focus of newer interdisciplinary studies (i.e., biocomplexity research funded by the US NSF, or various models of IIASA).

Another source of recent research trends in population-environment from the demographic and social science perspective is the UN report, Population, Environment and Development (downloadable from <http://www.un.org/esa/population/unpop.htm> or from <http://www.un.org/esa/population/cpd/comm2001.htm>)

I like to think that trends in social scientists approach to population and the environment reflect increasingly sophisticated and better informed (if vastly incomplete) understanding of environmental systems and cycles, upon which all life on earth depends, and less on simplistic and anthropogenic view of 'resources' for human use.²⁰

For discussion between demographers/social scientists and environmentalists to rise above debates and towards a cooperation, there must be continued self- and mutual education and discussion.

Thank you.

Laura Murphy, PhD
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

Clinical Assistant Professor
Department of International Health & Development, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine²⁰
and Stone Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] I=PAT
Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2001 05:15:49 +1000

I=PAT

A member of this list serve, who incidentally is now also a member of our

organization, suggested to us that we should do an elaboration of our economic model for sustainability in terms of the I=PAT equation. The concern was that in our push for global population reduction we are not addressing the major cause of environmental degradation, namely the high consumption per capita in the US and other very affluent countries.

As the question to I=PAT or not to I=PAT is raised in the GSP Policy Statement how our model stacks up in this equation becomes relevant to the seminar.

Our objective is for all countries to reduce their population to 1/6 of current levels over the course of the next 200 or 300 years. The global human population would be around 1 billion. In the case of the US that would mean a population of about 45 million people. So the population factor in the I=PAT equation is reduced by 5/6.

Our model demonstrates that a country with declining population can achieve prosperity across the board by adopting affirmative recycling policy. Poverty and unemployment are nonexistent. Because there is zero unemployment wages and salaries will continually rise (more jobs available than there are people to fill them). So the affluence factor in the I=PAT equation will treble.

Affirmative recycling policy will make the farming sector very affluent. By the time the US has a population of 45 million it is envisaged that the amount of agricultural land will be 1/4 of what we see currently. Farmers will be able to afford state of the art technology for environmental protection and waste management (for instance proper manure treatment plants at factory farms). In addition because affluence has trebled industry in general will be able to afford the technology for maximum environmental protection. (emission controls for instance which the Bush administration says are too expensive for industry to implement) So the technology factor in the I=PAT equation will be reduced by 3/4.

The final result under I=PAT would therefore be population reduced by 5/6, affluence trebled and technology down by 3/4. Introducing arbitrary numbers into the equation the current Environmental Impact in the US is $6 \times 10 \times 4 = 240$. The Environmental Impact if our economic model for sustainability was adopted would be $1 \times 30 \times 1 = 30$. We think our model stacks up quite well under I=PAT. We're talking here a reduction of environmental impact of almost 90%.

We thoroughly endorse the I=PAT equation as originally proposed by Ehrlich and Holdren and we can see no reason whatsoever to go beyond it. It's true merit only comes to the fore once you've got a really good economic model to

apply it to.

To illustrate the point let's look what happens if things continue the way they are. By the end of this century the population factor will have increased 1/3. The affluence factor would probably remain fairly static in as much as there would be the same proportions of rich and poor. With the farming sector chronically cash poor and inefficient, and no change in attitude in the industrial sector, the technology factor will struggle to keep pace with the population factor. Let's say the technology factor will increase by 1/2.

The current amount of environmental impact is $6 \times 10^4 = 240$. By the end of this century the environmental impact of the human race will be $9 \times 10^6 = 540$. As if the human race was not doing enough damage already, come the year 2100

we will have intensified our assault on this planet 125%.

The problem is not with the $I=PAT$ equation. The message it is delivering is crystal clear, and it is this message that should be taken to Johannesburg next year.

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org
email: webadmin@scientists4pr.org

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] The Demographic Imperative
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2001 01:57:47 +1000

In our efforts to put people first, let's not get involved in a McCarthyesque witchhunt against environmental militants. The Global Summit is obviously about environmental issues and the GSP should be speaking for all scientists and not just demographers. We should try to remain receptive to new ideas, and not dismiss them out of hand simply because they are not couched in demographer speak.

At this point we would like to present some comments by George Martine who presented the anchor paper for the inaugural PERN cyberseminar.

THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF SPACE: ADVANCING THE

POPULATION/ENVIRONMENT AGENDA
GEORGE MARTINE, DIRECTOR UNFPA COUNTRY SUPPORT TEAM,
MEXICO,DF.

"The population/environment literature has centred mostly on the relation between population growth and environmental change. This discussion is stagnated and provides surprisingly little guidance for policy formation; at most, it provides legitimacy for what is already being done."

"The overwhelming majority of the work on population/environment linkages has centred on how population size and rate of growth affect the depletion of natural resources. This debate is largely stagnated and its policy implications are surprisingly restricted."

"Personally, I would be willing to go further in this direction and state, unequivocally, that practically any environmental challenge that one can perceive as facing humankind today, from ozone depletion to waste disposal, is made more difficult by population growth."

"The very real threat posed by the combination of economic growth and population increase should be a matter of great concern to everybody, including policymakers, activists, researchers and common citizens alike."

We also present some comments from an article in the PERN database. We are wondering if this is the same Daniel Joseph Hogan who recently expressed his disapproval of the people participating in the cyberseminar.

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY:
Brazilian Perspectives

Daniel Joseph Hogan
Department of Sociology and Population Studies Center,
State University of Campinas
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/papers/hogan.doc>

"While there is an American organization which promotes the idea of negative growth (considering that

the ideal population for the United States would be that of the 1940s), the only historical experience of national mobilization in this regard is the Chinese. It seems very unlikely that this experience would resonate well in Brazil. Concern, therefore, moves from the question of growth in itself to the conditions in which decline will occur and how its benefits will be distributed."

"An important characteristic of contemporary social sciences is the interpenetration of science with other segments of society. In any academic congress today, politicians and NGO activists will be found together with specialists from government agencies. The reverse of the coin is also true: there is continually greater participation of academics in other spheres of public life. One of the consequences of this is that, although in specialized journals (the last bastion of scientific market reserve) this position is rarely found, in conferences and in publications which result from them, the neo-Malthusian vision is still present."

"Paul Ehrlich's formulation (1968), according to which environmental stress may be characterized as the product of population, affluence and technology, has become a commonplace, although without the determinant role of population size which the author emphasized. We can understand the "I=PAT" equation (Environmental Impact = Population x Affluence x Technology) not as a simple multiplicative relation, but as a synthesis of the principal factors involved... The advantage of the paradigm of the human ecologists is that it calls attention to the interrelations of each factor with the others."

"The new concern, both a product and a source of modern environmentalism, is connected to a holistic vision of the question. It is not only a question of identifying the environmental elements in the etiology of a given illness. The concern today puts into question our whole way of life and asks whether the "developed" way of life will only be attained with our self-poisoning. Can the contemporary agro-industrial complex be sustained without exhausting natural

resources? Without compromising the quality of air, rivers, the sea, soils? Without exposing the population at the workplace or at home to an innumerable number of substances prejudicial to health? The ecological question, in the last analysis, is of the viability of maintaining and extending our way of life."

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org
email: webadmin@scientists4pr.org

Date: Tue, 06 Nov 2001 14:13:10 -0200
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
From: Daniel Joseph Hogan <hogan@nepo.unicamp.br>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Sci for Pop Reduc note

Let's not be so touchy that criticism is seen as "witchhunting." Whether the GSP's statement should have a more strictly demographic focus or not is clearly an issue the panel will have to address. It is not clear to me at this point which strategy is preferable, though I believe demography has a specific contribution to make. Demographers do, of course, listen to others, and I would hope that this discussion continues to be open to all.

regards,
(the same) Dan Hogan

Daniel Joseph Hogan
Núcleo de Estudos de População/Population Studies Center
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
13081-970 Campinas-SP
Brasil
tel: 55 19 3788-5894

Date: Tue, 06 Nov 2001 13:26:41 -0500
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] health strategies

Greetings all,

As a change, here are some thoughts about the wholesystem linkages between

population, environment, economics, cultural tendencies, and human health. I know a few health policy experts, and try to keep abreast of news that is relevant to the field. There appears to be wide agreement that high population density increases the risk of onset and rates of infection of many human diseases, *ceteris paribus*. Of course individual countries like The Netherlands can be offered as counter examples; but they are exceptions that prove the rule. A key question to ask is: would the health of a national population benefit from increased or decreased density.

The only argument I've heard for the former is based on neoclassical economics whereby increased economic growth is said to require population growth, or certainly not shrinkage. This economic growth is assumed to provide better health for all *ad infinitum*. Technology is claimed to be the magic wand, but it requires continual inputs of non-human calories, with resource drain and waste production.. The major fallacy here is that fiat money (tokens/credits-the kind that exists today) and even precious metals and jewels themselves provide no goods or services that benefit or sustain life. They provide no nutrition, shelter, water, or fuel/energy. They do provide power to access goods and services to the extent that the medium of exchange is valued by others. But money does not directly create health. The growth of economies and populations in fact reduces the natural wealth upon which they are based, again *ceteris paribus*. There is a point of diminishing return of all growth, and this seems to me to be largely ignored by social scientists, particularly economists. So, environmental (and by implication health) strategies that fail to address the potential negative impacts of density, level, and growth of populations are obviously flawed.

Re the so called "population implosion" claims, they are obviously based upon national or regional cultural and economic fears; for the global population is not projected to stop growing (barring catastrophe) for at least the next half century. It is natural to want ones cultural roots and language to endure. It is also apparently natural for some cultures to produce offspring at two or three times the rate of other ones. I humbly suggest that much global violent conflict involves clashes of cultures and economies, with overt competitive breeding part of the picture. This is a self-destructive health strategy for both the local population as well as for the species as a whole. I see no easy solutions, but again suggest that women's empowerment and wholistic education for all are needed.

Steven Kurtz

--

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

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: [PERN_seminar] health strategies
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2001 12:56:17 +1100

> -----Original Message-----

> **From:** Steve Kurtz [SMTP:kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca]

> **Sent:** Wednesday, November 07, 2001 5:27 AM

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

> **Subject:** [PERN_seminar] health strategies

...

> *Re the so called "population implosion" claims, they are obviously based upon national or regional cultural and economic fears; for the global population is not projected to stop growing (barring catastrophe) for at least the next half century. It is natural to want ones cultural roots and language to endure. It is also apparently natural for some cultures to produce offspring at two or three times the rate of other ones. I humbly suggest that much global violent conflict involves clashes of cultures and economies, with overt competitive breeding part of the picture. This is a self-destructive health strategy for both the local population as well as for the species as a whole. I see no easy solutions, but again suggest that women's empowerment and wholistic education for all are needed. <*

I agree with Steve Kurtz on the cultural issue. Sometime scientific researches and solution which give the best outcome for a global problem (like the population and environment issue) do not get us much progress unless we address the cultural differences at play in adopting and agreeing to common framework or strategy. Bridging the cultural differences requires a commitment to work from common grounds which can be shifted due to economic and polical processes.

The clash of cultures is a divisive issue and should be managed and avoided. For most scientists across many cultures, I don't think there are any clashes or much disagreement on the need to address and solve the problem. But beyond the 'scientific world', there are 'other worlds' which are not aware of the issue and have complete different perspectives and ideas rooted in economic, religious and cultural traditions. And as Steve suggested women's empowerment and wholistic education for all may be the solution in the long term.

Hiep Duc
Air scientist
Environment Protection Authority, NSW

Date: 7 Nov 2001 09:24:07 -0000
From: "R.B.Bhagat" <bhagrb1@rediffmail.com>
To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Policy Issues

Human population constitutes different interest groups, and as such any issues have different perspectives. But the question of environment is a much larger issue which deals with our common survival in the long run. I agree with Laura that demographers/social scientists and environmentalists to rise above academic debates and towards a cooperation, there must be continued self-and mutual education and discussion. One of the important consensus that is emerging is that population does play a role of obstacle in sustainable development/Human Welfare and, therefore the discipline of population studies has also a role to play in the management of problems related with size and distribution of population, migration and urbanisation etc. Secondly, the education and empowerment is essential to deal with vulnerabilities. But there is no strategy suggested to deal with responsibility - common and differentiated. Should the responsible pay environmental tax in order to mobilise resources for education to deal with vulnerabilities? And also to discourage the environmentally unsound production/consumption.

I would like that the final document to consider these points as a policy strategy.

R. B. Bhagat, Ph.D
Department of Geography
Maharshi Dayanand University
Rohtak-124001, India

Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2001 10:57:18 -0500
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: perNSEminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] UNFPA SWP report focuses on population and environment

A Reuters news item is excerpted below about the UN Report that Laura Murphy mentioned. Note the last two sentences which point towards solutions.

Steve Kurtz

=====

World Facing Disaster as Population Booms -- U.N

Updated: Tue, Nov 06 9:15 PM EST

By Jeremy Lovell

LONDON (Reuters) - People are plundering the planet at an unprecedented and unsustainable rate that needs to be curbed quickly to avoid worldwide disaster, the United Nations said Wednesday.

"More people are using more resources with more intensity than at any point in human history," the United Nations said in its annual world population report for 2001.

"The costs of delaying action will increase rapidly over time. ... By 2050, 4.2 billion people (over 45 percent of the global total) will be living in countries that cannot meet the daily requirement of 50 liters (11 gallons) of water per person to meet basic needs."

The population, which has doubled to 6.1 billion in the past 40 years, is projected to surge 50 percent to 9.3 billion within another half century -- with all the growth in developing countries whose resources are already overstretched.

The report said water was being used and polluted at catastrophic rates.

WATER CONSUMPTION SURGES

Currently, 54 percent of available freshwater supplies are being used annually -- two-thirds for agriculture.

That figure is set to surge to 70 percent by 2025 due to population growth alone, and 90 percent if consumption in the developing countries reached the levels in the developed world.

Water is already being used at unsustainable rates in many countries, with water tables under some Chinese, Latin American and South Asian cities dropping by more than 3 feet a year and water from seas and rivers being diverted with occasionally disastrous results.

The report said 1.1 billion people already did not have access to clean water, and in developing nations up to 95 percent of sewage and 70 percent of industrial waste were simply being dumped untreated into water courses.

Vital rain forests are being destroyed at the highest rate in history, taking with them crucial sources of biodiversity and contributing to climate warming, thereby boosting already rising sea levels.

SEAS OVEREXPLOITED

The seas continue to be massively overexploited and erosion is taking a rising toll of plant species -- one-quarter of which could be lost forever by 2025.

The United Nations said food production would have to double and distribution would have to improve to feed the exploding population, with most of the increase coming from higher yielding varieties that needed more environmentally dangerous chemicals to grow.

It said the globalization of commerce had increased global wealth but at the same time added to global inequalities, with the hordes of the world's forgotten poor forced to plunder their scarce natural resources simply to survive from day to day.

The global HIV/AIDS epidemic had spiraled out of control and far too little money was being made available to stem it and treat it and its related tide of orphans and outcasts.

A crucial key lay in giving women -- who played a major and largely unsung role in rural communities across the globe -- a far greater say in society and, equally important, in setting the size of their desired families.

"It is clear that providing full access to reproductive health services would be far less costly in the long run than the environmental consequences of the population growth that will result if reproductive health needs are not met," the report said.

=====

--

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

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

Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2001 17:34:46 +0100
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
From: Wolfgang LUTZ <lutz@iiasa.ac.at>

PEOPLE versus POPULATION

As one of the coordinators of the Global Science Panel I have been following the lively discussion with great interest. I wanted to thank all the contributors for the many important points made that will certainly be considered by the Panel in the next round of working on the document.

Given this complex process of producing a document it is also evident that at this point the draft outline still reflects different strains of thought and does not yet have the coherence that we hope the final document will have. At this stage one important purpose of the discussion is to evaluate which one of the different strains of thought should enter the final document.

One of the key developments in the course of planning this document has been a change in the role this Panel is likely to play in the Johannesburg process. We started out with the intention of focusing clearly on a summary of our science based knowledge on the relationships between the human population (in its demographic definition as being characterized by its size, composition and regional distribution as driven by fertility, mortality and migration) and its natural environment. I fully agree with all the comments made that this analysis of population-environment interactions should start with this more precise definition of population and not immediately go to the consideration of people-environment interactions, i.e. studying the human impacts on the environment more broadly. A forthcoming Special Supplement of Population and Development Review entitled "Population and Environment: Methods of Analysis" (ed.: Lutz, Prskawetz and Sanderson) makes this point very clearly and recommends that all population-environment studies should start with a comprehensive analysis of the relevant demographic dynamics in order to deserve the name "population-environment study". On the basis of this then other important human dimensions such as institutions, consumption patterns, values, health, poverty etc. can be included in the analysis.

In the context of the Global Science Panel preparing a statement for Johannesburg, however, we only recently understood that most of the other scientific input being prepared by other groups has a very strong emphasis on the natural sciences and gives little attention to social issues in general. Looking through the statements of many of the regional preparatory conferences produced over the last months or of the "international eminent persons meeting" in September, one finds a lot on different environmental

issues and not so much on the human dimension of development. Given that unlike(which I see as something by the people for the people considering the environment) and not just on the environment many members of the Panel as well as many others in the human dimensions community consider this unsatisfactory and suggest that the Panel should strongly and vocally oppose this trend.

For the focus and intent of the Panel statement it is not yet clear what this new situation means. It would imply that in addition or possibly instead of the original more limited focus on population it should now consider the human dimension in sustainable development more broadly. Is there a way to on the one hand maintain precision and clarity with respect to population and on the other hand stress the human dimension more broadly and the people into the picture without making the statement confusing? In an early contribution to this discussion Bill Clark of Harvard suggested to use population as a vehicle to bring the human dimension into Johannesburg. To me this sounds like a good strategy. The trick will be how to do it right.

Any suggestions?

Wolfgang Lutz

From: "Harald Agerley" <agerley@mail1.stofanet.dk>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] I=PAT
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2001 18:04:14 +0100

In a post of November 6 it said that it had been "... suggested to us that we should do an elaboration of our economic model for sustainability in terms of the I=PAT equation. The concern was that in our push for global population reduction we are not addressing the major cause of environmental degradation, namely the high consumption per capita in the US and other very affluent countries."

The post concludes with:

"The problem is not with the I=PAT equation. The message it is delivering is crystal clear, and it is this message that should be taken to Johannesburg next year."

This conclusion was based on estimates with respect to the factors on the right hand side of the equation - at the *end* of a population reduction period. While I do not disagree with this I should like to point out the problems with I=PAT *during* the transition to a lower

population level - in particular in the first period.

I have calculated some scenarios for the development of global consumption (that is of $P \cdot A$) for a reduction of the global population to 1/6 of the present level during a period of only 100 years.

Assuming that the present growth rate of about 1.5% p.a. for the population in the developing countries can only be reduced to negative values over the span of several years due to the demographic momentum and that the per capita consumption in these countries will increase in the decades to come the scenarios show, that global consumption may very well increase by a factor 2 over the next few decades and probably at least by 1/3. This in spite of the assumption made, that the growth in the per capita consumption in the industrial countries will come to an immediate stop.

This shows, that sustainability requires a reduction of the T-factor in the $I=PAT$ equation even in case of an extreme population reduction development. Reducing the T-factor means using science and technology to improve resource productivity (eco-efficiency).

I think it is very important to have this in mind when discussing population reductions. These can not alone secure sustainability. Resource productivity must also be improved.

I have made the scenarios mentioned available on my below mentioned web site. You can find them clicking 'Global Consumption under Population Reduction Scenarios' on the top page.

Visit my website on Resource Productivity at
<http://csf.colorado.edu/authors/Agerley.Harald/index.html>
Harald Agerley - Sonderborg - Denmark

Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2001 13:29:58 -0500
From: pern-m <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Sustainability

(Message posted for Prof. Bartlett. Please e-mail pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu for a copy of Prof. Bartlett's paper.)

Dear Friends,

Let me call your attention to my paper on sustainability which is attached. This was published in "Population & Environment"

in 1994, and then later, at the request of the editor, was republished in the Journal of Renewable Resources.

In the paper I develop the Laws of Sustainability.

The First Law of Sustainability is;

Population growth and / or
growth in the rates of consumption of resources
cannot be sustained.

This is not an opinion. This is a fact. It is based on arithmetic, hence it is not debatable, unless you want to debate arithmetic.

Unfortunately this central fact appears rarely, if ever, in the discussions of sustainability. The Brundtland Report, which really put the topic of sustainability before the public, advocated all manner of unsustainable programs to try to bring about improved global equity. The problem is that we can't grow our way out of the problem, although many advocate this impossible course of action.

Thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

AL

`ALBERT ALLEN BARTLETT

Professor Emeritus of Physics

University of Colorado at Boulder

Boulder, Colorado, 80309-0390

Phone, Office: (303) 492-7016, Department Office: (303) 492-6952

FAX: (303) 492-3352

E-Mail: Albert.Bartlett@Colorado.EDU

THOUGHTS TO REMEMBER

Every increment of added population, and
every added increment of affluence
invariably destroys an increment
of the remaining environment.

Population growth and increases in affluence
make it impossible for reasonable increments
of improved efficiency in the use of resources
to enhance or even to preserve the environment.

You cannot preserve the environment
by accepting the population growth
and the increased affluence
that are destroying the environment.

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Helath Strategies
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2001 04:56:51 +1000

Steve Kurtz's submission on health strategies is obviously something on which we can all agree (this has to be putting people first). In point of fact if the policy statement centred itself on health strategies we could go a long way towards solving all the problems of the Third World including population density, poverty, illiteracy, sickness and infectious diseases without ever having to mention the dreaded word 'overpopulation' itself.

Consider this scenario. Suppose instead of conventional aid to Third World countries, the current resources of the World Bank and the IMF were directed instead to WHO. Suppose WHO was given a specific brief to make available state of the art medical facilities to all the 1.2 billion currently languishing in abject poverty.

The specific things to do:

- 1) Educate, train and employ indigenous people to be doctors, nurses, paramedics, support staff, cleaners, caterers etc.
- 2) Only contract with a local builder to construct each individual medical facility.
- 3) Wherever possible contract with local contractors for all the day to day outgoings of the medical facility.
- 4) Provide comprehensive family planning counseling, and educate local people to act as counselors.
- 5) Provide free the full array of contraceptives that are available in the developed countries.
- 6) Provide pregnancy termination as a free medical service on demand.
- 7) Provide counseling on sanitary habits and living conditions, and educate local people to act as counselors.

The specific things not to do:

- 1) Lend vast sums of money to governments of Third World countries so that they may build the medical facilities, provide the education for the counselors or provide anything else.

- 2) Enter into global contracts with multi-national corporations to provide equipment or services. If there is equipment that only a multi-national corporation can provide then it has to be purchased on an individual basis for an individual medical facility.
- 3) Enter into contracts with major national construction companies to build multiple medical facilities. In situations where only a large construction company can provide facilities there has to be an individual contract for a specific facility at a specific price which is approved by WHO.
- 4) Enter into global contracts with multi-national corporations to provide the raw materials to build these facilities. The builder will be responsible to obtain the raw materials at a local level.

For those of you who are interested we present a selection of criticisms of the World Bank and the IMF that are being made by an organization called 50 Years is Enough www.50years.org in Washington, DC. Although this organization does appear to be a trifle militant we have no reason to doubt that their complaints have some substance. These criticisms are presented as an appendix to this submission.

The substance of these criticisms is that current World Bank and IMF aid policies are dictated by big business for the benefit of big business, and if any poor person happens to benefit from these policies that is entirely unintentional and coincidental. Channeling the aid through WHO instead to provide medical facilities to the poor at grass roots level would be a real solution.

Scientists for Population Reduction
www.scientists4pr.org
email: webadmin@scientists4pr.org

Appendix:

50 Years Is Enough: U.S. Network for Global Economic Justice

50 Years Is Enough Network
3628 12th St., N.E.
Washington, DC 20017
USA

International Monetary Fund (IMF)/World Bank "debt relief" for poor and indebted countries is a sham

"Many poor countries must devote huge portions of their national budgets to paying back foreign creditors -- often for loans that were made to or for dictators, wasteful military spending or boondoggle projects. The poor countries of sub-Saharan Africa, for example, owe more than \$200 billion in foreign debt -- three times more than they earn annually in exports. About 20 percent of sub-Saharan African countries' export income(not counting South Africa) goes to service foreign debt. A huge part of poor country economies must be devoted to producing goods for export -- with the resultant income sent back out of the economy and not available for domestic use, including for such important domestic needs as healthcare, education and infrastructure."

CORPORATE GLOBALIZATION'S MANY MASKS

"The programs of the IMF and World Bank clear the landscape for companies and banks from the North to make money in Southern countries. Little of the wealth generated stays in the country where it's produced, though the fact of its being produced there makes statistics like the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) look better. In fact, living standards are slipping in most countries with IMF/World Bank programs, and debt levels have increased substantially. Forty-nine countries now have lower real per capita income than they did in the mid-1970s."

"How International Monetary Fund (IMF)/ World Bank structural adjustment programs have increased poverty around the world Structural adjustment -- the standard IMF/World Bank policy package which calls for slashing government spending, privatization, and opening up countries to exploitative foreign investment, among other measures -- has deepened poverty around the world. In the two regions with the most structural adjustment experience, per capita income has stagnated (Latin America) or plummeted (Africa). Structural adjustment has also contributed to rising income and wealth inequality in the developing world."

Behind the Scenes: Uganda Negotiates with WB & IMF

by Chidozie Ugwumba

50 Years Is Enough Network

"Our Friends at the Bank, a documentary film by Peter Chappell, approaches the issue of globalization through a penetrating "insider" look at the World Bank's, and to a lesser degree the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) and donor governments', interaction with borrower governments. The film casts bureaucrats, functionaries, economists, and civil servants almost as chess pieces, shuffling to and from a series of cabinet level meetings in a game played on a shifting board: sometimes Uganda - both city and countryside - sometimes the Bank and Fund's towering office buildings in Washington DC. The stakes in this game are no less than the economic futures of the Ugandan people, whose lives of rural hardship, urban scavenging, and lost limbs - either in the war against the dictator Idi Amin, or the current rebellion in the north against the government - are presented in stark contrast to their elected and appointed civil servants: crisply dressed in western style, marking time on gold watches." (The subject of this documentary film is for the World Bank to lend Uganda money so that they may buy US and British made arms).
DEMANDS of the IMF & WORLD BANK: 2001

We call for the immediate suspension of the policies and practices of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank Group that have caused widespread poverty, inequality, and suffering among the world's peoples and damage to the world's environment. We assert the responsibility of these institutions, together with the World Trade Organization, for an unjust world economic system. We note that these institutions are anti-democratic, controlled by the G-7 governments, and that their policies have benefited international private sector financiers, transnational corporations, and corrupt officials and politicians.

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] more on response from GSP coordinator Wolfgang Lutz
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2001 15:22:13 -0600

I wanted to urge participants to take note of the comments (earlier today) by Wolfgang Lutz, one of the GSP coordinators. These reflect a partial response of the Global Science Panel to the listserv discussion so far.

He concludes with a question to the participants: "...Is there a way to on the one hand maintain precision and clarity with respect to population and on the other hand stress the human dimension more broadly and the people into the picture without making the statement confusing? ..."

(please read his full remarks before responding!)
thank you.

Laura Murphy, PhD
Co-Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

Clinical Assistant Professor
Joint Appointment
Department of International Health and Development (School of Public = Health and Tropical Medicine) & Stone Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] More environmental militants
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2001 16:54:11 +1000

If the UN is saying this sort of thing, shouldn't the GSP try to give it's

policy statement a bit more bite???

Wednesday November 7 11:12 AM ET

UN: World Population May Reach 10.9B

By ED JOHNSON, Associated Press Writer

LONDON (AP) - The world's population could skyrocket to 10.9 billion people by 2050 if women do not gain better access to education and health care, a United Nations (news - web sites) report said Wednesday.

Women must receive adequate reproductive health care and have equal status to men and the right to plan the size of their families if the planet is to rein in a population already expected to grow by 50 percent to 9.3 billion over the next half century, the U.N. Population Fund said.

At a news briefing in London to launch the report, editor Alex Marshall said wealthy countries were failing to provide the \$20 billion a year needed to meet those goals.

"We are frustrated as to why the resources to implement these targets are not being met," said Marshall at the first of a series of press briefings to be held around the world Wednesday. He said the United States, Japan and Germany all were failing to pull their weight.

All the population growth projected by the report - from a current 6.1 billion - will take place in developing countries, intensifying their battle against poverty and straining the environment worldwide, the U.N. said.

Increasing population and consumption will continue to alter the planet on an "unprecedented scale," degrading soil, polluting air and water, melting ice caps and destroying natural habits, the "State of the World Population 2001" report said.

"We are looking over a cliff here. We are reaching the limits of some clearly definable resources," said Marshall, referring specifically to water, energy and food.

"The problems are tremendously severe in all these areas. We have a crisis of global proportions."

The world's 49 least-developed countries - already the most severely challenged by soil and water degradation and food shortages - will

nearly triple in population, from 668 million to 1.86 billion, the report said. As incomes rise in these countries, consumption will grow, placing yet more strain on the earth's resources, it predicted.

To feed the nearly 8 billion people expected by 2025 and improve their diets, the world will have to double food production and improve distribution - without relying on specialized fertilizers and pesticides, which would further disturb the ecological balance.

``More people are using more resources with more intensity than at any point in human history," said the report.

``Population growth, increasing affluence - with rising consumption, pollution and waste - and persistent poverty ... are putting increasing pressure on the environment," the report said.

The U.N. Population Fund, launched in 1969, aims to help developing countries find solutions to their population problems. It has three main program areas: reproductive health, including family planning and sexual health; population and development strategies; and advocacy.

-

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Summary of Discussion, Week 3 (Nov 1-7)
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2001 09:37:02 -0600

Week Three Summary: Discussion on the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment on "Population in Sustainable Development"

(Please save this message!)

Note: You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute: send your comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org. Read remarks online at <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Cyberseminars).

This message includes

- 1) A brief summary of substantive remarks Nov 1-7, 2001
- 2) Suggested topics for discussion, Week 4
- 3) A reminder of commands and ways to access the listserve

Reminder: The context: we want to solicit feedback from the population-environment research community to facilitate revision of the Preliminary Statement on "Population in Sustainable Development", prepared in September by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP). The Preliminary Statement is downloadable from <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Go to Cyberseminars). The final statement will be presented and discussed at the WSSD/Earth Summit 2 in Johannesburg, September 2002 (after review and further revisions). Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>. Learn more about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting <http://www.earthsummit2002.org>.

Members of the GSP are presently reviewing last week's comments and recommendations. We have heard from co-coordinator Wolfgang Lutz (on Nov 7) and expect to hear from others.

One of the goals of the Population Environment Research Network is to better communicate diverse perspectives and to cross the 'disciplinary boundaries' to improve research on critical social, demographic and environmental trends. This cyberdiscussion is a relevant forum to share your comments on the state of research, recognizing it tends to start from one perspective (i.e., the 'social' or environmental). The Statement itself has the much narrower goal of trying to synthesize key findings from social science research that translates into policy recommendations for communication to the Earth Summit 2002 audience. We hope that discussion leads to specific recommendations for the GSP to incorporate into their Statement so that it is clear, ethical, and scientifically sound and up-to-date.

1. Summary, Nov 1 - 7

Thanks to participants from Australia, Austria, Brazil, Italy, India, Brazil and the US who commented on varied topics last week: We heard debate on the focus on population vs. people, environmental change and human welfare oriented development. Last week continued the debate between those who see population and environment concerns from a Neo-Malthusian perspective vs. those who highlight other angles. At a global level, the issue of population growth is important, while others (Murphy, Bhagat, Coon) again mentioned the importance of scale. Most participants agreed that each concept (population, environment, change) must be well defined in the document. GSP coordinator Lutz asked: how [do we] maintain the strict definition of population while simultaneously adding the human dimension that many in the discussion agree is missing? Consumption--how to illuminate it within current frameworks, whether IPAT or others--was raised, and the need for

'eco-efficiency' to reduce material/energy use emphasized (Adgerley). Links between poverty, and population and the environment were discussed: much evidence says that poverty does not necessarily lead to greater environmental degradation (Moseley). Health and health strategies are important factors to include (Kurtz, Duc Hiep, 'Scientists'). The role of "culture" in shaping the debate and the perspectives and formulation of policy outcomes was highlighted. A focus on education, gender and reproductive health are imperative both for achieving sustainability as well as for generating a consensus about the population/environment dynamic.

Selected quotes (edited to save space) (with contributors name in parentheses so you can look up the full remarks.)

.Considering the size of (Brazilian) national territory and the present state of the demographic transition, this new attention does not emerge in terms of the volume or growth rates of population, but questions of health and population distribution. The relations between environmental change and fertility are important, but not yet objects of intense research. This change of emphasis occurred in parallel with the change in thinking on population and development at the international level. It is no longer population size or growth rates which will occupy the center of attention. The prudent husbandry of sustainability implies, for demographic dynamics, a careful adjustment of population distribution to a given territory's resource base. All of the factors which contribute to an understanding of the dynamics of population mobility must receive greater attention. (Hogan)

.[From research in coastal regions] Migration is not only a dynamic contributing to population growth in coastal areas, but brings with it changes in behavior, social networks and income sources. [We must] go beyond size (not ignore it completely) to composition, migration, urbanization and consumption and their impacts on the environment at different scales. At the same time, changes in the natural environment at many scales affect human fertility, health, mobility, livelihoods and vulnerability..systems models and feedback loops between natural and human systems are a focus of interdisciplinary studies.. (Murphy)

.in our push for global population reduction we are not addressing the major cause of environmental degradation, namely the high consumption in affluent countries.if the Statement centered on health strategies, we could go a long way towards solving all the problems of the Third World including population density, poverty, illiteracy, sickness and infectious diseases without ever having to mention the dreaded word 'overpopulation' itself. (Scientists for Population Reduction)

. An issue given passing reference in the draft outline of the science policy statement is the nature of poverty-environment interactions . an issue to which an entire chapter of Agenda 21 was devoted. The conventional wisdom is that the poor and hungry will often destroy their immediate environment in order to survive. A number of studies over the past 10 years have questioned this overly simplistic characterization. (Moseley)

. There appears to be wide agreement that high population density increases the risk of onset and rates of infection . would the health of a national population benefit from increased or decreased density. (Kurtz)

. A crucial key lay in giving women . a far greater say in society and, equally important, in setting desired family size-- ". providing full access to reproductive health services would be far less costly in the long run than the environmental consequences of the population growth that will result if reproductive health needs are not met" (Quotes from Lovell supplied by Kurtz)

. Scientific research and solutions which give the best outcome for a global problem do not get us much progress unless we address the cultural differences at play in adopting a common framework.. Bridging the cultural differences requires a commitment to work from common grounds . women's empowerment and holistic education may be the solution. (Duc Hiep)

. education and empowerment is essential to deal with vulnerabilities. But there is no strategy suggested to deal with responsibility -- common and differentiated. Should the responsible pay environmental tax.? [we need to] to discourage the environmentally unsound production/consumption.. (Bhagat)

.(the Global Science Panel) started out with the intention of focusing clearly on a summary of our science-based knowledge on the relationships between the human population (in its demographic definition: size, composition and regional distribution as driven by fertility, mortality and migration) and its natural environment. I fully agree with all the comments made that this analysis of population-environment interactions should start with this more precise definition of population and not immediately go to the consideration of people-environment interactions, i.e. studying the human impacts on the environment more broadly . In the context of the GSP preparing a statement for Johannesburg, however, we only recently understood that most of the other scientific input being prepared by other groups has a very strong emphasis on the natural

sciences and gives little attention to social issues in general.(Lutz)

URLs introduced this week:

Corrected URL for Russia Case study mentioned previously:
<http://www.gechs.org/aviso/AvisoEnglish/nine.shtml>

UNFPA Report on State of the World's Population released Nov 7
<http://www.unfpa.org/swp/2001/english/index.html>

Eco-efficiency and resource productivity
<http://csf.colorado.edu/authors/Agerley.Harald/index.html>

2) Suggested topics for discussion, Week 4

.Is there a way, on the one hand, to maintain precision and clarity with respect to population and, on the other hand, to stress the human dimension more broadly and the people into the picture without making the statement confusing? (Reference comments by Wolfgang Lutz, November 7)

Education and empowerment were mentioned as essential in dealing with the vulnerability aspect of the vulnerability/differential responsibility framework. Are there other essential variables/issues? What else is missing and needed?

Who is "responsible", and in what way? How should the statement address rising consumption concerns?

3) Review of commands and ways to access the listserve

You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute your thoughts: send comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org and we will post them to the listserve on your behalf.

You can view all the postings to date online at our website:

<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>

Visit the Cyberseminars page and View Comments.

If you are presently subscribed to 'pernseminars' and wish to unsubscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu

with the following text in the body of the message (no name or

signature, please)

unsubscribe pernseminars

If you wish to subscribe, write to

majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu

with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature):

subscribe pernseminars

---end of Week 3 summary of Population in Sustainable Development
cyberseminar----

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

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

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
**Subject: [PERN_seminar] First there was confusion, then there was
chaos...**
Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2001 05:46:14 +1000

TOWARD A CONCEPT OF POPULATION BALANCE CONSIDERING AGE
STRUCTURE, HUMAN CAPITAL, AND INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY

WOLFGANG LUTZ & WARREN SANDERSON
http://www.populationasia.org/popn_environ_analysis_report.htm

"International population analysis and politics is in disarray these days. There seems to be some confusion about the role of the population variable in social and economic development and environmental change."

"The population issue has largely become a specific sub-concern of health. But there is clearly more to population than one aspect of human health, the age structural aspects discussed in this seminar being a good example."

"Yet in international fora the aging concerns tend to be treated in a completely unrelated way to the population growth and population-environment concerns and the individual level reproductive health, female empowerment and freedom of choice concerns. There seems to be the need for some sort of umbrella concept that links these two macro-level concerns to each other and relates them to the individual level concerns."

".. it is important to strongly emphasize that we do not interpret this to be a realistic model of population and production. To take the model in the direction of greater realism, we would have to incorporate factors such as the capital stock so that we could capture the capital dilution effect of faster economic growth, the environment, so that we could capture diminishing returns generated by fixed resources, endogenous technical change so that we could incorporate the effects of scale..."

"Lutz (1994, 1995) also criticizes attempts to describe population/environment relations as very general and defends a more complex and nuanced approach. The solution is to maintain a truly interdisciplinary approach...(Hogan)"

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY:

Brazilian Perspectives

<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/papers/hogan.doc>

"Demographic science itself originated in the context of the polemic on the limits of nature to meet the demands of a growing population. But for two centuries, Demography limited its participation in this debate to confirming or refuting Malthus, and

only recently seeks to place its theoretical and analytic arsenal at the service of the environmental question.

When the "environmental crisis" emerged in recent decades, Demography was unprepared. Its response to this challenge has been partial and unarticulated. The urgency of environmental problems, however, has not permitted the comfortable pace of the evolution of scientific thinking and those who sought to answer this challenge did so from a varied range of theoretical approaches. In little over a decade, demographers have produced a respectable contribution to the environmental debate. It is possible to see, today, some return to this investment in the form of critical rethinking of its concepts and methodologies."

Today it is not possible to study population without having recourse to the separate disciplines of Demography, Economics, Sociology, Health Care, and Ecology. This GSP Policy Statement is therefore presented under those specific headings as we attempt to set out a holistic solution to World's environmental problems.

Only the last paragraph is ours.

Scientists for Population Reduction

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2001 14:36:16 -0500 (EST)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] comments by Mr. Peter Salenius

My "reactions"are as follows:

Introduction

... additional questions or important issues that should be raised:

1. I suggest the Introduction should conclude as it does with

.....

.....Johannesburg agenda. In short, the road from Rio to Johannesburg must pass through Cairo.....

but with the following addition:

*** The new international consensus regarding the improvement of social conditions and expanding choices for individuals does not address the situation in the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand where federal government encouragement or tolerance of massive immigration has been employed to maintain historical population growth rates in order to counter the declining reproduction rates that have been chosen by the citizenry. ***

2. I suggest that Putting the Human Population at the Center should conclude as it does but with the following addition

...as the core of sustainable development. Finally, when considering the broad array of priorities and policies that can contribute to promoting sustainable development, ***expansionist massive immigration into some developed countries***, social development and in particular education stand out as the essential foundation ***s** for achieving the goals of sustainable development.

3. I suggest for Population, Poverty and Differential Vulnerability

the following insertion to the third paragraph on page 5

.....and contribute to good governance. More educated populations tend to have more efficient and more responsible governments that can more effectively deal with environmental vulnerability ***however government departments often carry out their narrow mandates in relative isolation from each other as they confine themselves to their particular areas of responsibility such that, while environmental assessment of individual projects undergo scrutiny, no one is charged with monitoring the overall effects of government policy, legislation and regulations that contribute to such phenomena as the state sponsored exponential and open-ended population growth that is ultimately the root cause of much environmental damage.*** (please go to :

http://199.212.18.103/consultation/SALONIUS_f.htm

for a more thorough treatment of this governance problem).

4. I suggest for Population, Consumption and Differential Responsibility

the following insertion into the first paragraph on page 6

.... impact of different countries. However such analyses cannot differentiate the contributions of subgroups of the population*** or the growth rate of the numbers of individuals in these subgroups***, obscuring the real factors underlying impacts. For example, in many cases numbers and types of households ***and the growth rates of the numbers and types of households*** are a better basis for accounting for environmentally significant consumption than total family size *** (for instance the 5% of world population in Canada and the United States is responsible for more than 25% of world resource use and a disproportionately large share of the pollution of the world biosphere)***.

and the following insertion into the second paragraph on page 6

...consumption for luxuries. Understanding how different types of consumption are distributed ***over different countries and *** different types of households can help guide policies aimed at unsustainable consumption.

5. I suggest for Towards Population Balance

the following insertion and addition to the first paragraph

...than it was 10 years ago. While China is likely to experience an end to population growth within the next three decades, the USA ***, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are*** likely to see continued population growth ***unless immigration policies are changed to regulate migrant numbers so as to stabilize their populations in the face of rapidly declining domestic birth rates. The per capita influence of new citizens of these affluent countries, on mounting environmental damage, will far outstrip the damage caused by increasing numbers of people in poorer regions of the world.***

the omission of the entirety of the sentence that begins at the bottom of page 7 and continues at the top of page 8:

But moderate growth..... may not necessarily have negative implications, especially if environmental constraints are not yet relevant and productivity per person (which is closely related to education) increases over time.

///// first, productivity per person is only related to education IF there

is a ready access to considerable amounts of energy (since the beginning of the industrial revolution this energy has been predominantly NON RENEWABLE FOSSIL FUEL..... AND INCREASINGLY CONVENIENT OIL).

//// most discussions of long-term sustainability and "environmental constraints" disregard the fact that the quadrupling of the world's population since 1900 has been fueled by the expenditure of half of the NON RENEWABLE OIL that was laid down over millions of years.

//// A.A. Bartlett (1978) has suggested that "Modern agriculture is the use of land to convert petroleum into food."

//// according to the concept of the world as a 'spaceship'
.....there is no place on earth where "environmental constraints are not yet relevant" as we increasingly bathe in and breath the escalating amounts of each others effluents.

the modification of the third paragraph on page 8

*** The ecological footprint of collective humanity on earth, with its temporary fossil fuel subsidy, has become so large that "population stabilization" can only be seen as an interim stage in the direction of ultimate widespread population reduction. (see the web site of SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION at <http://www.scientists4pr.org>) Applying the goal of "population reduction" would imply that the US government should be asked tofirst use immigration as a tool to curb its environmentally destructive population growth and..... second to speed rapidly declining domestic birth rates by the use of monetary incentives to reward its citizens for the small family sizes that are required to regenerate large areas of the continent back to the wilderness state. Citizens of Russia and other countries whose populations are shrinking, due to low fertility, should receive monetary incentives to continue on the path of "population reduction" . Policies designed to reduce world population are the only avenues that have any possibility of avoiding the crises of mounting environmental destruction and resource depletion that loom ahead as geological deposits and natural services are impoverished coincident with continued increasing demands by swelling numbers of humans each of whom is striving for increased affluence(see web site at <http://scientists4pr.org>).

6. I suggest for Annex: Case Studies

the inclusion of the case of

Resource depletion and population growth: The case of Ethiopia

Based on current growth rates Ethiopia (with 57 million people) is faced with an increase of 106 million during the next 40 years. It is inconceivable that the country can support so many more people. It has some of the world's most severely eroded soils, much of its crop land is on steep slopes and its tree cover stands at a mere 3 percent. Many in Ethiopia's next generation will probably have to choose between emigration and starvation.

Many countries have been living off their capital ---- consuming their foreign reserves, their forests, soils and freshwater aquifers, and the patience of their citizens ---- in order to survive. As these reserves are diminished, pressures and conflicts mount and more and more people are forced to flee. The number of people on the move today has reached its highest point in history. (from H. Kane, 1995 as cited by W. Youngquist , GEODESTINIES: The inevitable control of Earth resources over nations and individuals, (page 41) National Book Company, 1997 499 p ISBN 0-89420-299-5

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute
Peter Salenius

From: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Press Release
Date: Sat, 10 Nov 2001 07:25:48 +1000

Shouldn't the GSP do likewise, instead of agonizing ad nauseum about their precious demographic precepts.

Do they care, or what?

STATEMENT BY SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION
FOR USE: FRIDAY NOVEMBER 9

This organization endorses the statements made by UNFPA in the report released Wednesday The State of World Population 2001.

Women must receive adequate reproductive health care and have equal status to men and the right to plan the size of their families if the planet is to rein in a population already expected to grow by 50 percent to 9.3billion over the next half century, the U.N. Population Fund said.

All the population growth projected by the report - from a current 6.1

billion - will take place in developing countries, intensifying their battle against poverty and straining the environment worldwide, the U.N. said.

At a news briefing in London to launch the report, editor Alex Marshall said wealthy countries were failing to provide the \$20 billion a year needed to meet those goals. The United States, Japan and Germany all were failing to pull their weight.

There is a dire need for proper medical facilities to be provided by WHO for all the 1.2 billion people in the Third World who are living in abject poverty. These people in addition to medical treatment should have free access to a full array of contraceptives and these medical facilities should provide pregnancy termination as a free medical service on demand.

By denying impoverished women in Third World countries adequate family planning options and reproductive assistance we are condemning these people to remain in a vicious circle where their own helplessness perpetuates the appalling conditions of overcrowding, misery and squalor in which they find themselves.

For a full statement of our policy visit: www.scientists4pr.org

Brad Bartholomew
Marketing Manager
Scientists for Population Reduction
Phone: +61 410 482 594
Email: promotions@scientists4pr.org

Date: 11 Nov 2001 05:47:06 -0000
From: "R.B.Bhagat" <bhagrb1@rediffmail.com>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Wolfgang Lutz's Remark

Wolfgang Lutz's two important remarks one of prioritising population over people and secondly his apprehension of losing precision and clarity with regard to population at the same time stressing human dimension without confusing the issue are very pertinent. It reflects the core of issue about the nature of demography. However, demography like other discipline has to respond the contemporary issues of human life as affected or affecting by environmental change.

I would like to argue that the alternative prioritisation of people over population will not confuse rather strengthened the fundamentals of demography, and will also likely to spur a theoretical shift in the discipline. Some examples could be

given as demographic data are defined, collected and published in the exercises of censuses.

GPS's statement on differential responsibility and differential vulnerability requires different definition of demographic data in regard to their size, composition and distribution. For example, some of the production activities are environmentally unsound, but we have only data on workers or categories of workers/non-workers in the censuses. Environmental consideration has not been introduced in the definition of work force structure. Consequently, our GNPs do not reflect true output due to lack of adjustment for environmental degradation. A new definition of work incorporating the environmental consideration is the challenge before the demographers.

Similarly, the traditional rural-urban classification of population based on size of population and non-agricultural work force has become redundant in view of blurring up rural-urban division and also due to decline in the quality of urban life (congestion, air pollution and water degradation etc.). A new classification of settlement based on human life chances and environment is another challenge before us. Furthermore, our migration data based on administrative boundary and rural-urban residence has only limited use to estimate the components of growth rates. A new b
man life chances and environment will place migration at the centre stage of demography.

The people's approach, therefore, will require a reconstruction of demographic data system- a fundamental basis of precision and clarity of demography.

R. B. Bhagat, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
(Population Geography)
Maharshi Dayanand University
Rohtak-124001, India

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 11:12:54 -0500 (EST)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] comments from Dr. Bertil Egero

Dear colleagues,

Is there still time for more profound reflections on the document?
My impression from the debate so far (without access to contributions the last 5-6 days) is that it has not yet succeeded in defining what the statement is intended to communicate. Clearly – as implied by comments from some colleagues - it cannot be seen as a “state of the art” paper, nor is it really a science-based set of policy-relevant conclusions. Only one recommendation is there, repeated several times but never explained, namely education.

Generally, the concept 'education' does not have one unequivocal meaning. In the text it is treated (forgive me for the expression) like a kind of mantra. This is very reminiscent of the way it has been used in various post-ICPD discourses on policy, replacing an earlier and equally one-sided advice of (more) family planning. In reality 'education' is not an unproblematic recipe for - indeed for what? Is it for 'population balance'? I suggest any recommendations of such a character as (more) 'education' are left out.

Now for a few more pointed comments.

1. It is evident both theoretically and from examples such as that of Russia today, that environmental change has determinants very different from, and generally more important than, population dynamics. For the statement to gain in credibility, this should be the first statement to make. At least in historically short perspectives such as the post-WW2 period, causes of environmental change are primarily non-demographic, although mediated by a growing number of human beings.
2. Secondly, the opposite relation 'that environmental change affects humans as much as other members of the ecosystem' needs to be emphasised. Studied by David Satterthwaite and others of how human-induced environment conditions affect poor in urban areas is a good case. Agenda 21 has a long chapter on population-related issues that is more elaborate than anything found in ICPD, including in its reference to human impacts of environment change. I suggest a reference to this chapter is made in the statement.
3. It is my conviction that a statement about population and environment cannot, to remain relevant to its focus, turn into a statement about individual humans. If it does, then it leaves the realm of population studies. This is true also for policy-making events such as ICPD, which landed very much in a human rights agenda. We may all agree that human rights should be the foundation for politics, whether national or international. At the same time, it is quite clear that politics directed to (negative) environment change or to population dynamics (including migration) never exclusively relates to individual welfare concerns or human rights. Politics relates to and addresses macro-factors, the wider context of individual human decisions and life careers. Politics attempts to achieve explicit macro-level objectives, and in so doing inevitably has indirect, often unanticipated, impacts on that context. The concepts of 'enabling' or 'disabling' context refer to such dimensions. ICDP recommended slower rates of population growth as a

desirable macro-goal, to be achieved without overruling human rights. The statement may address the macro-goal, and need not dwell specifically in the human rights issue.

4. There are two major trends in the world today, that I suggest should be addressed in the statement: Firstly, the rapidly growing number of people with substantial purchasing power – a net effect of population increase and growing per capita income. This, essentially, is what we all mean by ‘development’, and yet it is the basic population-related force behind global and local pollution and other undesirable environment changes. One part-answer could of course be to work for a more enabling anti-natalist environment, even if population momentum (ageing) is increasingly important in further growth in human numbers.

5. The second major trend is the way ‘globalisation’ acts – increasingly so in the IT age (see Manuel Castells’ recent work on the information age) – by marginalising poor countries and areas of the world. These are in large measure the countries/areas where the demographic transition remains incomplete (fertility remains high, mortality stalled or returning to higher levels). The combination of urban unemployment and rural economic stagnation entails real risks for local natural resource mismanagement and environmental depletion. To reduce environmental risks requires changes in the macro-situation of such areas, i.e. very different sets of recipes from those associated with demographic dynamics.

6. George Martins contributed a very interesting paper to a PERN debate earlier this year. Searching for more policy-relevant approaches to the population/environment debate than those which ended in recommendations for slower population increase, he discussed the macro-trends of environmental change and environmentally induced population movements. This led him to propose the concept of ‘sustainable use of space’ as one that would give interesting conclusions for policy. I believe his approach is highly relevant for the statement, not least in view of the two processes above, and that it might fruitfully be used as the entry to a more policy-oriented part of the paper.

7. Finally, the term “human population” in the opening paragraph seems a bit bizarre– what other populations are implied in the statement? I believe the “human community” could be a better choice. Another innovation - “population balance” – is nowhere in the text defined even in broad terms. It rings of neo-malthusian associations, including the idea that there is a scale against which human numbers in themselves could be measured. In fact, I think there is no need for either this term or a substitute.

Bertil Egerö

(To Laura - just in case)

Bertil Egerö
PROP/Sodeco
Box 114
Lund University, Sweden
bertilero@hotmail.com

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] suggestions; response to WL comments
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 13:23:04 -0600

I respond to a request for suggestions by Wolfgang Lutz, co-coordinator of the GSP, wrote (November 7 this forum) ".in addition or possibly instead of the original more limited focus on population [the statement] should now consider the human dimension in sustainable development more broadly. Is there a way to on the one hand maintain precision and clarity with respect to population and on the other hand stress the human dimension more broadly and the people into the picture without making the statement confusing? In an early contribution to this discussion Bill Clark of Harvard suggested to use population as a vehicle to bring the human dimension into Johannesburg ."

Could the problem faced by the authors be phrased as "how to articulate for a policy-oriented WSSD audience some feasible and humane policy implications that arise from a large, diverse body of scientific research into the relationships between population dynamics and environmental change/dynamics"?

Even with only 15 pages planned for the final Statement, it is possible to combine 'threads'

- 1) distinguish and define 'population' (demographic dimension more narrowly defined) vs. 'human-welfare' or people concerns more broadly
- 2) summarize key (scientific) innovative findings from 'demographic' analyses (population growth is a concern but not THE concern that requires attention; household dynamics, urbanization, migration, plus more comprehensive understanding of environmental dynamics and change.)

3) Identify the limitations of a narrow demographic approach alone for comprehending real-life relationships and potentials (positive and negative). Introduce the role of 'culture', local knowledge, values, consumption choices, economic and other policy instruments . (ie. 'development' in P/D/E).

4) Summarize key policy implications for a human-centered approach that are consistent with science (social and natural) and ethical concerns (a precautionary, anthropocentric, long-term approach)

I reiterate earlier comments of several participants²⁰

--'education' is not clearly defined, and as mentioned only repeats (as a 'mantra') the common thread of most UN conferences and rhetoric without adding new insights from population-environment research (what sort of education, for whom, where?)

--Consumption (and need for greener industry/production) is of course a major concern, and must be highlighted (it receives a few sentences)

--the statement must take a clearly an anthropocentric ethical, prudential stance if it is to enter policy debates; identify the value orientation of the panel up front, bring in scientific research, and lead to more specific policy implications. The GSP statement evidently is turning out to be an ethical statement by concerned scientists, rather than the original 'scientific' statement: it could do so more explicitly and with intention to greater effect.

--the statement could say much more in (even the present 8 pages) through careful organization, avoidance of empty 'jargon' phrases, and perhaps strategic use of case studies and background documents / boxes to fill out specific themes.

Thank you for your attention.

.

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: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Wednesday's UNFPA report
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 14:30:44 -0500

- > The U.N. Population Fund report 'The State of World Population 2001', that
- > predicts world population growth of 50 percent, to 9.3 billion by 2050 if
- > no action is taken to facilitate adequate family planning.
- >
- > However the statement that "ALL THE POPULATION GROWTH PROJECTED
- > BY THE
- > REPORT - FROM A CURRENT 6.1. BILLION - WILL TAKE PLACE IN
- > DEVELOPING
- > COUNTRIES" plainly misses the population trajectory of countries like the
- > United States and Canada where women do "receive adequate reproductive
- > health care and have equal status to men and the right to plan the size of
- > their families". As a result of this health care, equal status and right
- > to plan, the domestic birth rate is rapidly falling toward replacement
- > levels and in Canada toward a projected population shrinkage by 2030. The
- > federal governments of Canada and the U.S. and their neoclassical
- > economist advisors appear to be so fearful of the "demographic transition"
- > (see page 2, Draft outline for science policy statement of the Global
- > Science Panel on Population and Environment, 7 October,2001, entitled
- > POPULATION IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT) that they either accept
- > (United
- > States) or actively encourage (Canada) massive immigration that, along
- > with the diminishing resident birth rate, contributes to exponential
- > population growth rates of over 1 percent per year which will (unchecked)
- > DOUBLE numbers in 70 years.
- >
- > If the Earth Summit 2002 is going to realistically examine the influence
- > of population growth on the deteriorating environment of the planetary
- > biosphere, then it must address the disproportionate contribution of a
- > projected doubling of the populations of Canada and the United States,
- > whose residents (5 percent of world the world total) are already are
- > responsible for over 25 percent of planetary resource utilization and a
- > similar proportion of world environmental pollution because of their
- > affluent/effluent standard of consumption. The prospects for the
- > environmental damage that would be caused by a DOUBLING of their numbers
- > is cause for alarm.
- >
- > The almost complete disregard of the rampant population growth in
- > developed countries by both the U.N. Population Fund and the Draft of the
- > Global Science Panel on Population and Environment has serious
- > implications concerning the possibilities for influencing the POPULATION -
- > ENVIRONMENT DYNAMICS in Johannesburg in September, 2002.

>
> Peter Salonius

From: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu
To: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca>, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] Wednesday's UNFPA report
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 14:53:22 -0500

Peter, et al. -

Both you and UNFPA are right. Canada and the U.S. are both projected to grow substantially by 2050, but the developed world aggregated (including Europe, etc.) is projected to decline slightly, from 1.19 to 1.18 billion people, in spite of projected net immigration. So, at the developed/developing scale, all projection growth does occur in the developing world. See the UN Report, available at unfpa.org, at p. 70 and p. 72.

Cheers!...Fred Meyerson

Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] Wednesday's UNFPA report
To: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
From: "Ken Cordell/SRS/USDAFS" <kcordell@fs.fed.us>
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 16:37:37 -0500

Our population is projected to more than double by 2100. An astounding thought. I have just published a book entitled Footprints on the Land that examines the growth and spread of population upon the land in the U.S. and spatially overlays that growth onto the areas in the country where we still have natural lands and water in any abundance. This produces "hotspots" where growth is most likely to impact natural lands and water in the near future. There are many. The book information can be found on our web site at www.srs.fs.fed.us/trends. I am enjoying the commentary via email and intend to weigh in more.

Ken Cordell, Project Leader
Recreation, Wilderness and Demographic Trends
Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Forest Service Research
320 Green Street
Athens, Georgia 30602
706-559-4263 (Fax 706-559-4266)
E-mail kcordell@fs.fed.us

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 17:59:14 -0500
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] Wolfgang Lutz's Remark

The circumlocution by many in this forum around the nearly unanimously recognized problem of population level and growth is, frankly, astounding. Many countries have been asking for aid from the wealthy nations for a decade or more to directly address what they (not the wealthy nations) see as a monumental corrosive problem to their own *people's* well-being.

excerpted from "Feedback and Dis-equilibrium in Human Overpopulation"
<http://www.ryerson.ca/~woc/Discussion%20Papers/kurtzpaper2.htm>

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.

The Challenge to the South: Report of the South Commission,(Oxford University Press) 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)

[Julius Nyerere was a highly respected leader in Africa and in the UN for many years]

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.

This is *in addition* to the well-made point (Salonius and others) of the extreme impacts of the wealthy countries on global resource depletion and waste production. If the wealthy nations are in need of impact shrinkage, increased migration to them is obviously counterproductive, ceteris paribus. I ask once again:

Where is population growth desirable? Where does it enhance present and future well-being of our "Patch Disturbant" species?(John Logan, <http://dieoff.org/page78.htm>)

Some comments are in order here:

R.B.Bhagat:

"I would like to argue that the alternative prioritisation of people over population will not confuse rather strenthen the fundamentals of demography, and will also likely to spur a theoretical shift in the discipline."

The "fundamentals of demography" are not the main topic of this endeavor as I understand it. The dynamic of people/habitat and the well-being of both is at issue.

"GSP's statement on differential responsibility and differential vulnerability requires different definition of demographic data in regard to their size, composition and distribution."

The data is numerical. The total impact = multiples of behavior. How the micro-analyses are done can be useful to local planners, but the total impact must still be measured, and in all likelihood reduced if people are to benefit.

"For example, some of the production activities are environmentally unsound, but we have only data on workers or categories of workers/non-workers in the censuses."

Virtually all human behavior is harmful to other species. (see Logan) Of course there are varying degrees of impact/activity, but numbers are a factor in *every* human activity impact.

"Environmental consideration has not been introduced in the definition of work force structure. Consequently, our GNPs do not reflect true output due to lack of adjustment for environmental degradation. A new definition of work incorporating the environmental consideration is the challenge before the demographers."

Full cost accounting (incl externalities) and cradle to grave impact analyses are desirable, but they do not nullify the multiplier - the number of people involved in each activity.

" A new boundary based on human life chances and environment will place migration at the centre stage of demography.
The people's approach, therefore, will require a reconstruction of demographic data system - a fundamental basis of precision and clarity of demography."

This should be useful for planning purposes, however that would be in addition to macro analysis of regions with resource demands and waste sink stresses.

In my opinion, five pages are not required to present a clear GSP statement. Is the concern of the formulators to use Occam's Razor to present an unambiguous statement in the interests of the future or to cover the waterfront of topics of academic interest to the issuing body? Try as you may, you cannot take numbers out of population.

Steven B. Kurtz
Ottawa

--

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" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Week four of six: lets refocus discussion
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2001 17:59:48 -0600

Dear 'pernseminar' subscribers:

As co-coordinator of the Population Environment Research Network (with Catherine Marquette), I have been facilitating and summarizing the cyberseminar on the Global Science Panel Statement. We conclude our 4th week of discussion today. Two weeks remain. I am hoping to redirect comments back to the main thread: reactions to the statement being prepared for Earth Summit 2002.

Recall the recommended (not sole) themes for discussion were:

- a.. What are relevant "population variables" to consider .in "sustainable development"?
- b.. What key themes emerge from recent population-environment dynamics research?
- c.. Do you agree with the use of 'Population Balance'?

d.. Is the concept of "differentiated vulnerability/ responsibility" appropriate and useful?

In the next two weeks, please continue to address these initial themes, and also:

a.. Share findings from your own population-environment research relevant to the topic

b.. Raise concerns about the audience, orientation, and purpose of the Statement

c.. Respond to specific questions for reviewers in the Statement (downloadable online)

d.. Suggest feasible approaches to overcoming the 'population' vs. 'people' debate (demographic approaches vs. broader human-welfare orientation)

We also hope to hear from more Panelists about their reactions to comments so far.

The fourth week's summary will be ready tomorrow (Nov 15).

Furthermore, while many comments have been thoughtful and well-reasoned, a small minority of comments have been ill-advised. Please, contribute in the spirit of open, scientific exchange. Avoid personalistic comments or taunts which undermine discussion. The goal of the Network is to 'facilitate scientific analysis and dialogue about population and environment relationships' - hoping to go beyond ideological debates towards cooperation across disciplines around common, real concerns. Discussion of the GSP Statement can contribute to this aim while providing useful feedback to the Panelists.

Please refer to www.populationenvironmentresearch.org (cyberseminars page) for archives of discussion, summaries for each week, and the original guidelines for contributing (L. Murphy, dated October 19).

Thank you for your attention. We look forward to continued, spirited debate.

Laura Murphy
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

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: "Scientists for Population Reduction"
<webadmin@scientists4pr.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] An apology
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2001 16:24:25 +1000

Brad Bartholomew
(Male, Caucasian)
Webmaster
2/61 Garfield Tce
Surfers Paradise Qld 4217
Australia

I sincerely apologize for going overboard in presenting the views of Scientists for Population Reduction.

All I can say in my defense is that, as Dr Bertil Egero says the document reads like a "mantra", as if one person has written it and has presented one set of ideas. I had an expectation that the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment would be presenting multiple proposals on both population and environmental issues, and if I went over the top in presenting our ideas I guess subconsciously I was thinking that we were trying to push our set of ideas to replace someone else's set of ideas.

I do not know who wrote the draft document and I don't want to know for fear of getting myself further into trouble for making a personal attack.

You don't have to remove me from the list serve. The organization for whom I act as Webmaster has already resolved not to make any further submissions, and this is the first and last time that you will hear from me.

Shanti Shanti Shanti

**To: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu, psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca,
pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu**
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] MDC and LDC
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2001 19:14:17 +0100

Colleagues, especially Frederick Meyerson,

Let us not forget that the MDC/LDC country classification is several decades

old. In economic as well as in demographic terms of TFR and life expectancy, several LDC countries should now go with the MDC. And more are to come.

We need to relate to the realities of economic/demographic growth, not to an anachronistic classification.

One further note: It may have some theoretical value to discuss differential growth and optimum distribution of human numbers. In reality, to direct population increase through government policy alone is not there - population momentum is the best reminder of that - and whatever values we attach to demographic dynamics around the world, it is driven by such a composite set of factors that, by and large, it is out of reach for policy.

In terms of the IPAT equation, this means that it is the "T", and secondly the "A" that can be addressed in policy terms. For the rest, implement Cairo, ie give all the (technical) right to decide over their reproduction.

Cheers -

Bertil Egerö
(normally on bertil.egero@soc.lu.se)

From: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu
To: <bertilero@hotmail.com>, bertil.egero@soc.lu.se,
Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu, psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca,
pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: Re: [PERN_seminar] MDC and LDC
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2001 14:35:04 -0500

Bertil, et al.:

I agree entirely with you about the anachronism of the developed/developing country classification. I made this point in two 1998 (March and December) articles in Population and Development Review re: population and climate change policy.

The underlying question for the purposes of Rio+10, it seems to me, is how to deal with the question of demographic change across scales. Clearly, "developed" as an aggregation, at least for some purposes, is both inaccurate (not the right countries anymore) and masks significant opposing trends at smaller scales (the US, Canada vs. Italy, Spain). One thing we could usefully do would be to propose a new set of nested scales that are flexible and relate to challenges at the demographic and environmental interface.

Re: I=PAT, I very respectfully don't agree with your suggestion that "P" can never be addressed in policy terms. As long as there is unmet need (and there is a lot of it), addressing it is entirely consistent with Cairo. Equally, the spatial location of "P" can have an enormous impact on local and regional environments (e.g., protected areas, water resources). There is plenty of room for policy to address the location and movement of people, from the designation of protected areas to zoning practices to the nature and location of development funding (internal and external), and of course national, regional and local immigration/emigration policy.

Cheers!...Fred Meyerson

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Summary, week 4
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2001 22:09:27 -0600

Week Four Summary: Discussion on the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment

(Please save this message!)

Note: You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute: send your comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org. Read remarks online at <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Go to Cyberseminars).

This message includes

- 1) A summary of substantive remarks Nov 8-14, 2001 (and selected quotes);
- 2) Highlighted topics for discussion for Weeks 5-6
- 3) A reminder of commands and ways to access the listserve.
- 1) Summary of Discussion November 8-14

Reminder: We are soliciting feedback from the population-environment research community to facilitate revision of the preliminary policy statement on "Population in Sustainable Development", prepared in September by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP). The Preliminary Statement is downloadable from <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Cyberseminars). The final statement will be presented and discussed at the WSSD/Earth Summit 2 in Johannesburg, September 2002 (after review and further revisions). Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>. Learn more

about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting
<http://www.earthsummit2002.org>

Thanks to participants from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Italy, India, Brazil, Sweden and the US last week. The importance of including consumption, ecology, education, health, immigration and poverty alongside population growth-- in an interdisciplinary fashion --was underscored this week (Kurtz, Salenius, Scientists). Age structure and intergenerational equity should be addressed (Scientists). Specific changes in the text of the GSP Statement were suggested (EgerF6, Salenius). Ethiopia was raised as case of links between population growth and resource depletion (Salenius). Education does not hold one meaning and runs the risk of appealing general language with no specific contexts or actions (EgerF6). Also discussed: emphasize the impact on humans of environmental change, address migration and consumption in developed countries (North America), maintain the focus on population vs. individuals, note the "digital divide" and utilize the concept of 'sustainable use of space.' Replace the term human population with 'human community' (EgerF6). Migration and population growth in the US and Canada are critical given high consumption. Others acknowledged: consumption and population reductions are needed, but for developed countries, the growth rate will be lower (accounting for migration). Specific studies were referenced; a call was made to continue this trend.

Some selected quotes (see full remarks online)

.I suggest that Putting the Human Population at the Center should conclude as it does but with the following addition . when considering the broad array of priorities and policies that can contribute to promoting sustainable development, ***expansionist massive immigration into some developed countries***, social development and in particular education stand out as the essential foundation ***s** for achieving the goals of sustainable development. (Salenius).

By denying impoverished women in Third World countries adequate reproductive assistance we are condemning these people to remain in a vicious circle .(Bartholomew)

.the alternative prioritisation of people over population will not confuse rather strengthen the fundamentals of demography, and will also likely to spur a theoretical shift in the discipline.GPS's statement on differential responsibility and differential vulnerability requires different definition of demographic data in regard to their size, composition and distribution.Environmental consideration has not been introduced in the definition of work force structure... A new definition

of work incorporating the environmental consideration is the challenge before the demographers. Similarly, the traditional rural-urban classification of population has become redundant. (Bhagat)

. the opposite relation; that environmental change affects humans as much as other members of the ecosystem; needs to be emphasized. Studied by David Satterthwaite and others. Agenda 21 has a long chapter on population-related. I suggest a reference be made in the Statement.. a statement about population and environment cannot, to remain relevant to its focus, turn into a statement about individual humans. If it does, then it leaves the realm of population studies. The statement may address the macro-goal, and need not dwell specifically in the human rights issue. (EgerF6)

. Could the problem faced by the authors be phrased as "how to articulate for a policy-oriented WSSD audience some feasible and humane policy implications that arise from a large, diverse body of scientific research into the relationships between population dynamics and environmental change/dynamics (Murphy)

. If Earth Summit 2002 is going to realistically examine the influence of population growth on the deteriorating environment, it must address the disproportionate contribution of a projected doubling of the populations of Canada and the United States. (Salonius)

. Our population is projected to more than double by 2100. [my] book Footprints on the Land examines the growth and spread of population upon the land in the U.S. and spatially overlays that growth onto areas of natural lands and water. This produces "hotspots" (Cordell)

2) Topics for the two remaining weeks

Original themes

1. What are relevant "population variables" or dimensions to consider in "sustainable development"?
2. What key themes emerge from recent population-environment dynamics research?
3. Do you agree with the use of 'Population Balance'?
4. Is the concept of "differentiated vulnerability/ responsibility" appropriate and useful?

Continue to address these initial themes, and also:

1. Share findings from your own population-environment research relevant to the topic
 2. Raise concerns about the audience, orientation, and purpose of the Statement
 3. Respond to specific questions for reviewers in the Statement
 4. Suggest how to overcome the 'population' vs. 'people' debate (i.e., demographic approaches vs. broader human-welfare orientation)
- 3) Review of commands and ways to access the listserve

You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute your thoughts: send comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org and we will post them to the listserve on your behalf.

You can view all the postings to date online at our website:

<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>

Visit the Cyberseminars page and View Comments.

If you are presently subscribed to 'pernseminars' and wish to unsubscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature, please)

unsubscribe pernseminars

If you wish to subscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature):

subscribe pernseminars

-----end of week 4 summary

Laura Murphy, PhD
Clinical Assistant Professor
Department of International Health & Development,
School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine and
Stone Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net

From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Policy / Rio+10
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2001 08:23:52 -0500

Re: I=PAT, I concur with and extend Meyerson's statement(Nov. 15, 3:35 PM) about "P" being addressed in policy terms:

The policy arena has great potential for changing all of the P,A,and T terms that contribute to environmental impact (I) and the Earth Summit must deal with the capabilities of the international community and individual governments to influence these by taking a much stronger stand than apparently was taken at Rio wherein it was stated that all nations "must rapidly formulate and implement appropriate programs to cope with THE INEVITABLE INCREASE IN POPULATION NUMBERS"(p. 45, Agenda 21, The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet, Sitarz, 1993).

The most important policy initiatives are probably those of:

1. Non-renewable fossil fuel prices, which can and should be engineered by an international agreement on CARBON TAXES.
2. Modification of family size by monetary incentives.

1. International agreement on CARBON TAXES should be sought at Earth Summit 2002

A.A. Bartlett (1978) stated that:

"Modern agriculture is the use of land to convert petroleum into food" (American Journal of Physics 46: page 880).

In the short interval during which humanity has increasingly relied on carbonaceous energy sources that were laid down over millions of years, human numbers have increased from 1 billion to 6 billion.

This exponential human explosion would not have been possible without the energy subsidy that arose as a result of fossil fuels having been priced on the basis of their extraction costs. Humanity was able to TEMPORARILY free itself from the limitations that had formerly been imposed by the energy yield that was available from the sun, to the extent that in a little over 100 years human numbers have greatly exceeded the Earth's sustainable

carrying capacity.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the brief 'fossil fuel interval' will peak shortly such that energy for human activities (the per capita availability of which is directly tied to the standard of living and affluence) will increasingly have to come from solar based renewables.

The manner in which this return to renewable energy sources, that have limits and preclude growth, will dictate how much hardship will result from the adjustment. The further along the road to dependence on stored geological fossil fuels that individual nations and the families therein have traveled, the more painful and disruptive will be their withdrawal back to a sustainable energy budget based on renewables. The sooner the increasing dependence is arrested, the easier it will be to begin the slow and incremental divorce from finite energy (see 'The World Petroleum Life-Cycle, <http://dieoff.org/page133.htm>).

CARBON TAXES, applied by all nations by international agreement, as they incrementally rise over time (the rate of escalation to be subject to international agreement) will make research, development and open market acceptance of more expensive/less convenient but sustainable renewable energy sources increasingly more feasible.

An international agreement on CARBON TAXES, fashioned at Earth Summit 2002,

would circumvent the intensely political process that has surrounded the Kyoto process on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and climate warming that has, at best, achieved partial progress on inconsequential modifications of humanity's profligate utilization rate of fossil fuels.

2. The efficacy of modification of family size, in all nations, by the use of monetary incentives should be thoroughly discussed at Earth Summit 2002.

Pimentel (1999) gives evidence that:

Worldwide, an average of 2.1 children per couple would stabilize the human population on Earth at approximately 12 billion during this century while

*****AN AVERAGE OF 1.5 CHILDREN PER COUPLE WOULD REDUCE THE CURRENT 6 BILLION TO AN OPTIMAL [and sustainable] 2 BILLION PEOPLE EARLY IN THE NEXT CENTURY*****

Neoclassical growth economists and others, who may be concerned about the social disruptions, economic and political problems and abandonment of buildings and agricultural land that such a rapid reduction in human numbers to 2 billion would produce, should familiarize themselves with the proposals of SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION at:

<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

regarding internationally coordinated monetary incentives designed to influence family size and real estate prices worldwide as population shrinkage takes place.

Neoclassical growth economists and others, who may be concerned about the effects of a human numbers contraction during the next 100 years, should consider the catastrophic health and environmental problems, political and economic tensions that will mushroom with continued population growth towards and beyond 12 billion people as the international community continues engage in CAREFUL DISCUSSIONS about population like those at the first Earth Summit in Rio. This magnitude of inexorable escalation of human numbers, coincident with the decline in world oil production after 2010, if not addressed vigourously would almost certainly be accompanied by increasing political and military chaos.

I trust that participants in the DISCUSSION ON THE PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF THE GLOBAL SCIENCE PANEL ON POPULATION AND ENVIRONMENT will cast opinions, during the remaining two weeks, as to the importance of including the need for:

1. International agreement on CARBON TAXESand
 2. Monetary incentives for average family size reduction
.....in the Final Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment at the Earth Summit 2, September 2002 in Johannesburg.
- Peter Salonius

Date: Sun, 18 Nov 2001 13:03:30 -0500
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Lutz's good question

Greetings,

After re-reading many contributions, it seems that Wolfgang Lutz has put a key question to us which could benefit from further efforts towards an adequate answer.

Is there a way to on the one hand maintain precision and clarity with respect to population and on the other hand stress the human dimension more broadly and the people into the picture without making the statement confusing? In an early contribution to this discussion Bill Clark of Harvard suggested to use

population as a vehicle to bring the human dimension into Johannesburg. To me this sounds like a good strategy. The trick will be how to do it right.

Any suggestions?

Wolfgang Lutz

The well-being of any life form, including humans, is influenced by feedback from the behavior of individuals, groups, and the total number of the species alive at any time. "Human Dimension" refers to the values considered good/bad by a culture, with perhaps some proving to be universal. Comfort, health, love, freedom, and (limited?) procreation might be examples. With too few individuals in an area of suitable habitat, cooperation, teamwork, genetic diversity, and social experiences such as cultural and intellectual richness might be less than optimal. Scarcity/rarity of neighbors (as with goods and services) tends to increase the relative value of them to people in sparsely populated regions. Overcrowding (very high density) seems to devalue the individual, as noise, privacy, sanitation, etc can be troublesome, and competition for life's necessities and pleasures can become contentious. In "Health Strategies", some of these linkages were discussed. The concept of "Optimum Population" might help foster the "Human Dimension" since universal human values are a major factor for any group addressing population policies. Michael Ignatieff, in his book *The Rights Revolution* (from his famous Massey Lectures), claims that all nations have the right to limit the numbers of immigrants they welcome. He is a progressive, liberal historian. He also firmly believes in gender equality. Both of these key issues dominate population politics and policies.

The UN report already mentioned firmly places overpopulation as a "Human Dimension" issue. There is no logical reason to avoid asking the question: what would be an approximate VARIABLE optimum population for regions, countries, the planet. Objections can come from many sources, some perhaps rooted in cultural fear, economic fear, religious dogmas, sexist fear. If the "Human Dimension" is to be enhanced, it must not ignore what Garrett Hardin entitled his recent book: *The Ostrich Factor*. To do so would be to condemn more and more humans to unnecessary suffering.

Economist Lester Thurow wrote *Head to Head* which discusses post cold war economic competition. We are witnessing religious & cultural conflicts in many regions, with some perhaps really 'resource' wars. (water, forests, farmland...) Obviously if there were NO people, there would be no human problems. Various studies have been undertaken to guesstimate a sustainable population. It depends on average consumption levels, cleanliness of processes, degree of personal freedom desired, and many other factors. If the term "Population Balance" is put forth, the balance must be between numbers, behavior, and sustainable habitat. To omit any of these three will negatively

impact what counts: "The Human Dimension".

I humbly hope that these thoughts contribute to an adequate answer to the Lutz question.

Steven B. Kurtz

From: "Alex de Sherbinin" <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: "Steve Kurtz" <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: RE: [PERN_seminar] Lutz's good question
Date: Mon, 19 Nov 2001 11:20:21 -0500

I had intended to respond to this question posed by Wolfgang Lutz, so I will take this opportunity to add my thoughts. Thanks to Steven Kurtz for directing out attention to it.

Judging by the experience at Rio (UNCED in 1992), the human dimensions will not be out of the picture at all, but rather will be front and center as the primary concern of policy makers. It is likely that most participants at Johannesburg will be less concerned about environmental conditions per se than with how those conditions impinge upon economic development and human well being. After all, sustainable development has within it the concept of interlinked human-environmental systems, and most efforts to measure it have included environmental, social, and economic dimensions. Agenda 21 has at least 11 chapters that directly focus on human-environment issues:

2. International cooperation and trade
3. Combating poverty
4. Changing consumption patterns
5. Demographic dynamics
6. Human health
7. Human settlements
8. Integrating environment & development into decision making
14. Sustainable agriculture & rural development
24. Women in sustainable development
25. Children & youth
26. Indigenous people

Thus, the question becomes, how does the GSP contribute something new, useful and directly within its expertise?

My own recommendation would be to focus more narrowly on what we have

learned over the past decade from population-development-environment research that has relevance from a policy perspective. This would draw on the substantial number of local case studies that have been undertaken in the past decade, as well as broader modeling efforts (such as IIASA's PDE studies) and expert workshops and discussions. It would also draw on some new literature on population-development connections that questions the findings of the influential 1986 National Research Council report, which found that population was effectively neutral from a development standpoint (see *Population Matters: Demographic Change, Economic Growth, and Poverty in the Developing World*, Edited by Birdsall, Kelley, and Sinding, Oxford Univ. Press, 2001).

I would be less inclined to try to sell the world on a new concept, such as that of "population balance." In fact, I believe that most people will interpret this term in the same way that they interpret "population stabilization" - i.e., balancing population with available resources. (An American NGO called "Population-Environment Balance" has a strong anti-immigration stance on the grounds that more people means a declining quality of life.) The way that "population balance" is couched in the GSP statement, it suggests that we need to look at population dynamics in its widest sense - age structure, demographic characteristics (education levels, labor force participation, etc.), health, and rates of fertility, morbidity and mortality. This is a valuable insight, but is there no other way to convey this than to create a new term that will most likely be mis-used or mis-interpreted?

Overall, I see a lot of good in the statement. Ideas such as differential vulnerability and differential responsibility are valuable. But I believe that it should stick to a narrower focus, and not attempt to address human dimensions or "people and the environment" broadly construed. I also think that the statement will do a disservice if, in focusing on the benefits of a broader understanding of demographic processes, it downplays the challenges that rapid population growth poses to developing country economies and environments. (Just as we can safely say that Western-style consumption places huge burdens on the environment - often thousands of miles away from where the end consumer resides.) Finally, in order to show continuity, I would recommend reference, where appropriate, to population-related discussions at Rio and to relevant chapters of Agenda 21.

I realize that the GSP has a gargantuan task. I hope these comments help.

Alex de Sherbinin
Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN)
Columbia University

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Summary Week 5
Date: Fri, 23 Nov 2001 13:28:13 -0600

Week Five Summary: Discussion on the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment
(Please save this message!)

Note: You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute: send your comments to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org Read remarks online at <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Go to Cyberseminars).

This message includes0

- 1) A summary of substantive remarks week 5: Nov 15-22, 2001 (and selected quotes);
- 2) A reminder of commands and ways to access the listserve.

This summary covers the fifth week of discussion of the six weeks scheduled for discussion. If you were planning to contribute but have not done so yet: please send in your comments. The discussion will continue through Friday, November 30.

Reminder: We are soliciting feedback from the population-environment research community to facilitate revision of the preliminary policy statement on "Population in Sustainable Development", prepared in September by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP). The Preliminary Statement is downloadable from <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> (Cyberseminars). The final statement will be presented and discussed at the WSSD/Earth Summit 2 in Johannesburg, September 2002 (after review and further revisions). Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>. Learn more about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting <http://www.earthsummit2002.org>

- 1) A brief summary of themes and remarks during week 5: Nov 15-22, 2001 (and selected quotes below);

Comments touched upon consumption, 'LDC/DC/developed' country classifications, the role of policy in affecting 'population', recommendations for organizing the Statement, and answers to W. Lutz's question (November 7) Briefly: High consumption and rising (projected) populations in the US and Canada demand more attention in the Statement (Salonius). A new conception of nested scales (relating demographic and environmental interfaces: Meyerson) might help us overcome the 'anachronistic' LDC/MDC distinction (EgerF6). Population increase cannot be addressed through policy (owing to composite factors) so we

must focus on the T and A of IPAT (EgerF6). Others objected: Unmet need can be fulfilled consistent with the Cairo approach, and migration and zoning are other strategies (Meyerson), while an international carbon tax to reduce fossil fuel consumption and economic incentives to reduce family size were introduced (Salonius). Responding to Lutz: The Statement should focus on specific policy-relevant lessons from demographic dynamics and environment research, not broader 'human implications', noting that 'human dimensions' is already on Agenda 21 (de Sherbinin); also avoid 'population balance.' The concept of 'Optimum population' might help foster the 'human dimension' recognizing many common/universal values.(Kurtz)

Selected quotes from the fifth week of six weeks (see full remarks online)

--the document reads like a "mantra", as if one person has written it and has presented one set of ideas. I had an expectation that the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment would be presenting multiple proposals on both population and environmental issues (Bartholomew)

--the MDC/LDC country classification is several decades old. In economic as well as in demographic terms of TFR and life expectancy, several LDC countries should now go with the MDC. We need to relate to the realities of economic/demographic growth, not to an anachronistic classification . . . to direct population increase through government policy alone is not there. . . whatever values we attach to demographic dynamics, it is driven by such a composite set of factors [and] out of reach for policy. In terms of IPAT, it is the "T", and secondly the "A" that can be addressed in policy terms. For the rest, implement Cairo... (EgerF6)

-- I don't agree that "P" can never be addressed in policy terms. As long as there is unmet need, addressing it is consistent with Cairo. Equally, the spatial location of "P" can have an enormous impact (e.g., protected areas, water resources). .. policy [can] address the location and movement of people (protected areas to zoning practices to the nature and location of development funding), and immigration/emigration policies (at local, national, international levels). (Meyerson)

---RE: the anachronism of the developed/developing country classification. I made this point in Population and Development Review 1998, (population and climate change policy). .The underlying question for Rio+10 is how to deal with demographic change across scales: the "developed" aggregation is both inaccurate (not the right countries anymore) and masks significant opposing trends at smaller scales (the US, Canada vs. Italy, Spain). [We could] propose a new set of nested scales that are flexible and relate to challenges at the demographic and

environmental interface . (Meyerson)

---I concur with Meyerson's statement (Nov. 15) about "P" being addressed in policy terms: The policy arena has great potential for changing all of the P, A, and T terms that contribute to environmental impact (I). Earth Summit must deal with international and [national] governments' abilities to influence these [through] (1) carbon taxes (Non-renewable fossil fuel prices): the brief 'fossil fuel interval' will peak shortly such that energy for human activities (the per capita availability of which is directly tied to the standard of living and affluence) will increasingly have to come from solar based renewables.

An international agreement on CARBON TAXES, fashioned at Earth Summit 2002, would circumvent the intensely political process that has surrounded the Kyoto (2) Modification of family size by monetary incentives.<<http://www.scientists4pr.org>> [summarizes the arguments] regarding internationally coordinated monetary incentives designed to influence family size and real estate prices worldwide as population shrinkage takes place.(Salonius)

---Canada and the U.S. are both projected to >grow substantially by 2050, but the developed world aggregated is projected to decline from 1.19 to 1.18 billion. So, at the developed/developing scale, all projection growth does occur in the developing world. (See report at www.unfpa.org) (Meyerson)

---the statement that "ALL THE POPULATION GROWTH PROJECTED BY THE REPORT

- FROM A CURRENT 6.1. BILLION - WILL TAKE PLACE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES"

plainly misses the population trajectory of countries like the United States and Canada .. growth rates of over 1 percent per year which will DOUBLE numbers in 70 years. If the Earth Summit 2002 is going to realistically examine the influence of population growth on the environment, it must address the disproportionate contribution of a projected doubling of the populations of Canada and the United States, whose residents (5 percent of world total) are responsible for over 25 percent of resource use . the disregard of population growth in *developed countries by the U.N. Population Fund and the [GSP Statement] has serious implications concerning the possibilities for influencing the POPULATION - ENVIRONMENT DYNAMICS in Johannesburg .(Salonius)

---In response to Lutz's question (how to maintain precision with respect to population and also stress the human dimension more broadly ?) .The "Human Dimension" refers to the values considered good/bad with some perhaps universal (Comfort, health, love, freedom, and (limited?) procreation .) With too few individuals, cooperation, teamwork, genetic

diversity, cultural and intellectual richness might be less than optimal. Scarcity/rarity of neighbors tends to increase the relative value, while overcrowding seems to devalue the individual. The concept of "Optimum Population" might help foster the "Human Dimension" since universal human values are a major factor for any group addressing population policies. The UNFPA report places overpopulation as a "Human Dimension" issue. What would be an approximate VARIABLE optimum population for regions, countries, the planet? . the balance must be between numbers, behavior, and sustainable habitat. To omit any of these three will negatively impact what counts: "The Human Dimension". (Kurtz)

---In response to Lutz's question (how to maintain precision with respect to population and also stress the human dimension more broadly ?) Judging from UNCED 92, the human dimensions [are actually already] front and center . The question becomes: how does the GSP contribute something new, useful and directly within its expertise? Some recommendations:

- focus on what we have learned from population-development-environment research of relevance from a policy perspective; draw on local case studies, broader modeling efforts (IIASA's PDE studies), new literature (i.e. Population Matters: Demographic Change, Economic Growth, and Poverty in the Developing World, Birdsall, Kelley, and Sinding (eds), Oxford Univ. Press, 2001).

- [do not] try to sell "population balance"; most people will interpret this term [as] "population stabilization". It suggests we look at broader population dynamics- age structure, demographic characteristics (education levels, labor force participation, etc.), health, and rates of fertility, morbidity and mortality -valuable insights. Is there no other way to convey this than to create a new term that will most likely be mis-used .?20

- stick to a narrower focus, do not address human dimensions or "people and the environment" broadly. The statement will do a disservice if, in focusing on the benefits of a broader understanding of demographic processes, it downplays the challenges that rapid population growth poses to developing country economies and environments. (Just as we can safely say that Western-style consumption places huge burdens on the environment.) (de Sherbinin)

2) Review of commands and ways to access the listserve

You do not have to be subscribed to the listserve to contribute your thoughts: send comments to

pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org

and we will post them to the listserve on your behalf. You can view all the postings to date online at our website:

<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>

Visit the Cyberseminars page and View Comments.

If you are presently subscribed to 'pernseminars' and wish to unsubscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature, please)

unsubscribe pernseminars

If you wish to subscribe, write to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with the following text in the body of the message (no name or signature):

subscribe pernseminars

-----end of week 5 summary-----

Laura Murphy, PhD

Clinical Assistant Professor

Department of International Health & Development, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine20

and Stone Center for Latin American Studies

Tulane University

Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2001 16:33:52 -0600

To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

From: "Mary M. Kritz" <mmk5@cornell.edu>

Subject: [PERN_seminar] posting

I have been following the discussion on the GSP statement with great interest. I agree very much with Sherbinin's recommendation that the GSP should focus more narrowly on what we have learned over the past decade from research...His posting also made it clear that Agenda 21 is not ignoring the human dimension and, thus, there is no reason why the GSP should focus broadly on that issue in its statement. If the GSP does want to say something about the human dimension, it should consider what has been learned in the past 20-30 years about the effects of differential demographic processes (fertility, mortality, migration) on the quality of life of children, women, and families. I am thinking about how high fertility translates into large family size for the average family and, in turn, into nutrition and schooling deficits for children. It also usually correlates with health problems for women. These are human dimension issues on which there is widespread scientific agreement and they illustrate the interconnectedness of demographic processes and poverty.

I tend to side with the skeptics on the population balance concept, at least as that concept is formulated in the draft statement. I believe the draft statement opens the door to far too many issues and questions that can only be addressed in a speculative manner at this point. Several of these issues have been identified by others in the discussions. Although I am sympathetic to the main idea underlying the population balance approach i.e. that economic, social and ecological context should be taken into

account, in addition to an assessment of countries' discrete demographic processes I do not find a clear message for governments in the GSP draft document pages 7-8. I question whether rapid population growth and population aging should be treated as equivalent processes and think they can only be equated if one takes as a premise that nothing should be done about old age security systems in industrialized countries. Questions are and should be raised regarding whether retirement ages should continue to be set at relatively young ages when growing numbers of persons reaching those ages are healthy and could continue to be productive for several additional years, if "aging" were approached differently. The document also ignores the complicated issue of the implication for the environment of population growth rates in the USA (currently about one percent annually) due mainly to immigration, as several participants have observed.

Much of the Seminar discussion on the linkages between population-environment-development (PED) has been pitched at the global level. While a discussion at that level might have been appropriate 20-30 years ago, in recent decades we have seen large changes in each of the PED dimensions at the country level. In contrast to circa 1970 when fertility and mortality rates were almost uniformly high in most parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, today's countries in those regions are highly differentiated from each other in their demographic processes. If social scientists could agree on the determinants of the differential demographic trends countries have experienced in recent decades, and the extent to which those outcomes were related to development and environment conditions, I believe we could move discussions on PED linkages up a notch. However, I don't think there is agreement currently and thus the GSP can only take two courses: focus on the aspects where there is greater agreement; or lay out the issues on PED relationships and how these connect to the human dimension without taking a definitive stance.

With respect to the macro linkages, I found Egero's point helpful, namely that there is a tension between government policies which are intended to affect macro trends viewed as problematic and the human dimension. Kurtz is correct in reminding us that many developing countries have identified their demographic trends (high fertility and mortality) as problematic. We also know that many countries have taken steps to stem their rapid population growth rates and have been successful in doing so. Cairo is pertinent in that the countries where fertility and mortality rates have started downward are mainly ones where gender inequalities are lower. At the same time, Cairo may have muddied the waters with its message that population issues should only/mainly be approached from a human/reproductive rights standpoint. That message does push the macro issues to the sideline and it would be helpful to bring them back into the discussion at Earth Summit 2002.

Mary Kritz

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] last days of the seminar
Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2001 09:18:41 -0600

I wanted to remind subscribers to 'pernseminars' that Friday, November 30, is the last scheduled day for cyberdiscussion of the Global Science Panel Statement on "Population in Sustainable Development."
Please send in any final comments by tomorrow.

We will prepare final summaries of discussion and recommendations to the Panel by next week.

thank you.
Laura Murphy, PhD
Co-coordinator, Population Environment Research Network

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

Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2001 10:44:19 -0500 (EST)
From: Hlzazola
To: pernseminar@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERN_seminar] PERN seminar

I have also been following the discussion with great interest! The different and sometimes opposite perspectives show the limited research results available that could lead to global policy recommendations.

I suggest that one recommendation could be precisely a call for more research support on the P-D-E interactions, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. I fully agree with Catherine Marquette's point, related with the concept of sustainable development and the need to take a critical position regarding its normative character. In this respect I think there is an urgent need to deepen our understanding of the way how different cultures and human groups relate to the natural environment, considering the different social identities, roles and socialization processes, that shape -and are shaped also by- their reproductive behavior, their consumption and production patterns and ultimately their quality

of life. I think that only through the understanding of these complex mechanisms, we can be in a better position to recommend global policy interventions towards more sustainable P-D-E interactions.

Congratulations and thanks to all that make possible this interesting cyberseminar.

Best regards,
Haydea Izazola
UAM-Xochimilco. Mexico City

From: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu
To: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
CC: fmeyerso@nsf.gov
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] last days of the seminar
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 18:29:35 -0500

11-30-01 - from Fred Meyerson

I congratulate you on a very interesting cyber-seminar. Here are some additional comments re: the IUSSP Population-Environment Statement:

1) Authorship:

Who will be the ultimate author of this piece? How and by whom is/was the "Global Science Panel on Population and Environment" selected? What is the relationship between the "science panel" and PERN? These issues weren't clear, at least to me. It was also not clear whether you were looking for contributing authors, or simply critique.

2) Form and Purpose:

Who is the intended audience? How and when will the product be delivered, and to whom? What is the goal?

If the goal is change the course and results of WSSD, it's important to first think of the target audience in designing both the form and content. Assuming for a moment that the purpose of the document is to change/improve the content of agreements, etc. resulting from WSSD, and that the target audience is the most powerful policy-makers, I would favor making the document as short as possible with a few key points (2-4 pages at most). Anything longer will likely not be read by the key players. A longer companion piece could be useful for those few

policy-makers who want to read more, and for the scientific community, but I would lead with the short piece.

3) Scope of Content:

As demographers, ecologists, sociologists, and environmental scientists, I believe we are at our strongest when we focus on the scientific questions and results (including a straight forward assessment of uncertainty), and the implications of all of the above for policy.

There is plenty of straight forward factual population-environment content which is not commonly known, or about which there are serious misconceptions among policy-makers and the public. I think we should lead with this first - what is scientifically known (and to what degree of certainty). Then I think we should briefly state some important areas of scientific uncertainty that need to be resolved, and what that resolution could mean for policy. Then perhaps a concluding section: How can policy change the population-environment interactions that are of greatest concern?

I believe we are on more shaky and less cohesive ground when we speak collectively about ethics or "rich vs. poor", "north vs. south", or "developed and developing" questions. These are not scientific questions, and indeed the currently used classifications are often political legacy, rather than the product of logic. There is an important place for those discussions at WSSD, I just don't believe that this group is the right one to do it. Our strength is our scientific judgement, and I believe that we endanger our credibility and utility on that front by putting forward opinions in other areas in this particular document.

I am absolutely not against the expression of opinion (I have many and do express them), but I simply think there are other, more appropriate vehicles within WSSD than this statement from a "global science panel".

4) Content:

I have already made a number of comments about the content via the PERN seminar, but my impression is that there wasn't much closure through that process. I believe that the scientific statements and issues could have been better framed in the discussion paper, and that might have resulted in a more substantive dialogue. I am not abdicating responsibility here, and I do think this is a very important project, and the dialogue was fascinating. But I think that the product is insufficiently formed at the present time to have a complete substantive discussion. I would welcome another opportunity for input at a later, more developed stage.

I am in the midst of two quite similar multi-disciplinary social science/environmental science policy drafting processes within the National

Science Foundation and the US Global Change Research Program, and I therefore appreciate that this is very difficult work. I congratulate you for taking it on, and hope I can be useful later on.

Cheers!....Fred Meyerson

Assistant Professor (Research)
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology;
Faculty Associate, Population Studies and Training Center
Brown University
Providence, RI

2000-2001 contact at the National Science Foundation:

Frederick A.B. Meyerson, Ph.D., J.D.
AAAS/NSF Science and Technology Policy Fellow
National Science Foundation
Directorate for Geosciences
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1070
Arlington, VA 22230
Tel: 703-292-7857
Fax: 703-292-9152
e-mail: fmeyerso@nsf.gov

Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 09:25:40 +0100
To: murphyll@bellsouth.net, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
From: Wolfgang LUTZ <lutz@iiasa.ac.at>
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] last days of the seminar

Hi Laura,

Thanks to you and the others for all your good work on the cyber seminar.

When you do your final summary you can also convey to all participants in the discussion that thanks of the Panel coordinators for the many contributions. Each of the contributions will be seriously discussed by the members of the Panel.

You can also inform participants about the following next steps planned: The draft outline that was the basis for this cyber seminar will now be fully revised and made into a statement that should be as clear and

consistent as possible. This next draft will then also be discussed with the diplomatic level in the context of Johannesburg Prep Com II (New York 28 Jan - 8 Feb). We then plan another cyber seminar in Feb/March just preceding the meeting of the full Panel at IIASA 21-23 March, at which the statement will be finalized.

Many thanks for your efforts so far.

Cheers Wolfgang

Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 10:19:55 +0100
To: Frederick_Meyerson@brown.edu, <murphyll@bellsouth.net>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
From: Wolfgang LUTZ <lutz@iiasa.ac.at>
Subject: Re: [PERN_seminar] answers to Meyerson
Cc: fmeyerso@nsf.gov

As one of the coordinators of the Global Science Panel I just wanted to give quick answers to Fred Meyerson's good questions.

1. Authorship. The statement will be finalized at the March meeting at IIASA with the members of the Panel being the authors. A full list of members can be found on the IIASA web site. The Panel has been jointly initiated by IIASA, IUSSP and UNU. Mahendra Shah and myself serve as coordinators.
2. Form and Purpose: The statement will be discussed and distributed at the various Johannesburg PrepComs. After its finalization in March it shall also be widely distributed to national delegations and the public at large. The main purpose is to try to bridge the Cairo and Rio processes in a "science based manner". Hence the purpose is not to produce another scientific statement--there are many good scientific publications in the field--but to produce a policy relevant statement that is based on the best science and should hopefully bring some new dimensions into the way the Johannesburg Summit views "population in sustainable development" and goes beyond the old deadlock of the traditional population-consumption controversy. Whether the Panel succeeds in making this kind of contribution remains to be seen. The contributions in this past cyber seminar and in another one that is planned before the finalization of the document 21-23 March are providing very important input into this process.

Thank you also for your useful thoughts about the content of the statement that will certainly be taken into consideration.

PERN is a joint initiative of IUSSP and IHDP. Its aim is to foster global communication in the field of scientific population-environment analysis. It is completely independent from the Global Science Panel but agreed to serve as the facilitator for two cyber seminars discussing the statements of the Panels as the drafts evolve over time. PERN is also involved in several other activities such as building up a population-environment bibliography and is also conducting cyber seminars on other topics.

I hope this answered some of your questions. It is an exciting process and we do not yet exactly know where it will lead us to.

Best regards Wolfgang

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERN_seminar] Final summary, Population in Sustainable Development
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:45:28 -0600

Final Summary, Cyberseminar on Population in Sustainable Development, the Preliminary Statement of the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment
October -November, 2001

(Please save this message!)

This message includes

- 1) Concluding remarks
- 2) Clarification of GSP, purpose of the statement, etc.
- 3) Summary of final week's comments²⁰

1) Concluding Remarks

This message concludes our 6 week electronic discussion on "Population in Sustainable Development", a preliminary statement by the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment (GSP) in preparation for Earth Summit 2002. The follow-up cyberseminar is scheduled for February/March 2002 and will focus on the revised Statement.

Listserve subscribers numbered nearly 300, from dozens of countries from around the world representing the social and natural sciences. Participants contributed nearly 100 messages, which addressed key themes in the Statement: population balance (generally unfavorable), the

'differential vulnerability/responsibility' framework (generally favorable) and relevant 'population variables'. Attention to the appropriate (multiple) scales of analysis and major trends: urbanization, migration, and environmental change broadly (and its impacts on human health)-was urged. Emphasis on more narrowly defined 'demographic' variables vs. human welfare or 'people' more broadly received much attention (although no clear consensus emerged). Familiar debates emerged: neglect of consumption in industrialized countries vs. developing country dynamics; and Malthusian macro-level concern for environmental impact vs. a normative, human welfare orientation consistent with Cairo. Specific findings from research on population dynamics, poverty, development and environment, as well as internet sites and publications were shared (All comments are accessible through our website.)

The GSP coordinators wish to "convey to all participants in the discussion the thanks of the Panel coordinators for the many contributions. Each of the contributions will be seriously discussed by the members of the Panel." Next Steps: The draft document will be fully revised and made into a statement "as clear and consistent as possible." This second draft will be discussed "at the diplomatic level in the context of Johannesburg Prep Com II, in New York January 28 through February 8)." The next cyberseminar will discuss the revised Statement and will take place February/March (preceding the meeting of the full Global Science Panel at IIASA 21-23 March 2002, where the statement will be finalized.)

Learn more about the GSP by visiting: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at>. Follow the links to see a list of members of the GSP. Learn more about preparations for Earth Summit 2002 by visiting <http://www.earthsummit2002.org>. This site provides access to all the background documents, preparatory meetings, regional conferences, major groups, news, etc. Please join (if you have not done so) the Population Environment Research Network, to be informed of other events, opportunities and resources <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org>, "Sign Up"). This cyberseminar was our second public cyberseminar, and we value your participation. We also value feedback and recommendations for future such events: send an email to pernadmin@populationenvironmentresearch.org.

Thanks to Alex de Sherbinin, Hans Bosch, Lisa Valeroso and Al Pinto at CIESIN for making the cyberseminar possible by setting up the listserve. Thanks to the Global Science Panel and to all the participants for an engaging, fruitful cyberseminar.

2) Clarification about the GSP, membership, authorship and purpose of the statement, and relationship to the Population Environment Research Network. Several questions were raised by Fred Meyerson recently and addressed by Wolfgang Lutz (edited; full remarks online):

--Authorship and audience of the Statement: Who will be the ultimate author of this piece? How and by whom is/was the Global Science Panel on Population and Environment selected? What is the relationship between the science panel and the Population Environment Research Network?
"The statement will be finalized at the March meeting at IIASA with the members of the Panel being the authors. A full list of members can be found on the IIASA web site. The Panel has been jointly initiated by IIASA, IUSSP and UNU. Mahendra Shah and myself serve as coordinators."

--The form and purpose of the Statement: Who is the intended audience? How and when will the product be delivered, and to whom? What is the goal? (Meyerson)

"The statement will be discussed and distributed at the Johannesburg PrepComs. After finalization in March, it will be distributed to national delegations and the public. The main purpose is to try to bridge the Cairo and Rio processes in a 'science based manner' . not to produce another scientific statement, but to a policy relevant statement based on the best science [which brings] new dimensions to the Johannesburg Summit views "population in sustainable development" and goes beyond the traditional population-consumption controversy. This cyber seminar (and another planned for Feb/March) are providing important input .."

--the relationship between the Population Environment Research Network and the Global Science Panel:

"The Population Environment Research Network is a joint initiative of IUSSP and IHDP. Its aim is to foster global communication in the field of scientific population-environment analysis. It is completely independent from the Global Science Panel, but agreed to facilitate cyber seminars on the draft Statements.. "

3) Final comments in the last week tackled a wide range of topics. The Cairo message (a strong reproductive rights orientation) was contrasted with macro concerns of nations facing serious problems of employment, resources, and 'development' (EgerF6, Kritz). The population balance concept (as formulated) was criticized, as was the global tendencies in the Statement; it should recognize important country-level differences in demographic trends (Kritz). The 'human dimension' already in Agenda 21 does not need to be targeted here (Kritz). A 'scientific' (vs. normative standpoint) was encouraged (Meyerson) for the statement;

Izazola urges a call for more mixed method research which acknowledges a critical, normative perspective. Specific concerns and suggestions relating to the scope and purpose of the statement were raised: as scientists the statement should avoid delving into ethics or political divisions (Meyerson); the Statement should narrowly focus on what is known in the past decade, or layout the P/E/D connections broadly without taking a definitive stance (Kritz)

Selected quotes (edited for brevity: full remarks online)

The Cairo message vs macro trends

. There is a tension between government policies intended to affect problematic macro trends, and the human dimension. Cairo is pertinent, but it may have 'muddied the waters' with its message that population issues should be approached mainly from a human rights standpoint. That pushes the macro issues to the sideline and it would be helpful to bring them back into the discussion at Earth Summit 2002. (Kritz)

.two major trends in the world should be addressed: First, the rapidly growing number of people with substantial purchasing power, i.e. "development" , the basic population-related force behind global and local pollution and other undesirable environmental changes. Second, globalization acts to marginalize poor countries/areas .where the demographic transition remains incomplete. The combination of urban unemployment and rural economic stagnation entails risks for resource mismanagement and environmental depletion...[this calls for] changes in the macro-situation, i.e. very different sets of recipes from those associated with demographic dynamics. (Bertil Egero, Nov 14)

Population Balance

.I am skeptical of the population balance concept which opens the door to issues and questions that can only be addressed in a speculative manner at this point. .no clear message for governments is found in document. (Kritz)

.I question whether rapid population growth and population aging should be treated as equivalent processes. The document also ignores the complicated issue of the implication for the environment of population growth rates in the USA due mainly to immigration.(Kritz)

Research needs

.different and sometimes opposite perspectives show the limited research results leading to global policy recommendations. One recommendation is

for more research on P-D-E interactions using both quantitative and qualitative methods, recognizing its normative character. We need to deepen our understanding of how different cultures and groups relate to the natural environment; different social identities, roles and socialization processes, shape (and are shaped by) reproductive behavior, consumption, production and quality of life. (Haydea Izazola)

The scope of content and audience of the Statement:

.As demographers, ecologists, sociologists, and environmental scientists, we are at our strongest when we focus on the scientific questions and results and the implications of all of the above for policy. What is scientifically known (and to what degree of certainty)? Then state important areas of scientific uncertainty and what the resolution of uncertainty could mean for policy... We are on more shaky ground when we speak collectively about ethics, "rich vs. poor", "north vs. south"... These are not scientific questions. There is an important place for those discussions at WSSD, I just don't believe that this group is the right one to do it. Our strength is our scientific judgment (vs. opinions) . (Fred Meyerson)

.the GSP should focus more narrowly on what we have learned over the past decade ... from research..." Agenda 21 is not ignoring the human dimension and there is no reason why the GSP should focus on that. (M. Kritz)

.Much of the Seminar discussion has been pitched at the global level-- appropriate 20-30 years ago-- but in recent decades we have seen large changes in each of the Population-Environment-Development dimensions at the country level. If social scientists could agree on the determinants of the differential demographic trends and [how] those outcomes were related to development and environment conditions, we could move discussions up a notch. The GSP can only take two courses: 1-- focus on the aspects where there is greater agreement; or 2--lay out the issues on PED relationships and how these connect to the human dimension without taking a definitive stance. (Kritz)

. think of the target audience -- if the purpose is to improve the content of agreements resulting from WSSD through targeting powerful policy-makers, make the document short with a 2-4 key points . A longer companion piece could be useful. but I would lead with the short piece." (Meyerson)

. the scientific statements and issues could have been better framed.the product is insufficiently formed for a complete substantive discussion. I welcome another opportunity.I am in the midst of similar

multi-disciplinary social/environmental science policy drafting processes [and] I appreciate that this is difficult (Meyerson).

----- end of final summary for Cyberseminar on Population in Sustainable Development -----

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
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 584 2681
Fax: (504) 584 3653
Email: murphyll@bellsouth.net