

FAMINE, DISEASE AND WAR

John Scales Avery

August 9, 2022

INTRODUCTION¹

Malthus' Essay on The Principle of Population

T.R. Malthus' *Essay on The Principle of Population*, the first edition of which was published in 1798, was one of the the first systematic studies of the problem of population in relation to resources. Earlier discussions of the problem had been published by Botero in Italy, Robert Wallace in England, and Benjamin Franklin in America. However Malthus' *Essay* was the first to stress the fact that, in general, powerful checks operate continuously to keep human populations from increasing beyond their available food supply. In a later edition, published in 1803, he buttressed this assertion with carefully collected demographic and sociological data from many societies at various periods of their histories.

The publication of Malthus' *Essay* coincided with a wave of disillusionment which followed the optimism of the Enlightenment. The utopian societies predicted by the philosophers of the Enlightenment were compared with reign of terror in Robespierre's France and with the miseries of industrial workers in England; and the discrepancy required an explanation.

The optimism which preceded the French Revolution, and the disappointment which followed a few years later, closely paralleled the optimistic expectations of our own century, in the period after the Second World War, when it was thought that the transfer of technology to the less developed parts of the world would eliminate poverty, and the subsequent disappointment when poverty persisted.

Science and technology developed rapidly in the second half of the twentieth century, but the benefits which they conferred were just as rapidly consumed by a global population which today is increasing at the rate of one billion people every fourteen years. Because of the close parallel between the optimism and disappointments of Malthus' time and those of our own, much light can be thrown on our present situation by rereading the debate between Malthus and his contemporaries.

¹This book draws heavily on my previously published chapters in various books, but a considerable amount of new material has been added

Famine, disease and war

Malthus classified the checks to population growth as *preventative* and *positive*. Among the preventative checks he mentioned late marriage, and what he called “vice”. This included birth control, of which he disapproved. If he had been living today, I think that Malthus would consider birth control to be the most humane method for preventing excessive growth of population.

Among the positive checks to population growth, are the three terrible Malthusian forces, famine, disease and war. Today, each of these has taken on new and terrifying dimensions, and in this book, a chapter is devoted to each.

The climate emergency

The threat of catastrophic climate change came to the attention of scientists after the time of Malthus. However, this existential threat to the future of human civilization is connected to Malthus’ work by the fact that one of the driving forces behind climate change is population growth.

Our footprint on Nature’s face has grown too large

At present, the total human economy is demanding more from the environment than the environment can regenerate. If we go on with business as usual, then within a decade it would take two Earths to regenerate the resources that we collectively demand. Most economists are focused on growth, but endless growth of anything physical on a finite planet is a logical impossibility. We need a new economic system, a new social contract, and a new and more considerate relationship with our environment.

Famine today

I have for decades been predicting that by 2050, population growth, climate change, and the end of the fossil fuel era would combine to produce a severe and widespread global famine, involving billions rather than millions of people. However, population has grown faster than predicted, reaching 8 billion in November, 2022. Climate change has also developed more rapidly than predicted. Already today drought is threatening agriculture in many parts

of the world, and heat is damaging crops. Food prices have risen dramatically during the last few years, and a considerable fraction of the world's population is already experiencing food insecurity. According to the United Nations, in 2020, 40 percent of the world's population could not afford a healthy diet.

Disease today

The last two years have been dominated by the COVID-19 pandemic, but other diseases, such as tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, malaria, water-borne diseases, and infection with worms continue to produce hundreds of millions of deaths every year. The World Health Organization needs money to combat these diseases, but instead the world continues to spend immense amounts of money on war. Currently 2 trillion dollars are spent every year on armaments, and the total amount spent on war is much larger.

War today

Today the United States is waging a proxy war against Russia, with Ukraine as the battle-ground. Simultaneously the US is threatening China. In both cases, there is a great danger that nuclear weapons may be used.

War was always madness, always immoral, always the cause of unspeakable suffering, economic waste and widespread destruction, and always a source of poverty, hate, barbarism and endless cycles of revenge and counter-revenge. It has always been a crime for soldiers to kill people, just as it is a crime for murderers in civil society to kill people.

But today, the development of all-destroying thermonuclear weapons has put war completely beyond the bounds of sanity and elementary humanity. A thermonuclear war would destroy human civilization, together with most of the plants and animals with which we share the gift of life. We must strive to abolish not only nuclear weapons but also the institution of war itself.

Contents

1	MALTHUS	9
1.1	The education of Malthus	9
1.2	Debate on the views of Godwin and Condorcet	10
1.3	Publication of the first essay in 1798	16
1.4	The second essay published in 1803	18
1.5	Systems of equality	22
1.6	The Poor Laws	24
1.7	Replies to Malthus	25
1.8	Ricardo’s Iron Law of Wages; the Corn Laws	31
1.9	The Irish Potato Famine of 1845	33
1.10	The impact of Malthus on biology	36
2	FAMINE TODAY	45
2.1	Some recent developments	45
2.2	Optimum population in the distant future	48
2.3	Population growth and the Green Revolution	49
2.4	Energy-dependence of modern agriculture	52
2.5	Effects of climate change on agriculture	54
2.6	Harmful effects of industrialized farming	59
2.7	The demographic transition	61
3	DISEASE TODAY	69
3.1	Malaria	69
3.2	Tuberculosis	72
3.3	Water-borne diseases	76
3.4	HIV	80
3.5	Infection with worms	82
3.6	Smallpox and biological warfare	85
3.7	COVID-19	85
4	WAR TODAY	93
4.1	US-Russia proxy war in Ukraine	93
4.2	House Speaker Pelosi’s unnecessarily provocative visit to Taiwan	95

4.3	Militarism and money	97
4.4	Eisenhower's farewell address	97
4.5	The nuclear arms race	99
4.6	Global famine produced by nuclear war	105
4.7	Military-industrial complexes today	107
4.8	A culture of violence	115
4.9	The threats and costs of war	119
4.10	The threat of nuclear war	124
4.11	Flaws in the concept of nuclear deterrence	129
4.12	Dangers of nuclear power generation	133
4.13	Militarism is the US national religion	138
5	THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY	157
5.1	Contrasting responses to the pandemic and the climate crisis	157
5.2	Recovery from the pandemic offers climate action opportunities	158
5.3	Quick action is needed to save the long-term future	158
5.4	Is the transition to 100% renewable energy possible?	159
5.5	Renewables are now much cheaper than fossil fuels!	163
5.6	An economic tipping point	167
5.7	An unprecedented investment opportunity	168
5.8	For creating jobs, renewables beat fossil fuels	170
5.9	The Stern Review	171
5.10	Major producers of fossil fuels	178
5.11	Blood for oil	180
5.12	Fossil fuel extraction must stop!	180
5.13	Extinction events and feedback loops	181
5.14	A warning from the World Bank	184
5.15	Permian-Triassic extinction event	185
5.16	The Holocene (Anthropocene) extinction	186
5.17	Global warming and atmospheric water vapor	188
5.18	The albedo effect	188
5.19	The methane hydrate feedback loop	191
5.20	A feedback loop from warming of soils	191
5.21	Drying of forests and forest fires	192
5.22	Tipping points and feedback loops	192
5.23	Greta Thunberg's TED talk	193
5.24	Only immediate climate action can save the future	196
5.25	Worldwide school strike, 15 March, 2019	200
5.26	The World Meteorological Organization's report	207
5.27	Only 12 years left to limit climate change catastrophe	207
5.28	COP24, the climate summit in Poland	208
5.29	The UK declares a climate emergency	218
5.30	Understatement of existential climate risk	219

5.31	The 2018 IPCC report	224
6	THE GLOBAL HUMAN FOOTPRINT	239
6.1	How many earths does it take to support us?	239
6.2	Overuse of pesticides and the insect apocalypse	242
6.3	The Silent Spring	244
6.4	Biodiversity loss	248
6.5	Illegal burning for palm oil plantations	248
6.6	Jair Bolsonaro's attack on the Amazon rainforest	250
6.7	Growing populations and forest loss	254
6.8	Desertification and soil erosion	255
6.9	Forest drying and wildfires: a feedback loop	256
6.10	Degraded forests are carbon emitters	256
6.11	Replanting forests	257
6.12	Human ecology	259
6.13	Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne H. Ehrlich	259
6.14	John P. Holdren	263
6.15	Barry Commoner	267
6.16	The earth is our mother	272
7	WE NEED A NEW ECONOMIC SYSTEM	295
7.1	Introduction: The need for reform	295
7.2	The Club of Rome	297
7.3	Biological Carrying capacity and Economics	299
7.4	Social Values and Levels of Consumption	300
7.5	Entropy and economics	302
7.6	What is entropy?	302
7.7	Human society as a superorganism	303
7.8	Frederick Soddy	304
7.9	Currency reform, and nationalization of banks	305
7.10	Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen	305
7.11	Limits to Growth: A steady-state economy	307
7.12	Problems of globalization	308
7.13	A new social contract	311

Chapter 1

MALTHUS

1.1 The education of Malthus

T.R. Malthus' *Essay on The Principle of Population*, the first edition of which was published in 1798, was one of the the first systematic studies of the problem of population in relation to resources. Earlier discussions of the problem had been published by Botero in Italy, Robert Wallace in England, and Benjamin Franklin in America. However Malthus' *Essay* was the first to stress the fact that, in general, powerful checks operate continuously to keep human populations from increasing beyond their available food supply. In a later edition, published in 1803, he buttressed this assertion with carefully collected demographic and sociological data from many societies at various periods of their histories.

The publication of Malthus' *Essay* coincided with a wave of disillusionment which followed the optimism of the Enlightenment. The utopian societies predicted by the philosophers of the Enlightenment were compared with reign of terror in Robespierre's France and with the miseries of industrial workers in England; and the discrepancy required an explanation. The optimism which preceded the French Revolution, and the disappointment which followed a few years later, closely paralleled the optimistic expectations of our own century, in the period after the Second World War, when it was thought that the transfer of technology to the less developed parts of the world would eliminate poverty, and the subsequent disappointment when poverty persisted. Science and technology developed rapidly in the second half of the twentieth century, but the benefits which they conferred were just as rapidly consumed by a global population which today is increasing at the rate of one billion people every decade. Because of the close parallel between the optimism and disappointments of Malthus' time and those of our own, much light can be thrown on our present situation by rereading the debate between Malthus and his contemporaries.

Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) came from an intellectual family: His father, Daniel Malthus, was a moderately well-to-do English country gentleman, an enthusiastic believer in the optimistic ideas of the Enlightenment, and a friend of the philosophers Jean-Jaques Rousseau, David Hume and William Godwin. The famous book on population by the younger Malthus grew out of conversations with his father.



Figure 1.1: **The Rookery near Dorking in Surrey**

Daniel Malthus attended Oxford, but left without obtaining a degree. He later built a country home near Dorking, which he called “The Rookery”. The house had Gothic battlements, and the land belonging to it contained a beech forest, an ice house, a corn mill, a large lake, and serpentine walks leading to “several romantic buildings with appropriate dedications”. Daniel Malthus was an ardent admirer of Rousseau; and when the French philosopher visited England with his mistress, Thérèse le Vasseur, Daniel Malthus entertained him at the Rookery. Rousseau and Thérèse undoubtedly saw Daniel’s baby son (who was always called Robert or Bob) and they must have noticed with pity that he had been born with a hare lip. This was later sutured, and apart from a slight scar which marked the operation, he became very handsome.

Robert Malthus was at first tutored at home; but in 1782, when he was 16 years old, he was sent to study at the famous Dissenting Academy at Warrington in Lancashire. Joseph Priestly had taught at Warrington, and he had completed his famous *History of Electricity* there, as well as his *Essay on Government*, which contains the phrase “the greatest good for the greatest number”.

Robert’s tutor at Warrington Academy was Gilbert Wakefield (who was later imprisoned for his radical ideas). When Robert was 18, Wakefield arranged for him to be admitted to Jesus College, Cambridge University, as a student of mathematics. Robert Malthus graduated from Cambridge in 1788 with a first-class degree in mathematics. He was Ninth Wrangler, which meant that he was the ninth-best mathematician in his graduating class. He also won prizes in declamation, both in English and in Latin, which is surprising in view of the speech defect from which he suffered all his life.

1.2 Debate on the views of Godwin and Condorcet

In 1793, Robert Malthus was elected a fellow of Jesus College, and he also took orders in the Anglican Church. He was assigned as Curate to Okewood Chapel in Surrey. This small chapel stood in a woodland region, and Malthus’ illiterate parishioners were so poor

that the women and children went without shoes. They lived in low thatched huts made of woven branches plastered with mud. The floors of these huts were of dirt, and the only light came from tiny window openings. Malthus' parishioners diet consisted almost entirely of bread. The children of these cottagers developed late, and were stunted in growth. Nevertheless, in spite of the harsh conditions of his parishioners' lives, Malthus noticed that the number of births which he recorded in the parish register greatly exceeded the number of deaths. It was probably this fact which first turned his attention to the problem of population.

By this time, Daniel Malthus had sold the Rookery; and after a period of travel, he had settled with his family at Albury, about nine miles from Okewood Chapel. Robert Malthus lived with his parents at Albury, and it was here that the famous debates between father and son took place. 1793, the year when Robert Malthus took up his position at Okewood, was also the year in which Daniel Malthus friend, William Godwin, published his enormously optimistic book, *Political Justice*. In this book, Godwin predicted a future society where scientific progress would liberate humans from material want. Godwin predicted that in the future, with the institution of war abolished, with a more equal distribution of property, and with the help of scientific improvements in agriculture and industry, much less labour would be needed to support life. Luxuries are at present used to maintain artificial distinctions between the classes of society, Godwin wrote, but in the future values will change; humans will live more simply, and their efforts will be devoted to self-fulfillment and to intellectual and moral improvement, rather than to material possessions. With the help of automated agriculture, the citizens of a future society will need only a few hours a day to earn their bread.

Godwin went on to say, "The spirit of oppression, the spirit of servility and the spirit of fraud - these are the immediate growth of the established administration of property. They are alike hostile to intellectual improvement. The other vices of envy, malice, and revenge are their inseparable companions. In a state of society where men lived in the midst of plenty, and where all shared alike the bounties of nature, these sentiments would inevitably expire. The narrow principle of selfishness would vanish. No man being obliged to guard his little store, or provide with anxiety and pain for his restless wants, each would lose his own individual existence in the thought of the general good. No man would be the enemy of his neighbor, for they would have nothing to contend; and of consequence philanthropy would resume the empire which reason assigns her. Mind would be delivered from her perpetual anxiety about corporal support, and free to expatiate in the field of thought which is congenial to her. Each man would assist the inquiries of all."

Godwin insisted that there is an indissoluble link between politics, ethics and knowledge. *Political Justice* is an enthusiastic vision of what humans could be like at some future period when the trend towards moral and intellectual improvement has lifted men and women above their their present state of ignorance and vice. Much of the savage structure of the penal system would then be unnecessary, Godwin believed. (At the time when he was writing, there were more than a hundred capital offenses in England, and this number had soon increased to almost two hundred. The theft of any object of greater value than ten shillings was punishable by hanging.) In its present state, Godwin wrote, society



Figure 1.2: **William Godwin (1756-1836).**

decrees that the majority of its citizens “should be kept in abject penury, rendered stupid with ignorance and disgustful with vice, perpetuated in nakedness and hunger, goaded to the commission of crimes, and made victims to the merciless laws which the rich have instituted to oppress them”. But human behavior is produced by environment and education, Godwin pointed out. If the conditions of upbringing were improved, behavior would also improve. In fact, Godwin believed that men and women are subject to natural laws no less than the planets of Newton’s solar system. “In the life of every human”, Godwin wrote, “there is a chain of causes, generated in that eternity which preceded his birth, and going on in regular procession through the whole period of his existence, in consequence of which it was impossible for him to act in any instance otherwise than he has acted.”

The chain of causality in human affairs implies that vice and crime should be regarded with the same attitude with which we regard disease. The causes of poverty, ignorance, vice and crime should be removed. Human failings should be cured rather than punished. With this in mind, Godwin wrote, “our disapprobation of vice will be of the same nature as our disapprobation of an infectious distemper.”

In France the Marquis de Condorcet had written an equally optimistic book, *Esquisse d’un Tableau Historique des Progrès de l’Esprit Humain*. Condorcet’s optimism was unaffected even by the fact that at the time when he was writing he was in hiding, under sentence of death by Robespierre’s government. Besides enthusiastically extolling Godwin’s ideas to his son, Daniel Malthus also told him of the views of Condorcet.

Condorcet’s *Esquisse*, is an enthusiastic endorsement of the idea of infinite human perfectibility which was current among the philosophers of the 18th century, and in this book, Condorcet anticipated many of the evolutionary ideas of Charles Darwin. He compared humans with animals, and found many common traits. Condorcet believed that animals are able to think, and even to think rationally, although their thoughts are extremely simple compared with those of humans. He also asserted that humans historically began their existence on the same level as animals and gradually developed to their present state. Since this evolution took place historically, he reasoned, it is probable, or even inevitable, that a similar evolution in the future will bring mankind to a level of physical, mental and moral development which will be as superior to our own present state as we are now superior to animals. In his *Esquisse*, Condorcet called attention to the unusually long period of dependency which characterizes the growth and education of human offspring. This prolonged childhood is unique among living beings. It is needed for the high level of mental development of the human species; but it requires a stable family structure to protect the young during their long upbringing.

Thus, according to Condorcet, biological evolution brought into existence a moral precept, the sanctity of the family.

Similarly, Condorcet maintained, larger associations of humans would have been impossible without some degree of altruism and sensitivity to the suffering of others incorporated into human behavior, either as instincts or as moral precepts or both; and thus the evolution of organized society entailed the development of sensibility and morality.

Condorcet believed that ignorance and error are responsible for vice; and he listed what he regarded as the main mistakes of civilization: hereditary transmission of power,



Figure 1.3: Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834).



Figure 1.4: **The Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794).**

inequality between men and women, religious bigotry, disease, war, slavery, economic inequality, and the division of humanity into mutually exclusive linguistic groups.

Condorcet believed the hereditary transmission of power to be the source of much of the tyranny under which humans suffer; and he looked forward to an era when republican governments would be established throughout the world. Turning to the inequality between men and women, Condorcet wrote that he could see no moral, physical or intellectual basis for it. He called for complete social, legal, and educational equality between the sexes.

Condorcet predicted that the progress of medical science would free humans from the worst ravages of disease. Furthermore, he maintained that since perfectibility (i.e. evolution) operates throughout the biological world, there is no reason why mankind's physical structure might not gradually improve, with the result that human life in the remote future could be greatly prolonged. Condorcet believed that the intellectual and moral faculties of man are capable of continuous and steady improvement; and he thought that one of the most important results of this improvement will be the abolition of war.

As Daniel Malthus talked warmly about Godwin, Condorcet, and the idea of human

progress, the mind of his son, Robert, turned to the unbalance between births and deaths which he had noticed among his parishioners at Okewood Chapel. He pointed out to his father that no matter what benefits science might be able to confer, they would soon be eaten up by population growth. Regardless of technical progress, the condition of the lowest social class would remain exactly the same: The poor would continue to live, as they always had, on the exact borderline between survival and famine, clinging desperately to the lower edge of existence. For them, change for the worse was impossible since it would loosen their precarious hold on life; their children would die and their numbers would diminish until they balanced the supply of food. But any change for the better was equally impossible, because if more nourishment should become available, more of the children of the poor would survive, and the share of food for each of them would again be reduced to the precise minimum required for life.

Observation of his parishioners at Okewood had convinced Robert Malthus that this sombre picture was a realistic description of the condition of the poor in England at the end of the 18th century. Techniques of agriculture and industry were indeed improving rapidly; but among the very poor, population was increasing equally fast, and the misery of society's lowest class remained unaltered.

Daniel Malthus was so impressed with his son's arguments that he urged him to develop them into a small book. Robert Malthus' first essay on population, written in response to his father's urging, was only 50,000 words in length. It was published anonymously in 1798, and its full title was *An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it affects the future improvement of society, with remarks on the speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and other writers*. Robert Malthus' Essay explored the consequences of his basic thesis: that "the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man".

1.3 Publication of the first essay in 1798

"That population cannot increase without the means of subsistence", Robert Malthus wrote, "is a proposition so evident that it needs no illustration. That population does invariably increase, where there are means of subsistence, the history of every people who have ever existed will abundantly prove. And that the superior power cannot be checked without producing misery and vice, the ample portion of these two bitter ingredients in the cup of human life, and the continuance of the physical causes that seem to have produced them, bear too convincing a testimony."

In order to illustrate the power of human populations to grow quickly to enormous numbers if left completely unchecked, Malthus turned to statistics from the United States, where the population had doubled every 25 years for a century and a half. Malthus called this type of growth "geometrical" (today we would call it "exponential"); and, drawing on his mathematical education, he illustrated it by the progression 1,2,4,8,16,32,64,128,256,..etc. In order to show that, in the long run, no improvement in agriculture could possibly keep pace with unchecked population growth, Malthus allowed that, in England, agricultural

output might with great effort be doubled during the next quarter century; but during a subsequent 25-year period it could not again be doubled. The growth of agricultural output could at the very most follow an arithmetic (linear) progression, 1,2,3,4,5,6,...etc.

Because of the overpoweringly greater numbers which can potentially be generated by exponential population growth, as contrasted to the slow linear progression of sustenance, Malthus was convinced that at almost all stages of human history, population has not expanded freely, but has instead pressed painfully against the limits of its food supply. He maintained that human numbers are normally held in check either by “vice or misery”. (Malthus classified both war and birth control as a forms of vice.) Occasionally the food supply increases through some improvement in agriculture, or through the opening of new lands; but population then grows very rapidly, and soon a new equilibrium is established, with misery and vice once more holding the population in check.

Like Godwin’s *Political Justice*, Malthus’ *Essay on the Principle of Population* was published at exactly the right moment to capture the prevailing mood of England. In 1793, the mood had been optimistic; but by 1798, hopes for reform had been replaced by reaction and pessimism. Public opinion had been changed by Robespierre’s Reign of Terror and by the threat of a French invasion. Malthus’ clear and powerfully written essay caught the attention of readers not only because it appeared at the right moment, but also because his two contrasting mathematical laws of growth were so striking.

One of Malthus’ readers was William Godwin, who recognized the essay as the strongest challenge to his utopian ideas that had yet been published. Godwin several times invited Malthus to breakfast at his home to discuss social and economic problems. (After some years, however, the friendship between Godwin and Malthus cooled, the debate between them having become more acrimonious.)

In 1801, Godwin published a reply to his critics, among them his former friends James Mackintosh and Samuel Parr, by whom he recently had been attacked. His *Reply to Parr* also contained a reply to Malthus: Godwin granted that the problem of overpopulation raised by Malthus was an extremely serious one. However, Godwin wrote, all that is needed to solve the problem is a change of the attitudes of society. For example we need to abandon the belief “that it is the first duty of princes to watch for (i.e. encourage) the multiplication of their subjects, and that a man or woman who passes the term of life in a condition of celibacy is to be considered as having failed to discharge the principal obligations owed to the community”. “On the contrary”, Godwin continued, “it now appears to be rather the man who rears a numerous family that has to some degree transgressed the consideration he owes to the public welfare”. Godwin suggested that each marriage should be allowed only two or three children or whatever number might be needed to balance the current rates of mortality and celibacy. This duty to society, Godwin wrote, would surely not be too great a hardship to be endured, once the reasons for it were thoroughly understood.

1.4 The second essay published in 1803

Malthus' small essay had captured public attention in England, and he was anxious to expand it with empirical data which would show his principle of population to be valid not only in England in his own day, but in all societies and all periods. He therefore traveled widely, collecting data. He also made use of the books of explorers, such as Cook and Vancouver.

Malthus second edition - more than three times the length of his original essay on population - was ready in 1803. Book I and Book II of the 1803 edition of Malthus' *Essay* are devoted to a study of the checks to population growth which have operated throughout history in all the countries of the world for which he possessed facts.

In his first chapter, Malthus stressed the potentially enormous power of population growth contrasted the slow growth of the food supply. He concluded that strong checks to the increase of population must almost always be operating to keep human numbers within the bounds of sustenance. He classified the checks as either preventive or positive, the preventive checks being those which reduce fertility, while the positive checks are those which increase mortality. Among the positive checks, Malthus listed "unwholesome occupations, severe labour and exposure to the seasons, extreme poverty, bad nursing of children, great towns, excesses of all kinds, the whole train of common diseases and epidemics, wars, plague, and famine".

In the following chapters of Books I, Malthus showed in detail the mechanisms by which population is held at the level of sustenance in various cultures. He first discussed primitive hunter-gatherer societies, such as the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego, Van Diemens Land and New Holland, and those tribes of North American Indians living predominantly by hunting. In hunting societies, he pointed out, the population is inevitably very sparse: "The great extent of territory required for the support of the hunter has been repeatedly stated and acknowledged", Malthus wrote, "...The tribes of hunters, like beasts of prey, whom they resemble in their mode of subsistence, will consequently be thinly scattered over the surface of the earth."

"Like beasts of prey, they must either drive away or fly from every rival, and be engaged in perpetual contests with each other...The neighboring nations live in a perpetual state of hostility with each other. The very act of increasing in one tribe must be an act of aggression against its neighbors, as a larger range of territory will be necessary to support its increased numbers.

"The contest will in this case continue, either till the equilibrium is restored by mutual losses, or till the weaker party is exterminated or driven from its country... Their object in battle is not conquest but destruction. The life of the victor depends on the death of the enemy". Malthus concluded that among the American Indians of his time, war was the predominant check to population growth, although famine, disease and infanticide each played a part.

In the next chapter, Malthus quoted Captain Cook's description of the natives of the region near Queen Charlotte's Sound in New Zealand, whose way of life involved perpetual war. "If I had followed the advice of all our pretended friends", Cook wrote, "I might have

extirpated the whole race; for the people of each hamlet or village, by turns, applied to me to destroy the other". According to Cook, the New Zealanders practiced both ceaseless war and cannibalism; and population pressure provided a motive for both practices.

In later chapters on nomadic societies of the Near East and Asia, war again appears, not only as a consequence of the growth of human numbers, but also as one of the major mechanisms by which these numbers are reduced to the level of their food supply. The studies quoted by Malthus make it seem likely that the nomadic Tartar tribes of central Asia made no use of the preventive checks to population growth. In fact the Tartar tribes may have regarded growth of their own populations as useful in their wars with neighboring tribes.

Malthus also described the Germanic tribes of Northern Europe, whose population growth led them to the attacks which destroyed the Roman Empire.

He quoted the following passage from Machiavelli's *History of Florence*: "The people who inhabit the northern parts that lie between the Rhine and the Danube, living in a healthful and prolific climate, often increase to such a degree that vast numbers of them are forced to leave their native country and go in search of new habitations. When any of those provinces begins to grow too populous and wants to disburden itself, the following method is observed. In the first place, it is divided into three parts, in each of which there is an equal portion of the nobility and commonality, the rich and the poor. After this they cast lots; and that division on which the lot falls quits the country and goes to seek its fortune, leaving the other two more room and liberty to enjoy their possessions at home. These emigrations proved the destruction of the Roman Empire". Regarding the Scandinavians in the early middle ages, Malthus wrote: "Mallet relates, what is probably true, that it was their common custom to hold an assembly every spring for the purpose of considering in what quarter they should make war".

In many of the societies which Malthus described, a causal link can be seen, not only between population pressure and poverty, but also between population pressure and war. As one reads his *Essay*, it becomes clear why both these terrible sources of human anguish saturate so much of history, and why efforts to eradicate them have so often met with failure: The only possible way to eliminate poverty and war is to reduce the pressure of population by preventive checks, since the increased food supply produced by occasional cultural advances can give only very temporary relief.

In Book II, Malthus turned to the nations of Europe, as they appeared at the end of the 18th century, and here he presents us with a different picture. Although in these societies poverty, unsanitary housing, child labour, malnutrition and disease all took a heavy toll, war produced far less mortality than in hunting and pastoral societies, and the preventive checks, which lower fertility, played a much larger roll.

Malthus had visited Scandinavia during the summer of 1799, and he had made particularly detailed notes on Norway. He was thus able to present a description of Norwegian economics and demography based on his own studies. Norway was remarkable for having the lowest reliably-recorded death rate of any nation at that time: Only 1 person in 48 died each year in Norway. (By comparison, 1 person in 20 died each year in London.) The rate of marriage was also remarkably low, with only 1 marriage each year for every 130



Figure 1.5: Captain James Cook, FRS (1728-1779). According to Cook, the native New Zealanders practiced both ceaseless war and cannibalism; and population pressure provided a motive for both practices. Malthus based his description of hunter-gatherer societies on the writings of explorers such as Cook and Vancouver.

inhabitants; and thus in spite of the low death rate, Norway's population had increased only slightly from the 723,141 inhabitants recorded in 1769.

There were two reasons for late marriage in Norway: Firstly, every man born of a farmer or a labourer was compelled by law to be a soldier in the reserve army for a period of ten years; and during his military service, he could not marry without the permission of both his commanding officer and the parish priest. These permissions were granted only to those who were clearly in an economic position to support a family. Men could be inducted into the army at any age between 20 and 30, and since commanding officers preferred older recruits, Norwegian men were often in their 40's before they were free to marry. At the time when Malthus was writing, these rules had just been made less restrictive; but priests still refused to unite couples whose economic foundations they judged to be insufficient.

The second reason for late marriages was the structure of the farming community. In general, Norwegian farms were large; and the owner's household employed many young unmarried men and women as servants. These young people had no chance to marry unless a smaller house on the property became vacant, with its attached small parcel of land for the use of the "houseman"; but because of the low death rate, such vacancies were infrequent.

Thus Norway's remarkably low death rate was balanced by a low birth rate. Other chapters in Book II are devoted to the checks to population growth in Sweden, Russia, Central Europe, Switzerland, France, England, Scotland and Ireland.

Malthus painted a very dark panorama of population pressure and its consequences in human societies throughout the world and throughout history: At the lowest stage of cultural development are the hunter-gatherer societies, where the density of population is extremely low. Nevertheless, the area required to support the hunters is so enormous that even their sparse and thinly scattered numbers press hard against the limits of sustenance. The resulting competition for territory produces merciless intertribal wars.

The domestication of animals makes higher population densities possible; and wherever this new mode of food production is adopted, human numbers rapidly increase; but very soon a new equilibrium is established, with the population of pastoral societies once more pressing painfully against the limits of the food supply, growing a little in good years, and being cut back in bad years by famine, disease and war.

Finally, agricultural societies can maintain extremely high densities of population; but the time required to achieve a new equilibrium is very short. After a brief period of unrestricted growth, human numbers are once more crushed against the barrier of limited resources; and if excess lives are produced by overbreeding, they are soon extinguished by deaths among the children of the poor.

Malthus was conscious that he had drawn an extremely dark picture of the human condition. He excused himself by saying that he has not done it gratuitously, but because he was convinced that the dark shades really are there, and that they form an important part of the picture. He did allow one ray of light, however: By 1803, his own studies of Norway, together with personal conversations with Godwin and the arguments in Godwin's *Reply to Parr*, had convinced Malthus that "moral restraint" should be included among the possible checks to population growth. Thus he concluded Book II of his 1803 edition by

saying that the checks which keep population down to the level of the means of subsistence can all be classified under the headings of “moral restraint, vice and misery”. (In his first edition he had maintained that vice and misery are the only possibilities).

1.5 Systems of equality

In the 1803 edition of Malthus’ *Essay*, Books III and IV form a second volume.

The ideas which he put forward in this second volume are much more open to dispute than are the solidly empirical demographic studies of Books I and II. Malthus excused himself at the beginning of the second volume, saying that he realized that the ideas which he was about to put forward were less solidly based than those in his first volume. However, he said that he wished to explore all the consequences of his principle of population: “..Even the errors into which I may have fallen”, he wrote, “by according a handle to argument, and an additional excitement to examination, may be subservient to the important end of bringing a subject so nearly connected with the happiness of society into more general notice”.

Malthus began Book III by discussing the systems of equality proposed by Condorcet and Godwin; and he tried to show that such utopian societies would prove impossible in practice, because they would rapidly drown in a flood of excess population. Condorcet himself had recognized this difficulty. He realized that improved living conditions for the poor would lead to a rapid growth of population. “Must not a period then arrive”, Condorcet had written, “... when the increase of the number of men surpassing their means of subsistence, the necessary result must be either a continual diminution of happiness and population... or at least a kind of oscillation between good and evil?”

Condorcet believed the serious consequences of population pressure to be far in the future, but Malthus disagreed with him on exactly that point: “M. Condorcet’s picture of what may be expected to happen when the number of men shall surpass subsistence is justly drawn... The only point in which I differ from M. Condorcet in this description is with regard to the period when it may be applied to the human race... This constantly subsisting cause of periodical misery has existed in most countries ever since we have had any histories of mankind, and continues to exist at the present moment.”

“M. Condorcet, however, goes on to say”, Malthus continued, “that should the period, which he conceives to be so distant, ever arrive, the human race, and the advocates of the perfectibility of man, need not be alarmed at it. He then proceeds to remove the difficulty in a manner which I profess not to understand. Having observed that the ridiculous prejudices of superstition would by that time have ceased to throw over morals a corrupt and degrading austerity, he alludes either to a promiscuous concubinage, which would prevent breeding, or to something else as unnatural. To remove the difficulty in this way will surely, in the opinion of most men, be to destroy that virtue and purity of manners which the advocates of equality and of the perfectibility of man profess to be the end and object of their views.”

When Malthus referred to “something else as unnatural”, he of course meant birth

control, some forms of which existed at the time when he was writing; and in this passage we see that he was opposed to the practice. He preferred late marriage or “moral restraint” as a means of limiting excessive population growth.

After his arguments against Condorcet, Malthus discussed William Godwin’s egalitarian utopia, which, he said, would be extremely attractive if only it could be achieved: “The system of equality which Mr. Godwin proposes”, Malthus wrote, “is, on the first view of it, the most beautiful and engaging which has yet appeared. A melioration of society to be produced merely by reason and conviction gives more promise of permanence than any change effected and maintained by force. The unlimited exercise of private judgement is a doctrine grand and captivating, and has a vast superiority over those systems where every individual is in a manner the slave of the public.”

“The substitution of benevolence, as a master-spring and moving principle of society, instead of self-love, appears at first sight to be a consummation devoutly to be wished. In short, it is impossible to contemplate the whole of this fair picture without emotions of delight and admiration, accompanied with an ardent longing for the period of its accomplishment.”

“But alas!” Malthus continued, “That moment can never arrive.... The great error under which Mr. Godwin labours throughout his whole work is the attributing of almost all the vices and misery that prevail in civil society to human institutions. Political regulations and the established administration of property are, with him, the fruitful sources of all evil, the hotbeds of all the crimes that degrade mankind. Were this really a true state of the case, it would not seem a completely hopeless task to remove evil completely from the world; and reason seems to be the proper and adequate instrument for effecting so great a purpose. But the truth is, that though human institutions appear to be, and indeed often are, the obvious and obtrusive causes of much misery in society, they are, in reality, light and superficial in comparison with those deeper-seated causes of evil which result from the laws of nature and the passions of mankind.”

The passions of mankind drive humans to reproduce, while the laws of nature set limits to the carrying capacity of the environment. Godwin’s utopia, if established, would be very favorable to the growth of population; and very soon the shortage of food would lead to its downfall: Because of the overpowering force of population growth, “Man cannot live in the midst of plenty. All cannot share alike the bounties of nature. Were there no established administration of property, every man would be obliged to guard with his force his little store. Selfishness would be triumphant. The subjects of contention would be perpetual. Every individual would be under constant anxiety about corporal support, and not a single intellect would be left free to expatiate in the field of thought.”

Malthus believed that all systems of equality are doomed to failure, not only because of the powerful pressure of population growth, but also because differences between the upper, middle, and lower classes serve the useful purpose of providing humans with an incentive for hard work. He thought that fear of falling to a lower social status, and hope of rising to a higher one, provide a strong incentive for constructive activity. However, he believed that happiness is most often found in the middle ranks of society, and that therefore the highest and lowest classes ought not to be large. Malthus advocated universal

education and security of property as means by which the lowest classes of society could be induced to adopt more virtuous and prudent patterns of behavior.

1.6 The Poor Laws

Among the most controversial chapters of Malthus' second volume are those dealing with the Poor Laws. During the reign of Queen Elisabeth I, a law had been enacted according to which justices were authorized to collect taxes in order to set to work "...the children of all such, whose parents shall not by the said persons be thought able to keep and maintain their children; and also such persons, married or unmarried, as, having no means to maintain them, use no ordinary or daily trade to get their living by..". Malthus commented:

"What is this but saying that the funds for the maintenance of labour in this country may be increased without limit by a fiat of government...? Strictly speaking, this clause is as arrogant and absurd as if it had enacted that two ears of wheat should in the future grow where one had grown before. Canute, when he commanded the waves not to wet his princely foot, did not assume a greater power over the laws of nature." Malthus pointed out that if we believe that every person has a right to have as many children as he or she wishes, and if we enact a law, according to which every person born has a right to sustenance, then we implicitly assume that the supply of food can be increased without limit, which of course is impossible.

During the first few years of the nineteenth century there was a severe shortage of food in England, partly because of war with France, and partly because of harvest failures. As a result, the price of wheat tripled, causing great distress among the poor. By 1803, 3,000,000 pounds sterling were being distributed to make up the difference between the wages of poor workers and the amount which they needed to pay for food. Malthus regarded the supply of grain as constant, i.e. independent of the price; and he therefore believed that distribution of money under the Poor Laws merely raised the price of grain still further in relation to wages, forcing a larger number of independent workers to seek help. He thought that the distributed money helped to relieve suffering in some cases, but that it spread the suffering over a wider area.

In some parishes, the amount of money distributed under the Poor Laws was proportional to the number of children in a family, and Malthus believed that this encouraged the growth of population, further aggravating the shortage of food. "A poor man may marry with little or no prospect of being able to support a family in independence", he wrote, "...and the Poor Laws may be said therefore in some measure to create the poor which they maintain; and as the provisions of the country must, in consequence of the increased population, be distributed to every man in smaller proportions, it is evident that the labour of those who are not supported by parish assistance, will purchase a smaller quantity of provisions than before, and consequently more of them must be driven to ask for support." Malthus advocated a very gradual abolition of the Poor Laws, and he believed that while this change was being brought about, the laws ought to be administered in such a way that the position of least well-off independent workers should not be worse than the position of

those supported by parish assistance.

1.7 Replies to Malthus

The second edition of Malthus' *Essay* was published in 1803. It provoked a storm of controversy, and a flood of rebuttals. In 1803 England's political situation was sensitive. Revolutions had recently occurred both in America and in France; and in England there was much agitation for radical change, against which Malthus provided counter-arguments. Pitt and his government had taken Malthus' first edition seriously, and had abandoned their plans for extending the Poor Laws. Also, as a consequence of Malthus' ideas, England's first census was taken in 1801. This census, and subsequent ones, taken in 1811, 1821 and 1831, showed that England's population was indeed increasing rapidly, just as Malthus had feared. (The population of England and Wales more than doubled in 80 years, from an estimated 6.6 million in 1750 to almost 14 million in 1831.) In 1803, the issues of poverty and population were at the center of the political arena, and articles refuting Malthus began to stream from the pens of England's authors.

William Coleridge planned to write an article against Malthus, and he made extensive notes in the margins of his copy of the *Essay*. In one place he wrote: "Are Lust and Hunger both alike Passions of physical Necessity, and the one equally with the other independent of the Reason and the Will? Shame upon our race that there lives an individual who dares to ask the Question." In another place Coleridge wrote: "Vice and Virtue subsist in the agreement of the habits of a man with his Reason and Conscience, and these can have but one moral guide, Utility, or the virtue and Happiness of Rational Beings". Although Coleridge never wrote his planned article, his close friend Robert Southey did so, using Coleridge's notes almost verbatim. Some years later Coleridge remarked: "Is it not lamentable - is it not even marvelous - that the monstrous practical sophism of Malthus should now have gained complete possession of the leading men of the kingdom! Such an essential lie in morals - such a practical lie in fact it is too! I solemnly declare that I do not believe that all the heresies and sects and factions which ignorance and the weakness and wickedness of man have ever given birth to, were altogether so disgraceful to man as a Christian, a philosopher, a statesman or citizen, as this abominable tenet."

In 1812, Percy Bysshe Shelley, who was later to become William Godwin's son-in-law, wrote: "Many well-meaning persons... would tell me not to make people happy for fear of over-stocking the world... War, vice and misery are undoubtedly bad; they embrace all that we can conceive of temporal and eternal evil. Are we to be told that these are remediless, because the earth would in case of their remedy, be overstocked?" A year later, Shelley called Malthus a "priest, eunuch, and tyrant", and accused him, in a pamphlet, of proposing that "... after the poor have been stript naked by the taxgatherer and reduced to bread and tea and fourteen hours of hard labour by their masters.. the last tie by which Nature holds them to benignant earth (whose plenty is garnered up in the strongholds of their tyrants) is to be divided... They are required to abstain from marrying under penalty of starvation... whilst the rich are permitted to add as many mouths to consume



Figure 1.6: Coleridge’s notes on Malthus: **“I do not believe that all the heresies and sects and factions which ignorance and the weakness and wickedness of man have ever given birth to, were altogether so disgraceful to man as a Christian, a philosopher, a statesman or citizen, as this abominable tenet.”**

the products of the poor as they please”.

Godwin himself wrote a long book (which was published in 1820) entitled *Of Population, An Enquiry Concerning the Power and Increase in the Number of Mankind, being an answer to Mr. Malthus*. One can also view many of the books of Charles Dickens as protests against Malthus’ point of view. For example, *Oliver Twist* gives us a picture of a workhouse “administered in such a way that the position of least well-off independent workers should not be worse than the position of those supported by parish assistance.”

Among the authors defending Malthus was Harriet Martineau, who wrote: “The desire of his heart and the aim of his work were that domestic virtue and happiness should be placed within the reach of all... He found that a portion of the people were underfed, and that one consequence of this was a fearful mortality among infants; and another consequence the growth of a recklessness among the destitute which caused infanticide,



Figure 1.7: Shelley: “.. after the poor have been stript naked by the taxgatherer and reduced to bread and tea and fourteen hours of hard labour by their masters.. the last tie by which Nature holds them to benignant earth (whose plenty is garnered up in the strongholds of their tyrants) is to be divided...They are required to abstain from marrying under penalty of starvation...”



Figure 1.8: Tiny Tim, from Charles Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*. When he is informed that Tiny Tim will die unless he receives medical treatment, Scrooge remarks, "Then he had better die and reduce the surplus population!". Many of the events in Dickens' books can be viewed as protests against the ideas of Malthus.



Figure 1.9: Charles Dickens' Oliver Twist asks for a second portion of gruel, provoking a storm of outrage. As a boy, Dickens himself spent some time in a workhouse.



Figure 1.10: A portrait of the British political economist, author and social theorist Harriet Martineau (1802-1876). She was a very close friend of Charles Darwin's older brother, Erasmus. Commenting on the ideas of Malthus, she wrote: "Prudence as to time of marriage and making due provision for it was, one would think, a harmless recommendation enough, under the circumstances." Martineau's books were highly successful, sometimes outselling those of Charles Dickens.

corruption of morals, and at best, marriage between pauper boys and girls; while multitudes of respectable men and women, who paid rates instead of consuming them, were unmarried at forty or never married at all. Prudence as to time of marriage and for making due provision for it was, one would think, a harmless recommendation enough, under the circumstances.”

1.8 Ricardo's Iron Law of Wages; the Corn Laws

Malthus continued a life of quiet scholarship, unperturbed by the heated public debate which he had caused. At the age of 38, he married a second cousin. The marriage produced only three children, which at that time was considered to be a very small number. Thus he practiced the pattern of late marriage which he advocated. Although he was appointed rector of a church in Lincolnshire, he never preached there, hiring a curate to do this in his place. Instead of preaching, Malthus accepted an appointment as Professor of History and Political Economy at the East India Company's College at Haileybury. This appointment made him the first professor of economics in England, and probably also the first in the world. Among the important books which he wrote while he held this post was *Principles of Political Economy, Considered with a View to their Practical Application*. Malthus also published numerous revised and expanded editions of his *Essay on the Principle of Population*. The third edition was published in 1806, the fourth in 1807, the fifth in 1817, and the sixth in 1826.

Malthus became a close friend of the wealthy financier and economic theorist, David Ricardo (1772-1823). He and Ricardo met frequently to discuss economic problems, and when circumstances prevented them from meeting, they exchanged endless letters. Ricardo and Malthus differed on the subject of the Corn Laws, but they never allowed this difference of opinion to affect their friendship.

Although shortages of food had produced drastic increases in the price of grain, the import of cheap foreign grain was effectively prevented by the Corn Laws. These laws had been introduced by the large landowners, who controlled Parliament, but they were opposed by the manufacturers, who wished to make less expensive food available to their workers. On this issue, Malthus sided with the landowners, arguing that if England became dependent on imports of foreign grain, the country would be insecure: What if England's ability to export manufactured goods in exchange for the grain should later be undermined by foreign competition? Malthus pointed out that the country would then face starvation. Ricardo, on the other hand, sided with the rising class of manufacturers. In 1832 the Reform Bill gave the manufacturers control of Parliament, the Corn Laws were repealed, and England's rapidly-growing population became dependent on imports of foreign grain.

Ricardo accepted Malthus' principle of population, and from it he deduced what came to be called his "Iron Law of Wages". According to Ricardo, labor is a commodity, and wages are determined by the law of supply and demand: When wages fall below the starvation level, the workers' children die. Labor then becomes a scarce commodity, and wages rise. On the other hand, when wages rise above the starvation level, the working population



Figure 1.11: The economist David Ricardo (1772-1823), a close friend of Malthus. The joint pessimism of Ricardo and Malthus caused Carlyle to call economics “the dismal science”.

multiplies rapidly, labor becomes a plentiful commodity, and wages fall again.

Thus, according to Ricardo, there is an Iron Law which holds wages at the minimum level at which life can be supported. The combined pessimism of Malthus and Ricardo caused Carlyle to call economics “the dismal science”.

1.9 The Irish Potato Famine of 1845

Meanwhile, in Ireland, a dramatic series of events had occurred, confirming the ideas of Malthus. Anti-Catholic laws prevented the Irish cottagers from improving their social position; and instead they produced large families, fed almost exclusively on a diet of milk and potatoes. The potato and milk diet allowed a higher density of population to be supported in Ireland than would have been the case if the Irish diet had consisted primarily of wheat. As a result, the population of Ireland grew rapidly: In 1695 it had been approximately one million, but by 1821 it had reached 6,801,827. By 1845, the population of Ireland was more than eight million; and in that year the potato harvest failed because of blight. All who were able to do so fled from the country, many emigrating to the United States; but two million people died of starvation. As the result of this shock, Irish marriage habits changed, and late marriage became the norm, just as Malthus would have wished. After the Potato Famine of 1845, Ireland maintained a stable population of roughly four million.



Figure 1.12: The Irish Potato Famine.



Figure 1.13: The Irish Potato Famine.

1.10 The impact of Malthus on biology

The impact of Malthus' *Essay* was great, not only in demography and political economics, but also in biology. In 1836, Charles Darwin returned from his voyage on the *Beagle* with a mass of facts and ideas on species out of which he was struggling to construct a coherent picture; and Malthus gave him the clue he needed. "In October, 1838", Darwin wrote later in his *Autobiography*, "that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic enquiry, I happened to read for amusement 'Malthus on Population', and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on from long-continued observation of the habits of animals and plants, it at once struck me that under these circumstances favorable variations would tend to be preserved, and unfavorable ones to be destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of new species. Here then I had at last got a theory by which to work..."

Darwin wrote a sketch of his theory of evolution through natural selection; but he did not publish it, probably because he had a premonition of the furious opposition which his heretical ideas would provoke. In 1854 he returned to his work on species, but he was writing on a scale which would have developed into an enormous multi-volume work, whose completion might have taken the remainder of his life. Meanwhile, a young English biologist named Alfred Russell Wallace, working in the jungles of Malaysia, arrived at exactly the same theory as Darwin's, and in exactly the same way - by reading Malthus! Wallace wrote a short paper describing his theory and sent it to Darwin, asking the older scientist's opinion. Darwin was at first inclined to burn all his own work on the subject out of fairness to Wallace, but his friends persuaded him to instead write a short paper describing his views, which could be presented together with Wallace's article. The two papers were read together to a meeting of the Linnean Society, which listened in stunned silence. Posterity has given both Darwin and Wallace credit for their joint discovery of the theory of evolution through natural selection.




Figure 1.14: Both Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace arrived at their theories of natural selection in evolution as a result of reading Malthus.

Suggestions for further reading

1. A. Gore, *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It*, Rodale Books, New York, (2006).
2. A. Gore, *Earth in the Balance: Forging a New Common Purpose*, Earthscan, (1992).
3. A.H. Ehrlich and P.R. Ehrlich, *Earth*, Thames and Methuen, (1987).pro Simon and Schuster, (1990).
4. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Healing the Planet: Strategies for Resolving the Environmental Crisis*, Addison-Wesley, (1991).
5. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environmental Rhetoric Threatens our Future*, Island Press, (1998).
6. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *One With Nineveh: Politics, Consumption and the Human Future*, Island Press, (2004).
7. A.H. Ehrlich and U. Lele, *Humankind at the Crossroads: Building a Sustainable Food System*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
8. P.R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, Sierra/Ballentine, New York, (1972).
9. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Human Ecology*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1972).
10. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977)
11. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Extinction*, Victor Gollancz, London, (1982).
12. D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W.W. Behrens III, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, Universe Books, New York, (1972).

13. D.H. Meadows et al., *Beyond the Limits. Confronting Global Collapse and Envisioning a Sustainable Future*, Chelsea Green Publishing, Post Mills, Vermont, (1992).
14. D.H. Meadows, J. Randers and D.L. Meadows, *Limits to Growth: the 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Jct., VT 05001, (2004).
15. A. Peccei and D. Ikeda, *Before it is Too Late*, Kodansha International, Tokyo, (1984).
16. A. Peccei, *The Human Quality*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, (1977).
17. A. Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1977).
18. V.K. Smith, ed., *Scarcity and Growth Reconsidered*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1979).
19. R. Costanza, ed., *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1991).
20. IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis*, (2001).
21. N. Stern et al., *The Stern Review*, www.sternreview.org.uk, (2006).
22. T.M. Swanson, ed., *The Economics and Ecology of Biodiversity Decline: The Forces Driving Global Change*, Cambridge University Press, (1995).
23. P.M. Vitousek, H.A. Mooney, J. Lubchenco and J.M. Melillo, *Human Domination of Earth's Ecosystems*, *Science*, **277**, 494-499, (1997).
24. P.M. Vitousek, P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and P.A. Matson, *Human Appropriation of the Products of Photosynthesis*, *Bioscience*, *34*, 368-373, (1986).
25. D. King, *Climate Change Science: Adapt, Mitigate or Ignore*, *Science*, **303** (5655), pp. 176-177, (2004).
26. S. Connor, *Global Warming Past Point of No Return*, *The Independent*, (116 September, 2005).
27. D. Rind, *Drying Out the Tropics*, *New Scientist* (6 May, 1995).
28. J. Patz et al., *Impact of Regional Climate Change on Human Health*, *Nature*, (17 November, 2005).
29. M. McCarthy, *China Crisis: Threat to the Global Environment*, *The Independent*, (19 October, 2005).
30. L.R. Brown, *The Twenty-Ninth Day*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
31. N. Myers, *The Sinking Ark*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).
32. N. Myers, *Conservation of Tropical Moist Forests*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C., (1980).
33. National Academy of Sciences, *Energy and Climate*, NAS, Washington D.C., (1977).
34. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
35. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
36. E. Eckholm, *The Picture of Health: Environmental Sources of Disease*, New York, (1976).
37. Economic Commission for Europe, *Air Pollution Across Boundaries*, United Nations, New York, (1985).

38. G. Hagman and others, *Prevention is Better Than Cure*, Report on Human Environmental Disasters in the Third World, Swedish Red Cross, Stockholm, Stockholm, (1986).
39. G. Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons", *Science*, December 13, (1968).
40. K. Newland, *Infant Mortality and the Health of Societies*, Worldwatch Paper 47, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1981).
41. D.W. Orr, *Ecological Literacy*, State University of New York Press, Albany, (1992).
42. E. Pestel, *Beyond the Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York, (1989).
43. D.C. Pirages and P.R. Ehrlich, *Ark II: Social Responses to Environmental Imperatives*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1974).
44. Population Reference Bureau, *World Population Data Sheet*, PRM, 777 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington D.C. 20007, (published annually).
45. R. Pressat, *Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1970).
46. M. Rechcigl (ed.), *Man/Food Equation*, Academic Press, New York, (1975).
47. J.C. Ryan, *Life Support: Conserving Biological Diversity*, Worldwatch Paper 108, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
48. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
49. B. Stokes, *Local Responses to Global Problems: A Key to Meeting Basic Human Needs*, Worldwatch Paper 17, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1978).
50. L. Timberlake, *Only One Earth: Living for the Future*, BBC/ Earthscan, London, (1987).
51. UNEP, *Environmental Data Report*, Blackwell, Oxford, (published annually).
52. UNESCO, *International Coordinating Council of Man and the Biosphere*, MAB Report Series No. 58, Paris, (1985).
53. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *A Bibliography of United Nations Publications on Population*, United Nations, New York, (1977).
54. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *The State of World Population*, UNPF, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, 10017, (published annually).
55. United Nations Secretariat, *World Population Prospects Beyond the Year 2000*, U.N., New York, (1973).
56. J. van Klinken, *Het Dierde Punte*, Uitgiversmaatschappij J.H. Kok-Kampen, Netherlands (1989).
57. B. Ward and R. Dubos, *Only One Earth*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1973).
58. WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF, *The Reproductive Health of Adolescents: A Strategy for Action*, World Health Organization, Geneva, (1989).
59. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press, (1975).
60. E.O. Wilson (ed.), *Biodiversity*, National Academy Press, Washington D.C., (1988).
61. E.O. Wilson, *The Diversity of Life*, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, London, (1992).
62. G. Woodwell (ed.), *The Earth in Transition: Patterns and Processes of Biotic Impoverishment*, Cambridge University Press, (1990).
63. World Resources Institute (WRI), *Global Biodiversity Strategy*, The World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), (1992).

64. World Resources Institute, *World Resources 200-2001: People and Ecosystems: The Fraying Web of Life*, WRI, Washington D.C., (2000).
65. D.W. Pearce and R.K. Turner, *Economics of Natural Resources and the Environment*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1990).
66. P. Bartelmus, *Environment, Growth and Development: The Concepts and Strategies of Sustainability*, Routledge, New York, (1994).
67. H.E. Daly and K.N. Townsend, (editors), *Valuing the Earth. Economics, Ecology, Ethics*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1993)
68. C. Flavin, *Slowing Global Warming: A Worldwide Strategy*, Worldwatch Paper 91, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1989).
69. S.H. Schneider, *The Genesis Strategy: Climate and Global Survival*, Plenum Press, (1976).
70. WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF, *The Reproductive Health of Adolescents: A Strategy for Action*, World Health Organization, Geneva, (1989).
71. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
72. W. Jackson, *Man and the Environment*, Wm. C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, (1971).
73. T. Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, (1988).
74. T.M. Swanson, ed., *The Economics and Ecology of Biodiversity Decline: The Forces Driving Global Change*, Cambridge University Press, (1995).
75. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *One With Nineveh: Politics, Consumption and the Human Future*, Island Press, (2004).
76. D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W.W. Behrens III, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, Universe Books, New York, (1972).
77. D.H. Meadows et al., *Beyond the Limits. Confronting Global Collapse and Envisioning a Sustainable Future*, Chelsea Green Publishing, Post Mills, Vermont, (1992).
78. D.H. Meadows, J. Randers and D.L. Meadows, *Limits to Growth: the 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Jct., VT 05001, (2004).
79. A. Peccei and D. Ikeda, *Before it is Too Late*, Kodansha International, Tokyo, (1984).
80. V.K. Smith, ed., *Scarcity and Growth Reconsidered*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1979).
81. British Petroleum, *BP Statistical Review of World Energy*, (published yearly).
82. R. Costanza, ed., *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1991).
83. J. Darmstadter, *A Global Energy Perspective*, Sustainable Development Issue Backgrounder, Resources for the Future, (2002).
84. D.C. Hall and J.V. Hall, *Concepts and Measures of Natural Resource Scarcity*, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, **11**, 363-379, (1984).
85. M.K. Hubbert, *Energy Resources*, in *Resources and Man: A Study and Recommendations*, Committee on Resources and Man, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1969).

86. J.A. Krautkraemer, *Nonrenewable Resource Scarcity*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, bf 36, 2065-2107, (1998).
87. C.J. Cleveland, *Physical and Economic Aspects of Natural Resource Scarcity: The Cost of Oil Supply in the Lower 48 United States 1936-1987*, *Resources and Energy* **13**, 163-188, (1991).
88. C.J. Cleveland, *Yield Per Effort for Additions to Crude Oil Reserves in the Lower 48 States, 1946-1989*, *American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin*, **76**, 948-958, (1992).
89. M.K. Hubbert, *Technique of Prediction as Applied to the Production of Oil and Gas*, in *NBS Special Publication 631*, US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, (1982).
90. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Oil Discovery Indices and Projected Discoveries*, *Oil and Gas Journal*, **11**, 19, (1984).
91. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Future Crude Oil Supplies and Prices*, *Oil and Gas Journal*, July 25, 111-112, (1988).
92. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Updated Hubbert Curves Analyze World Oil Supply*, *World Oil*, November, 91-94, (1996).
93. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Get Ready for Another Oil Shock!*, *The Futurist*, January-February, 20-23, (1997).
94. Energy Information Administration, *International Energy Outlook, 2001*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
95. Energy Information Administration, *Caspian Sea Region*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
96. National Energy Policy Development Group, *National Energy Policy*, The White House, (2004). (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/energy/>)
97. IEA, *CO2 from Fuel Combustion Fact-Sheet*, International Energy Agency, (2005).
98. H. Youguo, *China's Coal Demand Outlook for 2020 and Analysis of Coal Supply Capacity*, International Energy Agency, (2003).
99. R.H. Williams, *Advanced Energy Supply Technologies*, in *World Energy Assessment: Energy and the Challenge of Sustainability*, UNDP, (2000).
100. H. Lehmann, *Energy Rich Japan*, Institute for Sustainable Solutions and Innovations, Aachen, (2003).
101. W.V. Chandler, *Materials Recycling: The Virtue of Necessity*, Worldwatch Paper 56, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C, (1983).
102. W.C. Clark and others, *Managing Planet Earth*, Special Issue, *Scientific American*, September, (1989).
103. B. Commoner, *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*, Bantam Books, New York, (1972).
104. J.R. Frisch, *Energy 2000-2020: World Prospects and Regional Stresses*, World Energy Conference, Graham and Trotman, (1983).
105. J. Holdren and P. Herrera, *Energy*, Sierra Club Books, New York, (1971).
106. National Academy of Sciences, *Energy and Climate*, NAS, Washington D.C., (1977).

107. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
108. C. Pollock, *Mining Urban Wastes: The Potential for Recycling*, Worldwatch Paper 76, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
109. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
110. World Resources Institute, *World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems: The Fraying Web of Life*, WRI, Washington D.C., (2000).
111. J.E. Young, John E., *Mining the Earth*, Worldwatch Paper 109, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
112. J.R. Craig, D.J. Vaughan and B.J. Skinner, *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, (2001).
113. W. Youngquist, *Geodesinies: The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources Over Nations and Individuals*, National Book Company, Portland Oregon, (1997).
114. M. Tanzer, *The Race for Resources. Continuing Struggles Over Minerals and Fuels*, Monthly Review Press, New York, (1980).
115. C.B. Reed, *Fuels, Minerals and Human Survival*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers Inc., Ann Arbor Michigan, (1975).
116. M.K. Hubbert, *Energy Resources*, in *Resources and Man: A Study and Recommendations*, Committee on Resources and Man, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1969).
117. J.A. Krautkraemer, *Nonrenewable Resource Scarcity*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, bf 36, 2065-2107, (1998).
118. C.J. Cleveland, *Physical and Economic Aspects of Natural Resource Scarcity: The Cost of Oil Supply in the Lower 48 United States 1936-1987*, *Resources and Energy* **13**, 163-188, (1991).
119. C.J. Cleveland, *Yield Per Effort for Additions to Crude Oil Reserves in the Lower 48 States, 1946-1989*, *American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin*, **76**, 948-958, (1992).
120. M.K. Hubbert, *Technique of Prediction as Applied to the Production of Oil and Gas*, in *NBS Special Publication 631*, US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, (1982).
121. Energy Information Administration, *International Energy Outlook, 2001*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
122. Energy Information Administration, *Caspian Sea Region*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
123. National Energy Policy Development Group, *National Energy Policy*, The White House, (2004). (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/energy/>)
124. M. Klare, *Bush-Cheney Energy Strategy: Procuring the Rest of the World's Oil*, *Foreign Policy in Focus*, (Interhemispheric Resource Center/Institute for Policy Studies/SEEN), Washington DC and Silver City NM, January, (2004).
125. IEA, *CO2 from Fuel Combustion Fact-Sheet*, International Energy Agency, (2005).

126. H. Youguo, *China's Coal Demand Outlook for 2020 and Analysis of Coal Supply Capacity*, International Energy Agency, (2003).
127. R.H. Williams, *Advanced Energy Supply Technologies*, in *World Energy Assessment: Energy and the Challenge of Sustainability*, UNDP, (2000).
128. H. Lehmann, *Energy Rich Japan*, Institute for Sustainable Solutions and Innovations, Achen, (2003).
129. W.V. Chandler, *Materials Recycling: The Virtue of Necessity*, Worldwatch Paper 56, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C, (1983).
130. J.R. Frisch, *Energy 2000-2020: World Prospects and Regional Stresses*, World Energy Conference, Graham and Trotman, (1983).
131. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
132. J. Holdren and P. Herrera, *Energy*, Sierra Club Books, New York, (1971).
133. National Academy of Sciences, *Energy and Climate*, NAS, Washington D.C., (1977).
134. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
135. P.B. Smith, J.D. Schilling and A.P. Haines, *Introduction and Summary*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
136. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
137. J.R. Craig, D.J. Vaughan and B.J. Skinner, *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, (2001).
138. W. Youngquist, *Ge Destinies: The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources Over Nations and Individuals*, National Book Company, Portland Oregon, (1997).
139. M. Tanzer, *The Race for Resources. Continuing Struggles Over Minerals and Fuels*, Monthly Review Press, New York, (1980).
140. C.B. Reed, *Fuels, Minerals and Human Survival*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers Inc., Ann Arbor Michigan, (1975).
141. A.A. Bartlett, *Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis*, American Journal of Physics, **46**, 876-888, (1978).
142. N. Gall, *We are Living Off Our Capital*, Forbes, September, (1986).

Chapter 2

FAMINE TODAY

“Unless progress with agricultural yields remains very strong, the next century will experience human misery that, on a sheer numerical scale, will exceed everything that has come before”

Nobel Laureate Norman Borlaug speaking of a global food crisis in the 21st century

2.1 Some recent developments

I have for decades been predicting that. by 2050, the combination of a growing global population of humans, climate change, and the end of the fossil fuel era, would produce a

famine of enormous proportions, involving billions rather than millions of people. Here is an example of the sort of thing that I have written:

“As glaciers melt in the Himalayas, depriving India and China of summer water supplies; as sea levels rise, drowning the fertile rice fields of Viet Nam and Bangladesh; as drought threatens the productivity of grain-producing regions of North America; and as the end of the fossil fuel era impacts modern high-yield agriculture, there is a threat of wide-spread famine. There is a danger that the 1.5 billion people who are undernourished today will not survive an even more food-scarce future.

“People threatened with famine will become refugees, desperately seeking entry into countries where food shortages are less acute. Wars, such as those currently waged in the Middle East, will add to the problem.

“What can we do to avoid this crisis, or at least to reduce its severity? We must urgently address the problem of climate change; and we must shift money from military expenditure to the support of birth control programs and agricultural research. We must also replace the institution of war by a system of effective global governance and enforceable international laws.”

However, it now appears that the beginnings of a global famine can already be seen, and it may become a tragic reality much sooner than 2050. According to United Nations agencies, **“Almost 3.1 billion people (40 percent) of the world’s population could not afford a healthy diet in 2020, an increase of 112 million since 2019 because of rising food prices stemming from the pandemic.”**¹

¹<https://popularresistance.org/un-agencies-warn-of-looming-catastrophe-as-global-hunger-rises/>




Figure 2.1: Regions with the most hunger are shown in green (severe), red (more severe) and brown (most severe).




Figure 2.2: Population growth and fossil fuel use, seen on a time-scale of several thousand years. The dots are population estimates in millions from the US Census Bureau. Fossil fuel use appears as a spike-like curve, rising from almost nothing to a high value, and then falling again to almost nothing in the space of a few centuries. When the two curves are plotted together, the explosive rise of global population is seen to be simultaneous with, and perhaps partially driven by, the rise of fossil fuel use. This raises the question of whether the world's population is headed for a crash when the fossil fuel era has ended. (Author's own graph)

2.2 Optimum population in the distant future

What is the optimum population of the world? It is certainly not the maximum number that can be squeezed onto the globe by eradicating every species of plant and animal that cannot be eaten. The optimum global population is one that can be supported in comfort, equality and dignity - and with respect for the environment.

In 1848 (when there were just over one billion people in the world), John Stuart Mill described the optimal global population in the following words:

“The density of population necessary to enable mankind to obtain, in the greatest degree, all the advantages of cooperation and social intercourse, has, in the most populous countries, been attained. A population may be too crowded, although all be amply supplied with food and raiment.”

“... Nor is there much satisfaction in contemplating the world with nothing left to the spontaneous activity of nature; with every rood of land brought into cultivation, which is capable of growing food for human beings; every flowery waste or natural pasture plowed up, all quadrupeds or birds which are not domesticated for man’s use exterminated as his rivals for food, every hedgerow or superfluous tree rooted out, and scarcely a place left where a wild shrub or flower could grow without being eradicated as a weed in the name of improved agriculture. If the earth must lose that great portion of its pleasantness which it owes to things that the unlimited increase of wealth and population would extirpate from it, for the mere purpose of enabling it to support a larger, but not better or happier population, I sincerely hope, for the sake of posterity, that they will be content to be stationary, long before necessity compels them to it.”²

Has the number of humans in the world already exceeded the earth’s sustainable limits? Will the global population of humans crash catastrophically after having exceeded the carrying capacity of the environment? There is certainly a danger that this will happen - a danger that the 21st century will bring very large scale famines to vulnerable parts of the world, because modern energy-intensive agriculture will be dealt a severe blow by prohibitively high petroleum prices, and because climate change will reduce the world’s agricultural output. When the major glaciers in the Himalayas have melted, they will no longer be able to give India and China summer water supplies; rising oceans will drown much agricultural land; and aridity will reduce the output of many regions that now produce much of the world’s grain. Falling water tables in overdrawn aquifers, and loss of topsoil will add to the problem. We should be aware of the threat of a serious global food crisis in the 21st century if we are to have a chance of avoiding it.

The term *ecological footprint* was introduced by William Rees and Mathis Wackernagel in the early 1990’s to compare demands on the environment with the earth’s capacity to regenerate. In 2005, humanity used environmental resources at such a rate that it would take 1.3 earths to renew them. In other words, we have already exceeded the earth’s carrying capacity. Since eliminating the poverty that characterizes much of the world

²John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy, With Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy*, (1848).

today will require more resources per capita, rather than less. it seems likely that in the era beyond fossil fuels, the optimum global population will be considerably less than the present population of the world.

2.3 Population growth and the Green Revolution

Limitations on cropland

In 1944 the Norwegian-American plant geneticist Norman Borlaug was sent to Mexico by the Rockefeller Foundation to try to produce new wheat varieties that might increase Mexico's agricultural output. Borlaug's dedicated work on this project was spectacularly successful. He remained with the project for 16 years, and his group made 6,000 individual crossings of wheat varieties to produce high-yield disease-resistant strains.

In 1963, Borlaug visited India, bringing with him 100 kg. of seeds from each of his most promising wheat strains. After testing these strains in Asia, he imported 450 tons of the Lerma Rojo and Sonora 64 varieties - 250 tons for Pakistan and 200 for India. By 1968, the success of these varieties was so great that school buildings had to be commandeered to store the output. Borlaug's work began to be called a "Green Revolution". In India, the research on high-yield crops was continued and expanded by Prof. M.S. Swaminathan and his coworkers. The work of Green Revolution scientists, such Norman Borlaug and M.S. Swaminathan, has been credited with saving the lives of as many as a billion people.

Despite these successes, Borlaug believes that the problem of population growth is still a serious one. "Africa and the former Soviet republics", Borlaug states, "and the Cerrado³, are the last frontiers. After they are in use, the world will have no additional sizable blocks of arable land left to put into production, unless you are willing to level whole forests, which you should not do. So, future food-production increases will have to come from higher yields. And though I have no doubt that yields will keep going up, whether they can go up enough to feed the population monster is another matter. Unless progress with agricultural yields remains very strong, the next century will experience human misery that, on a sheer numerical scale, will exceed the worst of everything that has come before."

With regard to the prospect of increasing the area of cropland, a report by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (*Provisional Indicative World Plan for Agricultural Development*, FAO, Rome, 1970) states that "In Southern Asia,... in some countries of Eastern Asia, in the Near East and North Africa... there is almost no scope for expanding agricultural area... In the drier regions, it will even be necessary to return to permanent pasture the land that is marginal and submarginal for cultivation. In most of Latin America and Africa south of the Sahara, there are still considerable possibilities for expanding cultivated areas; but the costs of development are high, and it will often be more economical to intensify the utilization of areas already settled." Thus there is a possibility of increasing the area of cropland in Africa south of the Sahara and in Latin America, but

³ The Cerrado is a large savanna region of Brazil.



Figure 2.3: **Professor M.S. Swaminathan, father of the Green Revolution in India.** (Open and Shut7)



Figure 2.4: **Norman Borlaug and agronomist George Harrer in 1943.** (Human Wrongs Watch)




Figure 2.5: This graph shows the total world production of coarse grain between 1960 and 2004. Because of high-yield varieties, the yield of grain increased greatly. Notice, however, that the land under cultivation remained almost constant. High-yield agriculture depends on large inputs of fossil fuel energy and irrigation, and may be difficult to maintain in the future. (FAO)

only at the cost of heavy investment and at the additional cost of destruction of tropical rain forests.

Rather than an increase in the global area of cropland, we may encounter a future loss of cropland through soil erosion, salination, desertification, loss of topsoil, depletion of minerals in topsoil, urbanization and failure of water supplies. In China and in the southwestern part of the United States, water tables are falling at an alarming rate. The Ogallala aquifer (which supplies water to many of the plains states in the central and southern parts of the United States) has a yearly overdraft of 160%.

In the 1950's, both the U.S.S.R and Turkey attempted to convert arid grasslands into wheat farms. In both cases, the attempts were defeated by drought and wind erosion, just as the wheat farms of Oklahoma were overcome by drought and dust in the 1930's.

If irrigation of arid lands is not performed with care, salt may be deposited, so that the land is ruined for agriculture. This type of desertification can be seen, for example, in some parts of Pakistan. Another type of desertification can be seen in the Sahel region of Africa, south of the Sahara. Rapid population growth in the Sahel has led to overgrazing, destruction of trees, and wind erosion, so that the land has become unable to support even its original population.

Especially worrying is a prediction of the International Panel on Climate Change concerning the effect of global warming on the availability of water: According to Model A1 of the IPCC, global warming may, by the 2050's, have reduced by as much as 30% the water available in large areas of world that now are large producers of grain⁴.

Added to the agricultural and environmental problems, are problems of finance and distribution. Famines can occur even when grain is available somewhere in the world, because those who are threatened with starvation may not be able to pay for the grain, or for its transportation. The economic laws of supply and demand are not able to solve this type of problem. One says that there is no "demand" for the food (meaning demand in the economic sense), even though people are in fact starving.

2.4 Energy-dependence of modern agriculture

Food prices and energy prices

A very serious problem with Green Revolution plant varieties is that they require heavy inputs of pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation. Because of this, the use of high-yield varieties contributes to social inequality, since only rich farmers can afford the necessary inputs. Monocultures, such as the Green Revolution varieties may also prove to be vulnerable to future epidemics of plant diseases, such as the epidemic that caused the Irish Potato Famine in 1845. Even more importantly, pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation all depend on the use of fossil fuels. One must therefore ask whether high agricultural yields can be maintained in the future, when fossil fuels are expected to become prohibitively scarce and expensive.

⁴See the discussion of the Stern Report in Chapter 7.

Modern agriculture has become highly dependent on fossil fuels, especially on petroleum and natural gas. This is especially true of production of the high-yield grain varieties introduced in the Green Revolution, since these require especially large inputs of fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation. Today, fertilizers are produced using oil and natural gas, while pesticides are synthesized from petroleum feedstocks, and irrigation is driven by fossil fuel energy. Thus agriculture in the developed countries has become a process where inputs of fossil fuel energy are converted into food calories. If one focuses only on the farming operations, the fossil fuel energy inputs are distributed as follows:

1. Manufacture of inorganic fertilizer, 31%
2. Operation of field machinery, 19%
3. Transportation, 16%
4. Irrigation, 13%
5. Raising livestock (not including livestock feed), 8%
6. Crop drying, 5%
7. Pesticide production, 5%
8. Miscellaneous, 8%

The ratio of the fossil fuel energy inputs to the food calorie outputs depends on how many energy-using elements of food production are included in the accounting. David Pimental and Mario Giampietro of Cornell University estimated in 1994 that U.S. agriculture required 0.7 kcal of fossil fuel energy inputs to produce 1.0 kcal of food energy. However, this figure was based on U.N. statistics that did not include fertilizer feedstocks, pesticide feedstocks, energy and machinery for drying crops, or electricity, construction and maintenance of farm buildings. A more accurate calculation, including these inputs, gives an input/output ratio of approximately 1.0. Finally, if the energy expended on transportation, packaging and retailing of food is included, Pimental and Giampietro found that the input/output ratio for the U.S. food system was approximately 10, and this figure did not include energy used for cooking.

The Brundtland Report's⁵ estimate of the global potential for food production assumes "that the area under food production can be around 1.5 billion hectares (3.7 billion acres - close to the present level), and that the average yields could go up to 5 tons of grain equivalent per hectare (as against the present average of 2 tons of grain equivalent)." In other words, the Brundtland Report assumes an increase in yields by a factor of 2.5. This would perhaps be possible if traditional agriculture could everywhere be replaced by energy-intensive modern agriculture using Green Revolution plant varieties. However, Pimental

⁵ World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, (1987). This book is often called "The Brundtland Report" after Gro Harlem Brundtland, the head of WCED, who was then Prime Minister of Norway.

and Giampietro's studies show that modern energy-intensive agricultural techniques cannot be maintained after fossil fuels have been exhausted.

At the time when the Brundtland Report was written (1987), the global average of 2 tons of grain equivalent per hectare included much higher yields from the sector using modern agricultural methods. Since energy-intensive petroleum-based agriculture cannot be continued in the post-fossil-fuel era, future average crop yields will probably be much less than 2 tons of grain equivalent per hectare.

The 1987 global population was approximately 5 billion. This population was supported by 3 billion tons of grain equivalent per year. After fossil fuels have been exhausted, the total world agricultural output is likely to be considerably less than that, and therefore the population that it will be possible to support will probably be considerably less than 5 billion, assuming that our average daily per capita use of food calories remains the same, and assuming that the amount of cropland and pasturage remains the same (1.5 billion hectares cropland, 3.0 billion hectares pasturage).

The Brundtland Report points out that "The present (1987) global average consumption of plant energy for food, seed and animal feed amounts to 6,000 calories daily, with a range among countries of 3,000-15,000 calories, depending on the level of meat consumption." Thus there is a certain flexibility in the global population that can survive on a given total agricultural output. If the rich countries were willing to eat less meat, more people could be supported.

2.5 Effects of climate change on agriculture

Effects of temperature increase on crops

There is a danger that when climate change causes both temperature increases and increased aridity in regions like the US grain belt, yields will be very much lowered. Of the three main grain types (corn, wheat and rice) corn is the most vulnerable to the direct effect of increases in temperature. One reason for this is the mechanism of pollination of corn: A pollen grain lands on one end of a corn-silk strand, and the germ cell must travel the length of the strand in order to fertilize the kernel. At high temperatures, the corn silk becomes dried out and withered, and is unable to fulfill its biological function. Furthermore, heat can cause the pores on the underside of the corn leaf to close, so that photosynthesis stops.

According to a study made by Mohan Wali and coworkers at Ohio State University, the photosynthetic activity of corn increases until the temperature reaches 20 degrees Celsius. It then remains constant until the temperature reaches 35 degrees, after which it declines. At 40 degrees and above, photosynthesis stops altogether.

Scientists in the Philippines report that the pollination of rice fails entirely at 40 degrees Celsius, leading to crop failures. Wheat yields are also markedly reduced by temperatures in this range.

Predicted effects on rainfall

According to the Stern Report, some of the major grain-producing areas of the world might lose up to 30% of their rainfall by 2050. These regions include much of the United States, Brazil, the Mediterranean region, Eastern Russia and Belarus, the Middle East, Southern Africa and Australia. Of course possibilities for agriculture may simultaneously increase in other regions, but the net effect of climate change on the world's food supply is predicted to be markedly negative.

Unsustainable use of groundwater

It may seem surprising that fresh water can be regarded as a non-renewable resource. However, groundwater in deep aquifers is often renewed very slowly. Sometimes renewal requires several thousand years. When the rate of withdrawal of groundwater exceeds the rate of renewal, the carrying capacity of the resource has been exceeded, and withdrawal of water becomes analogous to mining a mineral. However, it is more serious than ordinary mining because water is such a necessary support for life.

In many regions of the world today, groundwater is being withdrawn faster than it can be replenished, and important aquifers are being depleted. In China, for example, groundwater levels are falling at an alarming rate. Considerations of water supply in relation to population form the background for China's stringent population policy.

At a recent lecture, Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute was asked by a member of the audience to name the resource for which shortages would most quickly become acute. Most of the audience expected him to name oil, but instead he replied "water". Lester Brown then cited China's falling water table. He predicted that within decades, China would be unable to feed itself. He said that this would not cause hunger in China itself: Because of the strength of China's economy, the country would be able to purchase grain on the world market. However Chinese purchases of grain would raise the price, and put world grain out of reach of poor countries in Africa. Thus water shortages in China will produce famine in parts of Africa, Brown predicted.

Under many desert areas of the world are deeply buried water tables formed during glacial periods when the climate of these regions was wetter. These regions include the Middle East and large parts of Africa. Water can be withdrawn from such ancient reservoirs by deep wells and pumping, but only for a limited amount of time.

In oil-rich Saudi Arabia, petroenergy is used to drill wells for ancient water and to bring it to the surface. Much of this water is used to irrigate wheat fields, and this is done to such an extent that Saudi Arabia exports wheat. The country is, in effect, exporting its ancient heritage of water, a policy that it may, in time, regret. A similarly short-sighted project is Muammar Qaddafi's enormous pipeline, which will bring water from ancient sub-desert reservoirs to coastal cities of Libya.

In the United States, the great Ogallala aquifer is being overdrawn. This aquifer is an enormous stratum of water-saturated sand and gravel underlying parts of northern Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming and South Dakota. The



Figure 2.6: **Whitechuck Glacier in the North Cascades National Park in 1973.** (Nicholas College)



Figure 2.7: **The same glacier in 2006** (Nicholas College)

average thickness of the aquifer is about 70 meters. The rate of water withdrawal from the aquifer exceeds the rate of recharge by a factor of eight.

Thus we can see that in many regions, the earth's present population is living on its inheritance of water, rather than its income. This fact, coupled with rapidly increasing populations and climate change, may contribute to a food crisis partway through the 21st century.

Glacial melting and summer water supplies

The summer water supplies of both China and India are threatened by the melting of glaciers. The Gangotri glacier, which is the principle glacier feeding India's great Ganges River, is reported to be melting at an accelerating rate, and it could disappear within a few decades. If this happens, the Ganges could become seasonal, flowing only during the

monsoon season.

Chinese agriculture is also threatened by disappearing Himalayan glaciers, in this case those on the Tibet-Quinghai Plateau. The respected Chinese glaciologist Yao Tandong estimates that the glaciers feeding the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers are disappearing at the rate of 7% per year.

The Indus and Mekong Rivers will be similarly affected by the melting of glaciers. Lack of water during the summer season could have a serious impact on the irrigation of rice and wheat fields.

Forest loss and climate change

Mature forests contain vast amounts of sequestered carbon, not only in their trees, but also in the carbon-rich soil of the forest floor. When a forest is logged or burned to make way for agriculture, this carbon is released into the atmosphere. One fifth of the global carbon emissions are at present due to destruction of forests. This amount is greater than the CO₂ emissions for the world's transportation systems.

An intact forest pumps water back into the atmosphere, increasing inland rainfall and benefiting agriculture. By contrast, deforestation, for example in the Amazonian rainforest, accelerates the flow of water back into the ocean, thus reducing inland rainfall. There is a danger that the Amazonian rainforest may be destroyed to such an extent that the region will become much more dry. If this happens, the forest may become vulnerable to fires produced by lightning strikes. This is one of the feedback loops against which the Stern Report warns - the drying and burning of the Amazonian rainforest may become irreversible, greatly accelerating climate change, if destruction of the forest proceeds beyond a certain point.

Erosion of topsoil

Besides depending on an adequate supply of water, food production also depends on the condition of the thin layer of topsoil that covers the world's croplands. This topsoil is being degraded and eroded at an alarming rate: According to the World Resources Institute and the United Nations Environment Programme, "It is estimated that since World War II, 1.2 billion hectares... has suffered at least moderate degradation as a result of human activity. This is a vast area, roughly the size of China and India combined." This area is 27% of the total area currently devoted to agriculture ⁶. The report goes on to say that the degradation is greatest in Africa.

The risk of topsoil erosion is greatest when marginal land is brought into cultivation, since marginal land is usually on steep hillsides which are vulnerable to water erosion when wild vegetation is removed.

David Pimental and his associates at Cornell University pointed out in 1995 that "Because of erosion-associated loss of productivity and population growth, the per capita food

⁶The total area devoted to agriculture throughout the world is 1.5 billion hectares of cropland and 3.0 billion hectares of pasturage.



Figure 2.8: **Desert regions of the Africa that are in danger of spreading.** (FAO)

supply has been reduced over the past 10 years and continues to fall. The Food and Agricultural Organization reports that the per capita production of grains which make up 80% of the world's food supply, has been declining since 1984."

Pimental et al. add that "Not only is the availability of cropland per capita decreasing as the world population grows, but arable land is being lost due to excessive pressure on the environment. For instance, during the past 40 years nearly one-third of the world's cropland (1.5 billion hectares) has been abandoned because of soil erosion and degradation. Most of the replacement has come from marginal land made available by removing forests. Agriculture accounts for 80% of the annual deforestation."

Topsoil can also be degraded by the accumulation of salt when irrigation water evaporates. The worldwide area of irrigated land has increased from 8 million hectares in 1800 to more than 100 million hectares today. This land is especially important to the world food supply because it is carefully tended and yields are large in proportion to the area. To protect this land from salination, it should be irrigated in such a way that evaporation is minimized.

Finally cropland with valuable topsoil is being be lost to urban growth and highway development, a problem that is made more severe by growing populations and by economic growth.

Laterization

Every year, more than 100,000 square kilometers of rain forest are cleared and burned, an area which corresponds to that of Switzerland and the Netherlands combined. Almost

half of the world's tropical forests have already been destroyed. Ironically, the land thus cleared often becomes unsuitable for agriculture within a few years.

Tropical soils may seem to be fertile when covered with luxuriant vegetation, but they are usually very poor in nutrients because of leeching by heavy rains. The nutrients which remain are contained in the vegetation itself; and when the forest cover is cut and burned, the nutrients are rapidly lost.

Often the remaining soil is rich in aluminum oxide and iron oxide. When such soils are exposed to oxygen and sun-baking, a rocklike substance called Laterite is formed. The temples of Angkor Wat in Cambodia are built of Laterite; and it is thought that laterization of the soil contributed to the disappearance of the Khmer civilization, which built these temples.

2.6 Harmful effects of industrialized farming

A major global public health crisis may soon be produced by the wholesale use of antibiotics in the food of healthy farm animals. The resistance factors produced by shovelling antibiotics into animal food produces resistance factors (plasmids) which can easily be transferred to human pathogens. A related problem is the excessive use of pesticides and artificial fossil-fuel-derived fertilizers in agriculture. Pharming is not a joke. It is a serious threat.⁷

Plasmids

Bacteria belong to a class of organisms (prokaryotes) whose cells do not have a nucleus. Instead, the DNA of the bacterial chromosome is arranged in a large loop. In the early 1950's, Joshua Lederberg discovered that bacteria can exchange genetic information. He found that a frequently-exchanged gene, the F-factor (which conferred fertility), was not linked to other bacterial genes; and he deduced that the DNA of the F-factor was not physically a part of the main bacterial chromosome. In 1952, Lederberg coined the word "plasmid" to denote any extrachromosomal genetic system.

In 1959, it was discovered in Japan that genes for resistance to antibiotics can be exchanged between bacteria; and the name "R-factors" was given to these genes. Like the F-factors, the R-factors did not seem to be part of the main loop of bacterial DNA.

⁷<http://ecowatch.com/2014/03/06/misuse-antibiotics-fatal-superbug-crisis/>
<http://ecowatch.com/2013/12/06/8-scary-facts-about-antibiotic-resistance/>
<http://ecowatch.com/2015/03/27/obama-fight-superbug-crisis/>
<http://ecowatch.com/2014/03/12/fda-regulation-antibiotics-factory-farms/>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/health-35153795>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/health-21702647>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/health-34857015>
<http://sustainableagriculture.net/about-us/>
<https://pwccc.wordpress.com/programa/>

Because of the medical implications of this discovery, much attention was focused on the R-factors. It was found that they were plasmids, small loops of DNA existing inside the bacterial cell, but not attached to the bacterial chromosome. Further study showed that, in general, between one percent and three percent of bacterial genetic information is carried by plasmids, which can be exchanged freely even between different species of bacteria.

In the words of the microbiologist, Richard Novick, "Appreciation of the role of plasmids has produced a rather dramatic shift in biologists' thinking about genetics. The traditional view was that the genetic makeup of a species was about the same from one cell to another, and was constant over long periods of time. Now a significant proportion of genetic traits are known to be variable (present in some individual cells or strains, absent in others), labile (subject to frequent loss or gain) and mobile, all because those traits are associated with plasmids or other atypical genetic systems."

Because of the ease with which plasmids conferring resistance to antibiotics can be transferred from animal bacteria to the bacteria carrying human disease, the practice of feeding antibiotics to healthy farm animals is becoming a major human health hazard. The World Health Organization has warned that if we lose effective antibiotics through this mechanism, "Many common infections will no longer have a cure, and could kill unabated". The US Center for Disease Control has pointed to the emergence of "nightmare bacteria", and the chief medical officer for England Prof Dame Sally Davies has evoked parallels with the "apocalypse".

Pesticides, artificial fertilizers and topsoil

A closely analogous danger results from the overuse of pesticides and petroleum-derived fertilizers in agriculture. A very serious problem with Green Revolution plant varieties is that they require heavy inputs of pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation. Because of this, the use of high-yield varieties contributes to social inequality, since only rich farmers can afford the necessary inputs. Monocultures, such as the Green Revolution varieties may also prove to be vulnerable to future plant diseases, such as the epidemic that caused the Irish Potato Famine in 1845. Even more importantly, pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation all depend on the use of fossil fuels. One must ask, therefore, whether high-yield agriculture can be maintained in the post-fossil-fuel era.

Topsoil is degraded by excessive use of pesticides and artificial fertilizers. Natural topsoil is rich in organic material, which contains sequestered carbon that would otherwise be present in our atmosphere in the form of greenhouse gases. In addition, natural topsoil contains an extraordinarily rich diversity of bacteria and worms that act to convert agricultural wastes from one year's harvest into nutrients for the growth of next year's crop. Pesticides kill these vital organisms, and make the use of artificial fertilizers necessary.

Finally, many small individual farmers, whose methods are sustainable, are being eliminated by secret land-grabs or put out of business because they cannot compete with unsustainable high-yield agriculture. Traditional agriculture contains a wealth of knowledge and biodiversity, which it would be wise for the world to preserve.



Figure 2.9: Child suffering with the deficiency disease Marasmus in India. (Public domain)

2.7 The demographic transition

The phrase “developing countries” is more than a euphemism; it expresses the hope that with the help of a transfer of technology from the industrialized nations, all parts of the world can achieve prosperity. Some of the forces that block this hope have just been mentioned. Another factor that prevents the achievement of worldwide prosperity is population growth.

In the words of Dr. Halfdan Mahler, former Director General of the World Health Organization, “Country after country has seen painfully achieved increases in total output, food production, health and educational facilities and employment opportunities reduced or nullified by excessive population growth.”

The growth of population is linked to excessive urbanization, infrastructure failures and unemployment. In rural districts in the developing countries, family farms are often divided among a growing number of heirs until they can no longer be subdivided. Those family members who are no longer needed on the land have no alternative except migration to overcrowded cities, where the infrastructure is unable to cope so many new arrivals. Often

The Stages of the Demographic Transition.




Figure 2.10: A schematic graph showing the demographic transition from an old equilibrium with a high birth rate and high death rate to a new equilibrium where both the birth rate and the death rate are low. (Wikimedia)

the new migrants are forced to live in excrement-filled makeshift slums, where dysentery, hepatitis and typhoid are endemic, and where the conditions for human life sink to the lowest imaginable level. In Brazil, such shanty towns are called “favelas”.

If modern farming methods are introduced in rural areas while population growth continues, the exodus to cities is aggravated, since modern techniques are less labor-intensive and favor large farms. In cities, the development of adequate infrastructure requires time, and it becomes a hopeless task if populations are growing rapidly. Thus, population stabilization is a necessary first step for development.

It can be observed that birth rates fall as countries develop. However, development is sometimes blocked by the same high birth rates that economic progress might have prevented. In this situation (known as the “demographic trap”), economic gains disappear immediately because of the demands of an exploding population.

For countries caught in the demographic trap, government birth control programs are especially important, because one cannot rely on improved social conditions to slow birth rates. Since health and lowered birth rates should be linked, it is appropriate that family-planning should be an important part of programs for public health and economic development.

A recent study conducted by Robert F. Lapham of Demographic Health Surveys and W. Parker Maudlin of the Rockefeller Foundation has shown that the use of birth control is correlated both with socio-economic setting and with the existence of strong family-planning programs. The implication of this study is that even in the absence of increased living standards, family-planning programs can be successful, provided they have strong government support.

China, the world’s most populous nation, has adopted the somewhat draconian policy of allowing only one child for families in living in towns and cities (35.9% of the popula-



Figure 2.11: Education of women and higher status for women are vitally important measures, not only for their own sake, but also because these social reforms have proved to be the key to lower birth rates. (Kundan Srivastava)

tion). Chinese leaders obtained popular support for their one-child policy by means of an educational program which emphasized future projections of diminishing water resources and diminishing cropland per person if population increased unchecked. Like other developing countries, China has a very young population, which will continue to grow even when fertility has fallen below the replacement level because so many of its members are contributing to the birth rate rather than to the death rate. China's present population is 1.3 billion. Its projected population for the year 2025 is 1.5 billion. China's one-child policy is supported by 75% of the country's people, but the methods of enforcement are sometimes criticized, and it has led to a M/F sex ratio of 1.17/1.00. The natural baseline for the sex ratio ranges between 1.03/1.00 and 1.07/1.00.

Education of women and higher status for women are vitally important measures, not only for their own sake, but also because in many countries these social reforms have proved to be the key to lower birth rates. Religious leaders who oppose programs for the education of women and for family planning on "ethical" grounds should think carefully about the scope and consequences of the catastrophic global famine which will undoubtedly occur within the next 50 years if population is allowed to increase unchecked. Do these leaders really wish to be responsible for the suffering and death from starvation of hundreds of millions of people?

At the United Nations Conference on Population and Development, held in Cairo in September, 1994, a theme which emerged very clearly was that one of the most important keys to controlling the global population explosion is giving women better education and equal rights. These goals are desirable for the sake of increased human happiness, and for the sake of the uniquely life-oriented point of view which women can give us; but in addition, education and improved status for women have shown themselves to be closely

connected with lowered birth rates. When women lack education and independent careers outside the home, they can be forced into the role of baby-producing machines by men who do not share in the drudgery of cooking, washing and cleaning; but when women have educational, legal, economic, social and political equality with men, experience has shown that they choose to limit their families to a moderate size.

Sir Partha Dasgupta of Cambridge University has pointed out that the changes needed to break the cycle of overpopulation and poverty are all desirable in themselves. Besides education and higher status for women, they include state-provided social security for old people, provision of water supplies near to dwellings, provision of health services to all, abolition of child labor and general economic development.

The UN Summit on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants

On September 19, 2016, the United Nations General Assembly held a 1-day summit meeting to address the pressing problem of refugees. It is a problem that has been made acute by armed conflicts in the Middle East and Africa, and by climate change.

One of the outcomes of the summit was the a Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. Here is a statement of the severity of the problem from paragraph 3 of the Declaration:

“We are witnessing in today’s world an unprecedented level of human mobility. More people than ever before live in a country other than the one in which they were born. Migrants are present in all countries of the world. Most of them move without incident. In 2015, their number surpassed 244 million, growing at a rate faster than the world’s population. However, there are 65 million forcibly displaced persons, including over 21 million refugees, 3 million asylum seekers and over 40 million internally displaced persons.”

Sadly, the world’s response to the tragic plight of refugees fleeing from zones of armed conflict has been less than generous. Men, women and many children, trying to escape from almost certain death in the war-torn Middle East, have been met, not with sympathy and kindness, but with barbed wire and tear gas.

Germany’s Chancellor, Angela Merkel, courageously made arrangements for her country to accept a large number of refugees, but as a consequence her party has suffered political setbacks. On the whole, European governments have moved to the right, as anti-refugee parties gained strength. The United States, Canada Australia and Russia, countries that could potentially save the lives of many refugees, have accepted almost none. In contrast, tiny Lebanon, despite all its problems, has become the home of so many refugees that they are a very large fraction of the country’s total population.

As the effects of climate change become more pronounced, we can expect the suffering and hopelessness of refugees to become even more severe. This is a challenge which the world must meet with humanity and solidarity.

The World Cities Report, 2016

According to the World Cities Report⁸, by 2030, two thirds of the world's population will be living in cities. As the urban population increases, the land area occupied by cities is increasing at a higher rate. It is projected that by 2030, the urban population of developing countries will double, while the area covered by cities could triple.

Commenting on this, the UN-Habitat Executive Director, Joan Clos, said: "In the twenty years since the Habitat II conference, the world has seen a gathering of its population in urban areas. This has been accompanied by socioeconomic growth in many instances. But the urban landscape is changing and with it, the pressing need for a cohesive and realistic approach to urbanization".

"Such urban expansion is wasteful in terms of land and energy consumption and increases greenhouse gas emissions. The urban centre of gravity, at least for megacities, has shifted to the developing regions."

One can foresee that in the future, as fossil fuels become increasingly scarce, the problem of feeding urban populations will become acute.

Suggestions for further reading

1. P. Dasgupta, *Population, Resources and Poverty*, *Ambio*, **21**, 95-101, (1992).
2. L.R. Brown, *Who Will Feed China?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
3. L.R. Brown, et al., *Saving the Planet. How to Shape and Environmentally Sustainable Global Economy*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
4. L.R. Brown, *Postmodern Malthus: Are There Too Many of Us to Survive?*, *The Washington Post*, July 18, (1993).
5. L.R. Brown and H. Kane, *Full House. Reassessing the Earth's Population Carrying Capacity*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
6. L.R. Brown, *Seeds of Change*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1970).
7. L.R. Brown, *The Worldwide Loss of Cropland*, Worldwatch Paper 24, Worldwatch Institute, Washington, D.C., (1978).
8. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *Our Demographically Divided World*, Worldwatch Paper 74, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1986).
9. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *The Future of Urbanization: Facing the Ecological and Economic Constraints*, Worldwatch Paper 77, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
10. L.R. Brown, and others, *State of the World*, W.W. Norton, New York, (published annually).
11. H. Brown, *The Human Future Revisited. The World Predicament and Possible Solutions*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
12. H. Hanson, N.E. Borlaug and N.E. Anderson, *Wheat in the Third World*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1982).

⁸<http://wcr.unhabitat.org/>

13. A. Dil, ed., *Norman Borlaug and World Hunger*, Bookservice International, San Diego/Islamabad/Lahore, (1997).
14. N.E. Borlaug, *The Green Revolution Revisited and the Road Ahead*, Norwegian Nobel Institute, Oslo, Norway, (2000).
15. N.E. Borlaug, *Ending World Hunger. The Promise of Biotechnology and the Threat of Antiscience Zealotry*, *Plant Physiology*, **124**, 487-490, (2000).
16. M. Giampietro and D. Pimental, *The Tightening Conflict: Population, Energy Use and the Ecology of Agriculture*, in *Negative Population Forum*, L. Grant ed., Negative Population Growth, Inc., Teaneck, N.J., (1993).
17. H.W. Kendall and D. Pimental, *Constraints on the Expansion of the Global Food Supply*, *Ambio*, **23**, 198-2005, (1994).
18. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
19. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
20. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
21. D. Pimental and M. Pimental, *Food Energy and Society*, University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado, (1996).
22. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
23. RS and NAS, *The Royal Society and the National Academy of Sciences on Population Growth and Sustainability*, *Population and Development Review*, **18**, 375-378, (1992).
24. A.M. Altieri, *Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1995).
25. G. Conway, *The Doubly Green Revolution*, Cornell University Press, (1997).
26. J. Dreze and A. Sen, *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford University Press, (1991).
27. G. Bridger, and M. de Soissons, *Famine in Retreat?*, Dent, London, (1970).
28. W. Brandt, *World Armament and World Hunger: A Call for Action*, Victor Gollanz Ltd., London, (1982).
29. A.K.M.A. Chowdhury and L.C. Chen, *The Dynamics of Contemporary Famine*, Ford Foundation, Dacca, Pakistan, (1977)
30. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
31. M.E. Clark, *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1989).
32. J.-C. Chesnais, *The Demographic Transition*, Oxford, (1992).
33. C.M. Cipola, *The Economic History of World Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1974).
34. E. Draper, *Birth Control in the Modern World*, Penguin Books, Ltd., (1972).
35. Draper Fund Report No. 15, *Towards Smaller Families: The Crucial Role of the Private Sector*, Population Crisis Committee, 1120 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (1986).

36. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
37. E. Havemann, *Birth Control*, Time-Life Books, (1967).
38. J. Jacobsen, *Promoting Population Stabilization: Incentives for Small Families*, Worldwatch Paper 54, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1983).
39. N. Keyfitz, *Applied Mathematical Demography*, Wiley, New York, (1977).
40. W. Latz (ed.), *Future Demographic Trends*, Academic Press, New York, (1979).
41. World Bank, *Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, Washington D.C., (1986).
42. J.E. Cohen, *How Many People Can the Earth Support?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
43. J. Amos, *Climate Food Crisis to Deepen*, BBC News (5 September, 2005).
44. J. Vidal and T. Ratford, *One in Six Countries Facing Food Shortage*, The Guardian, (30 June, 2005).
45. J. Mann, *Biting the Environment that Feeds Us*, The Washington Post, July 29, 1994.
46. G.R. Lucas, Jr., and T.W. Ogletree, (editors), *Lifeboat Ethics. The Moral Dilemmas of World Hunger*, Harper and Row, New York.
47. J.L. Jacobson, *Gender Bias: Roadblock to Sustainable Development*, Worldwatch Paper 110, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
48. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
49. M. ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain: Choices for the Third World*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1976).
50. H. Le Bras, *La Planète au Village*, Datar, Paris, (1993).
51. E. Mayr, *Population, Species and Evolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, (1970).

Chapter 3

DISEASE TODAY

3.1 Malaria

Key facts from the World Health Organization

- Malaria is a life-threatening disease caused by parasites that are transmitted to people through the bites of infected female *Anopheles* mosquitoes. It is preventable and curable.
- In 2020, there were an estimated 241 million cases of malaria worldwide.
- The estimated number of malaria deaths stood at 627 000 in 2020.
- The WHO African Region carries a disproportionately high share of the global malaria burden. In 2020, the region was home to 95% of malaria cases and 96% of malaria deaths. Children under 5 accounted for about 80% of all malaria deaths in the Region.




Figure 3.1: Main symptoms of malaria.




Figure 3.2: The life cycle of malaria parasites. Sporozoites are introduced by a mosquito bite. They migrate to the liver, where they multiply into thousands of merozoites. The merozoites infect red blood cells and replicate, infecting more and more red blood cells. Some parasites form gametocytes, which are taken up by a mosquito, continuing the life cycle.

3.2 Tuberculosis

Key facts from WHO

- A total of 1.5 million people died from TB in 2020 (including 214 000 people with HIV). Worldwide, TB is the 13th leading cause of death and the second leading infectious killer after COVID-19 (above HIV/AIDS).
- In 2020, an estimated 10 million people fell ill with tuberculosis (TB) worldwide. 5.6 million men, 3.3 million women and 1.1 million children. TB is present in all countries and age groups. But TB is curable and preventable.
- In 2020, 1.1 million children fell ill with TB globally. Child and adolescent TB is often overlooked by health providers and can be difficult to diagnose and treat.
- In 2020, the 30 high TB burden countries accounted for 86% of new TB cases. Eight countries account for two thirds of the total, with India leading the count, followed by China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh and South Africa.
- Multidrug-resistant TB (MDR-TB) remains a public health crisis and a health security threat. Only about one in three people with drug resistant TB accessed treatment in 2020.
- Globally, TB incidence is falling at about 2% per year and between 2015 and 2020 the cumulative reduction was 11%. This was over half way to the End TB Strategy milestone of 20% reduction between 2015 and 2020.
- An estimated 66 million lives were saved through TB diagnosis and treatment between 2000 and 2020.
- Globally, close to one in two TB-affected households face costs higher than 20% of their household income, according to latest national TB patient cost survey data. The world did not reach the milestone of 0% TB patients and their households facing catastrophic costs as a result of TB disease by 2020.
- By 2022, US\$ 13 billion is needed annually for TB prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care to achieve the global target agreed at the UN high level-meeting on TB in 2018.
- Funding in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) that account for 98% of reported TB cases falls far short of what is needed. Spending in 2020 amounted to US\$ 5.3 billion less than half (41%) of the global target.




Figure 3.3: Depiction of a man with tuberculosis.

- There was an 8.7% decline in spending between 2019 and 2020 (from US\$ 5.8 billion to US\$ 5.3 billion), with TB funding in 2020 back to the level of 2016.
- Ending the TB epidemic by 2030 is among the health targets of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).




Figure 3.4: The main symptoms of variants and stages of tuberculosis are given,[17] with many symptoms overlapping with other variants, while others are more (but not entirely) specific for certain variants. Multiple variants may be present simultaneously.




Figure 3.5: Scanning electron micrograph of *M. tuberculosis*.

3.3 Water-borne diseases

Key facts from the World Health Organization

- Over 2 billion people live in water-stressed countries, which is expected to be exacerbated in some regions as result of climate change and population growth.
- Globally, at least 2 billion people use a drinking water source contaminated with faeces. Microbial contamination of drinking-water as a result of contamination with faeces poses the greatest risk to drinking-water safety.
- While the most important chemical risks in drinking water arise from arsenic, fluoride or nitrate, emerging contaminants such as pharmaceuticals, pesticides, per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs) and microplastics generate public concern.
- Safe and sufficient water facilitates the practice of hygiene, which is a key measure to prevent not only diarrheal diseases, but acute respiratory infections and numerous neglected tropical diseases.
- Microbiologically contaminated drinking water can transmit diseases such as diarrhoea, cholera, dysentery, typhoid and polio and is estimated to cause 485 000 diarrhoeal deaths each year.
- In 2020, 74% of the global population (5.8 billion people) used a safely managed drinking-water service - that is, one located on premises, available when needed, and free from contamination.



Figure 3.6: Adult cholera patient with “Washer Woman’s Hand” sign. Due to severe dehydration, cholera manifests itself in decreased skin turgor, which produces the so-called “Washer Woman’s Hand” sign.



Figure 3.7: Preventive inoculation against cholera in 1966.



Figure 3.8: Women at a village pond in Matlab, Bangladesh washing utensils and vegetables. The woman on the right is putting a sari filter onto a water-collecting pot (or kalash) to filter water for drinking.

3.4 HIV

Key facts from WHO

- HIV continues to be a major global public health issue, having claimed 40.1 million [33.6-48.6 million] lives so far.
- There is no cure for HIV infection. However, with increasing access to effective HIV prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care, including for opportunistic infections, HIV infection has become a manageable chronic health condition, enabling people living with HIV to lead long and healthy lives.
- There were an estimated 38.4 million [33.9-43.8 million] people living with HIV at the end of 2021, two thirds of whom (25.6 million) are in the WHO African Region.
- In 2021, 650 000 [510 000-860 000] people died from HIV-related causes and 1.5 million [1.1-2.0 million] people acquired HIV.
- To reach the new proposed global 95-95-95 targets set by UNAIDS, we will need to redouble our efforts to avoid the worst-case scenario of 7.7 million HIV-related deaths over the next 10 years, increasing HIV infections due to HIV service disruptions during COVID-19, and the slowing public health response to HIV.




Figure 3.9: The HIV replication cycle.



Figure 3.10: Left to right: the African green monkey source of SIV, the sooty mangabey source of HIV-2, and the chimpanzee source of HIV-1.

3.5 Infection with worms

Key facts from WHO

- Soil-transmitted helminth infections are caused by different species of parasitic worms.
- They are transmitted by eggs present in human faeces, which contaminate the soil in areas where sanitation is poor.
- Infected children are nutritionally and physically impaired.
- Approximately 1.5 billion people are infected with soil-transmitted helminths worldwide.
- Control is based on periodical deworming to eliminate infecting worms, health education to prevent re-infection, and improved sanitation to reduce soil contamination with infective eggs.
- Safe and effective medicines are available to control infection.




Figure 3.11: *Ascaris* life cycle: Adult worms in the lumen of the small intestine (1). The female produces eggs (approximately 200,000 per day) that are excreted with the feces (2). Unfertilized eggs are harmless, but fertilized ones are infective after 18 days to several weeks (3). Infective eggs are ingested (4), enter the gut (5), develop into larvae in the intestine, and penetrate the blood vessel to enter lungs, where they develop further (6), after 10 to 14 days, penetrate the alveolar walls, ascend the bronchial tree to the throat, and are re-swallowed (7). Upon reaching the small intestine, they develop into adult worms (8). It takes 2 to 3 months for one complete cycle. Adult worms can live 1 to 2 years.




Figure 3.12: Piece of intestine, blocked by worms, surgically removed from a 3-year-old boy in South Africa.

3.6 Smallpox and biological warfare

In 1959, a World Health Organization team led by D.A. Henderson devised a strategy in which cases of smallpox were isolated and all their contacts vaccinated, so that the disease had no way of reaching new victims. Descriptions of the disease were circulated, and rewards offered for reporting cases. The strategy proved to be successful, and finally, in 1977, the last natural case of smallpox was isolated in Somalia. After a two-year waiting period, during which no new cases were reported, WHO announced in 1979 that smallpox, one of the most frightful diseases of humankind, had been totally eliminated from the world. This was the first instance of the complete eradication of a disease, and it was a demonstration of what could be achieved by the enlightened use of science combined with international cooperation. The eradication of smallpox was a milestone in human history.

But our species is not really completely wise and rational; we do not really deserve to be called “Homo sapiens”. Stone-age emotions and stone-age politics are alas still with us. Samples of smallpox virus were taken to “carefully controlled” laboratories in the United States and the Soviet Union. Why? Probably because these two Cold War opponents did not trust each other, although both had signed the Biological Weapons Convention. Each feared that the other side might intend to use smallpox as a biological weapon. There were also rumors that unofficial samples of the virus had been saved by a number of other countries, including North Korea, Iraq, China, Cuba, India, Iran, Israel, Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

In 1989 Vladimir Pasechnik, a senior Soviet scientist, defected to the UK. According to Pasechnik, the civilian pharmaceutical firm Biopreparat was in fact a front for a massive Soviet bio-weapons program. His testimony was echoed by Dr. Kanatjan Alibekov, who had been Chief Scientist at Biopreparat between 1987 and 1992, but who defected to the United States in 1992. Alibekov said that a particularly virulent strain of smallpox virus was being cultivated at Biopreparat and that it was being developed as an offensive weapon. In November, 2001, the United States announced that it will not destroy its stocks of smallpox virus, and that it intends to keep them. To make the discouraging story of smallpox complete, the financial section of a European newspaper (“Metroxpress”) recently published a photograph of two very satisfied-looking businessmen. The accompanying article explained the reason for their satisfaction: It was considered likely that smallpox might be used by terrorists. Hence a massive vaccination program would undoubtedly soon take place in Europe, and the company of these two businessmen would make large profits by manufacturing the vaccine. One despairs for the human race!

3.7 COVID-19

History of the pandemic

Starting in December, 2019, and accelerating rapidly during the spring of 2020, our world has been hit by a new and extremely serious pandemic. It is caused by a coronavirus

Table 3.1: Confirmed cases and deaths as of 3 August, 2022

Country	cases	deaths
United States	93,319,702	1,055,975
India	44,050,009	526,430
France	33,921,343	152,280
Brazil	33,890,428	679,063
Germany	31,044,554	144,360
United Kingdom	23,304,479	183,953
Italy	21,124,644	172,397
World	584,402,152	6,424,032

closely related to bat coronaviruses, and the disease, designated COVID-19 has a high death rate compared with seasonal influenza. As of April 1, 2020, more than 859,000 cases of COVID-19 have been reported in over 200 countries and territories, resulting in approximately 42,000 deaths. Of course the death rate is actually lower that would be calculated from the ratio $42/859=0.049$, since the actual number of infected people is very much larger than the number of confirmed cases. Older people, and people with previously existing health problems are especially at risk.

The first cases of COVID-19 were noticed in the city of Wuhan, in the Hubei province of China. A cluster of cases centered on the Hunan Seafood Wholesale Market, and the outbreak is thought to have been a case where a virus has been transmitted from an animal host to humans.

The World Health Organization recognized the outbreak as being a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on January 30, 2020. Later, on March 11, 2020, WHO declared it to be a pandemic.

Governments around the world have reacted to the pandemic by closing borders, closing schools, universities, restaurants, barber shops, bars, sports events, and nonessential economic activities of all sorts, also requiring people to stay at home, and requesting them to practice “social distancing”, i.e. staying at least 2 meters from all others, even family members. Different countries have reacted with different rates of speed and different degrees of stringency. But the daily life of people around the world has been severely disrupted by the pandemic, and the economic consequences, already severe, will probably become worse.

A pandemic of this kind was not unexpected. Public health experts have been predicting that our world would soon be hit by a severe pandemic because air travel can take infected people almost instantly across vast distances, making local disease outbreaks global before effective limiting action can be taken.

Suggestions for further reading

1. Breathnach, C S (September 1984). *Biographical sketches-No. 44. Metchnikoff*. Irish Medical Journal. Ireland. 77 (9).
2. de Kruif, Paul (1996). *Microbe Hunters*. San Diego: A Harvest Book.
3. Deutsch, Ronald M. (1977). *The new nuts among the berries*. Palo Alto, CA: Bull Pub. Co.
4. Fokin, Sergei I. (2008). *Russian scientists at the Naples zoological station, 1874 - 1934*. Napoli: Giannini.
5. Gourko, Helena; Williamson, Donald I.; Tauber, Alfred I. (2000). *The Evolutionary Biology Papers of Elie Metchnikoff*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
6. Karnovsky, M L (May 1981). *Metchnikoff in Messina: a century of studies on phagocytosis*. N. Engl. J. Med. United States. 304 (19): 1178-80.
7. Lavrova, L N (September 1970). *I. I. Mechnikov and the significance of his legacy for the development of Soviet science (on the 125th anniversary of his birth)*. Zh. Mikrobiol. Epidemiol. Immunobiol. USSR. 47 (9): 3-5.
8. Metchnikoff, Olga (2014) [1921]. *Life of Elie Metchnikoff 1845-1916*. The Floating Press.
9. Schmalstieg Frank C, Goldman Armond S (2008). *Ilya Ilich Metchnikoff (1845-1915) and Paul Ehrlich (1854-1915) The centennial of the 1908 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine*. Journal of Medical Biography. 16 (2): 96-103.
10. Tauber AI (2003). *Metchnikoff and the phagocytosis theory*. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology. 4 (11): 897-901.
11. Tauber, Alfred I.; Chernyak, Leon (1991). *Metchnikoff and the Origins of Immunology: From Metaphor to Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
12. Zalkind, Semyon (2001) [1957]. *Ilya Mechnikov: His Life and Work*. The Minerva Group, Inc.
13. Jerne, N. K. (1955). *The Natural-Selection Theory of Antibody Formation* (PDF). Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 41 (11): 849-857.
14. Jerne, N. K. (1974). *Towards a network theory of the immune system*. Annales d'immunologie. 125C (1-2): 373-389.
15. Jerne, N.K. (1984), *Nobel lecture: The Generative Grammar of the Immune System* (PDF), Nobelprize.org, retrieved 8 July 2019.
16. Hoffmann, G.W. (1994), *Niels Jerne, Immunologist 1911-1994*, Vaccine Research, Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., 3: 173-174, archived from the original on 6 October 2014.
17. Dubiski, S. (2004). *Science as Autobiography: The Troubled Life of Niels Jerne*. JAMA: the Journal of the American Medical Association. 291 (10): 1267.
18. Podolsky, Alfred I. Tauber; Scott H. (1997). *The Generation of Diversity : Clonal Selection Theory and the Rise of Molecular Immunology* (1st paperback ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press.

19. *Biology in Context - The Spectrum of Life* Authors, Peter Aubusson, Eileen Kennedy.
20. Forsdyke D.R. (1995). *The Origins of the Clonal Selection Theory of Immunity*. FASEB Journal. 9: 164-66.
21. G. Köhler and C. Milstein (1975). *Continuous cultures of fused cells secreting antibody of predefined specificity*. Nature. 256 (5517): 495-7.
22. István Hargittai (2006). *Köhler's Invention*. Journal Structural Chemistry. 17 (1)
23. Melchers, F (1995). *Georges Köhler (1946-95)*. Nature. 374 (6522) (published Apr 6, 1995). p. 498.
24. Danon, Y L (1996). *Monoclonal antibodies: George Kohler*. Harefuah. 130 (2) (published Jan 15, 1996). pp. 108-9.
25. Armstrong, Dorsey (2016). *The Black Death: The World's Most Devastating Plague*. The Great Courses.
26. Benedictow, Ole Jørgen (2004). *Black Death 1346-1353: The Complete History*.
27. Byrne, J. P. (2004). *The Black Death*. London. Greenwood Publishing Group.
28. Cantor, Norman F. (2001). *In the Wake of the Plague: The Black Death and the World It Made*, New York, Free Press.
29. Cohn, Samuel K. Jr., (2002). *The Black Death Transformed: Disease and Culture in Early Renaissance Europe*, London: Arnold.
30. Gasquet, Francis Aidan (1893). *The Great Pestilence AD 1348 to 1349: Now Commonly Known As the Black Death*.
31. Hecker, J.F.C. (1859). B.G. Babington (trans) (ed.). *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*. London: TrÅ¼bner.
32. Herlihy, D., (1997). *The Black Death and the Transformation of the West*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
33. McNeill, William H. (1976). *Plagues and Peoples*. Anchor/Doubleday.
34. Scott, S., and Duncan, C. J., (2001). *Biology of Plagues: Evidence from Historical Populations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Shrewsbury, J. F. D., (1970). *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles*, London: Cambridge University Press.
36. Twigg, G., (1984). *The Black Death: A Biological Reappraisal*, London: Batsford.
37. Ziegler, Philip (1998). *The Black Death*. Penguin Books. 1st editions 1969.
38. H. Lodish, A. Berk, S.L. Zipursky, P. Matsudaira, D. Baltimore, and J. Darnell, *Molecular Cell Biology, 4th Edition*, W.H. Freeman, New York, (2000).
39. Lily Kay, *Who Wrote the Book of Life? A History of the Genetic Code*, Stanford University Press, Stanford CA, (2000).
40. Sahotra Sarkar (editor), *The Philosophy and History of Molecular Biology*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, (1996).
41. James D. Watson et al. *Molecular Biology of the Gene, 4th Edition*, Benjamin-Cummings, (1988).
42. J.S. Fruton, *Proteins, Enzymes, and Genes*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1999).
43. S.E. Lauria, *Life, the Unfinished Experiment*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York (1973).

44. A. Lwoff, *Biological Order*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, (1962).
45. James D. Watson, *The Double Helix*, Athenium, New York (1968).
46. F. Crick, *The genetic code*, Scientific American, **202**, 66-74 (1962).
47. F. Crick, *Central dogma of molecular biology*, Nature, **227**, 561-563 (1970).
48. David Freifelder (editor), *Recombinant DNA, Readings from the Scientific American*, W.H. Freeman and Co. (1978).
49. James D. Watson, John Tooze and David T. Kurtz, *Recombinant DNA, A Short Course*, W.H. Freeman, New York (1983).
50. Richard Hutton, *Biorevolution, DNA and the Ethics of Man-Made Life*, The New American Library, New York (1968).
51. Martin Ebon, *The Cloning of Man*, The New American Library, New York (1978).
52. Sheldon Krimsky, *Genetic Alchemy: The Social History of the Recombinant DNA Controversy*, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass (1983).
53. M. Lappe, *Germs That Won't Die*, Anchor/Doubleday, Garden City N.Y. (1982).
54. M. Lappe, *Broken Code*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco (1984).
55. President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research, *Splicing Life: The Social and Ethical Issues of Genetic Engineering with Human Beings*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C. (1982).
56. U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, *Impacts of Applied Genetics - Microorganisms, Plants and Animals*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C. (1981).
57. W.T. Reich (editor), *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, The Free Press, New York (1978).
58. Martin Brown (editor), *The Social Responsibility of the Scientist*, The Free Press, New York (1970).
59. B. Zimmerman, *Biofuture*, Plenum Press, New York (1984).
60. John Lear, *Recombinant DNA, The Untold Story*, Crown, New York (1978).
61. B. Alberts, D. Bray, J. Lewis, M. Raff, K. Roberts and J.D. Watson, *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, Garland, New York (1983).
62. C. Woese, *The Genetic Code; The Molecular Basis for Genetic Expression*, Harper and Row, New York, (1967).
63. F.H.C. Crick, *The Origin of the Genetic Code*, J. Mol. Biol. **38**, 367-379 (1968).
64. M.W. Niernberg, *The genetic code: II*, Scientific American, **208**, 80-94 (1962).
65. L.E. Orgel, *Evolution of the Genetic Apparatus*, J. Mol. Biol. **38**, 381-393 (1968).
66. Melvin Calvin, *Chemical Evolution Towards the Origin of Life, on Earth and Elsewhere*, Oxford University Press (1969).
67. R. Shapiro, *Origins: A Skeptic's Guide to the Origin of Life*, Summit Books, New York, (1986).
68. J. William Schopf, *Earth's earliest biosphere: its origin and evolution*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., (1983).
69. J. William Schopf (editor), *Major Events in the History of Life*, Jones and Bartlet, Boston, (1992).

70. Robert Rosen, *Life itself: a comprehensive inquiry into the nature, origin and fabrication of life*, Columbia University Press, (1991).
71. R.F. Gesteland, T.R. Cech, and J.F. Atkins (editors), *The RNA World, 2nd Edition*, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, New York, (1999).
72. C. de Duve, *Blueprint of a Cell*, Niel Patterson Publishers, Burlington N.C., (1991).
73. C. de Duve, *Vital Dust; Life as a Cosmic Imperative*, Basic Books, New York, (1995).
74. F. Dyson, *Origins of Life*, Cambridge University Press, (1985).
75. S.A. Kaufman, *Antichaos and adaptation*, Scientific American, 265, 78-84, (1991).
76. S.A. Kauffman, *The Origins of Order*, Oxford University Press, (1993).
77. F.J. Varela and J.-P. Dupuy, *Understanding Origins: Contemporary Views on the Origin of Life, Mind and Society*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, (1992).
78. Stefan Bengtson (editor) *Early Life on Earth; Nobel Symposium No. 84*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1994).
79. Herrick Baltscheffsky, *Origin and Evolution of Biological Energy Conversion*, VCH Publishers, New York, (1996).
80. J. Chilea-Flores, T. Owen and F. Raulin (editors), *First Steps in the Origin of Life in the Universe*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, (2001).
81. R.E. Dickerson, Nature **283**, 210-212 (1980).
82. R.E. Dickerson, Scientific American **242**, 136-153 (1980).
83. C.R. Woese, *Archaeobacteria*, Scientific American **244**, 98-122 (1981).
84. N. Iwabe, K. Kuma, M. Hasegawa, S. Osawa and T. Miyata, *Evolutionary relationships of archaeobacteria, eubacteria, and eukaryotes inferred phylogenetic trees of duplicated genes*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **86**, 9355-9359 (1989).
85. C.R. Woese, O. Kundler, and M.L. Wheelis, *Towards a Natural System of Organisms: Proposal for the Domains Archaea, Bacteria and Eucaria*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **87**, 4576-4579 (1990).
86. W. Ford Doolittle, *Phylogenetic Classification and the Universal Tree*, Science, **284**, (1999).
87. G. Wächterhäuser, *Pyrite formation, the first energy source for life: A hypothesis*, Systematic and Applied Microbiology **10**, 207-210 (1988).
88. G. Wächterhäuser, *Before enzymes and templates: Theory of surface metabolism*, Microbiological Reviews, **52**, 452-484 (1988).
89. G. Wächterhäuser, *Evolution of the first metabolic cycles*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **87**, 200-204 (1990).
90. G. Wächterhäuser, *Groundworks for an evolutionary biochemistry the iron-sulfur world*, Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology **58**, 85-210 (1992).
91. M.J. Russell and A.J. Hall, *The emergence of life from iron monosulphide bubbles at a submarine hydrothermal redox and pH front* J. Geol. Soc. Lond. **154**, 377-402, (1997).
92. L.H. Caporale (editor), *Molecular Strategies in Biological Evolution*, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., May 18, (1999).

93. W. Martin and M.J. Russell, *On the origins of cells: a hypothesis for the evolutionary transitions from abiotic geochemistry to chemoautotrophic prokaryotes, and from prokaryotes to nucleated cells*, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci., **358**, 59-85, (2003).
94. Werner Arber, *Elements in Microbial Evolution*, J. Mol. Evol. **33**, 4 (1991).
95. Michael Gray, *The Bacterial Ancestry of Plastids and Mitochondria*, BioScience, **33**, 693-699 (1983).
96. Michael Grey, *The Endosymbiont Hypothesis Revisited*, International Review of Cytology, **141**, 233-257 (1992).
97. Lynn Margulis and Dorian Sagan, *Microcosmos: Four Billion Years of Evolution from Our Microbial Ancestors*, Allan and Unwin, London, (1987).
98. Lynn Margulis and Rene Fester, eds., *Symbiosis as a Source of Evolutionary Innovation: Speciation and Morphogenesis*, MIT Press, (1991).
99. Charles Mann, *Lynn Margulis: Science's Unruly Earth Mother*, Science, **252**, 19 April, (1991).
100. Jan Sapp, *Evolution by Association; A History of Symbiosis*, Oxford University Press, (1994).
101. J.A. Shapiro, *Natural genetic engineering in evolution*, Genetics, **86**, 99-111 (1992).
102. E.M. De Robertis et al., *Homeobox genes and the vertebrate body plan*, Scientific American, July, (1990).
103. J.S. Schrum, T.F. Zhu and J.W. Szostak, *The origins of cellular life*, Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol., May 19 (2010).
104. I. Budin and J.W. Szostak, *Expanding Roles for Diverse Physical Phenomena During the Origin of Life*, Annu. Rev. Biophys., **39**, 245-263, (2010).

Chapter 4

WAR TODAY

4.1 US-Russia proxy war in Ukraine

The Ukraine war and nuclear weapons

After his illegal and brutal invasion of Ukraine, Vladimir Putin put Russia's nuclear forces on high alert, thus threatening the world with an all-destroying nuclear war. The threat brought back memories of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when the world was balanced on the edge of a suicidal and genocidal nuclear war. We are once again reminded of the urgent need for the world to rid itself of nuclear weapons.

The danger of nuclear war

War was always madness, always immoral, always the cause of unspeakable suffering, economic waste and widespread destruction, and always a source of poverty, hate, barbarism and endless cycles of revenge and counter-revenge. It has always been a crime for soldiers to kill people, just as it is a crime for murderers in civil society to kill people. No flag has ever been wide enough to cover up the atrocities of war.

But today, the development of all-destroying thermonuclear weapons has put war completely beyond the bounds of sanity and elementary humanity.

Today, the existing nuclear weapons have half a million times the power of the bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki. A thermonuclear war would destroy human civilization, together with most of the plants and animals with which we share the gift of life.

Research has shown that fire-storms produced by a nuclear war would send vast quantities of smoke into the atmosphere, blocking sunlight, and blocking the hydrological cycle. The climate would become very cold for a period of about ten years. Human agriculture would fail. Plants and animals would also be killed by the nuclear winter.

Can we not rid ourselves of both nuclear weapons and the institution of war itself? We must act quickly and resolutely before our beautiful world is reduced to radioactive ashes, together with everything that we love.

The invasion of Ukraine cannot be called unprovoked

To understand how Russians feel about having western weapons and troops poured into a position on their nation's borders, we should imagine how the United States would react if large numbers of Russian weapons and troops were stationed in Mexico or Canada.

In 1991, after the breakup of the Soviet Union, George H.W. Bush and his Secretary of State, James Baker, promised Mikhail Gorbachev that if he agreed to the unification of Germany, NATO would not expand eastward, toward Russia, "not one inch". The promise was broken almost immediately by Bill Clinton, who helped to bring the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland into NATO. Russians saw this not only as a betrayal, but also as an act of aggression.

The Monroe Doctrine

There is no document more fundamental to the foreign policy of the United States than the Monroe Doctrine. It states that interference in the Western Hemisphere by European powers would be interpreted as an attack on the United States, and would be opposed by the United States. The Monroe Doctrine has been used to justify U.S. interventions in Central America and in the Caribbean. Understandably, the United States wishes to have its backyard secure. Why should Russia not have the same wish?

The U.S. should stop threatening Russia

Because Russia's fears are legitimate, and based on historical suffering, the U.S, and its allies should stop threatening Russia. Nuclear missiles should be removed from positions near to the Russian border, and the eastward expansion of NATO should be halted.

A diplomatic solution to the conflict is the only way to end it

UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres has urged Russia and Ukraine to negotiate an immediate cease-fire and a mutually agreeable settlement to end the conflict. However, this rational solution is opposed by politicians in the United States and elsewhere, who are influenced by money from giant arms corporations. Thus, more and more heavy weapons are sent to Ukraine, pouring oil onto the flames, and enriching the merchants of death. This must stop, and a diplomatic solution must be found under Secretary General Guterres' wise leadership.

4.2 House Speaker Pelosi's unnecessarily provocative visit to Taiwan

The military-industrial complex needs enemies

The military-industrial complex, against which President Eisenhower warned in his famous farewell address, needs enemies and frightening tensions to justify obscenely enormous military budgets. Without enemies, they would wither. Friendship between the US and China is bad news for the powerful and enormously wealthy US military-industrial complex, whose wealth translates into the power to influence politicians and media. Thus, American politicians like Nancy Pelosi do everything they can to make an enemy of China.

Some recent news reports of US threats to China

- “U.S. Navy deploys four warships east of Taiwan as Pelosi heads to Taipei,” Reuters, August 2, 2022
- “Navy transits Taiwan Strait as Esper in Taipei calls for end to ‘One China’ policy,” Stars and Stripes, July 20, 2022
- “US military considered using nuclear weapons against China in 1958 Taiwan Strait crisis, leaked documents show,” CNN, May 24, 2021
- “Would a nuclear-armed Taiwan deter China?,” Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI), December 24, 2020
- “Yes, Taiwan Needs Nuclear Weapons to Deter China,” American Enterprise Institute (AEI), November 5, 2021
- “To avoid Ukraine’s fate, Taiwan needs nuclear missiles - now,” Boston Globe, March 2, 2022
- “Reestablish the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group-Taiwan,” War on the Rocks, January 7, 2022
- “US Nearly Doubled Military Personnel Stationed in Taiwan This Year,” Voice of America (VOA), December 2, 2021
- “War with China: Thinking Through the Unthinkable,” RAND Corporation, 2016
- “America must prepare for war with China over Taiwan,” The Hill, November 24, 2021
- “Timeline: U.S. arms sales to Taiwan in 2020 total \$5 billion amid China tensions,” Reuters, December 7, 2020

- “U.S. Set to Sell Taiwan \$7 Billion in Arms,” Wall Street Journal, September 16, 2020
- “US makes 3rd arms sale to Taiwan under Biden admin,” Anadolu Agency, April 6, 2022

A statement by the Chinese foreign minister

“China and the United States are two major countries. The right way for them to deal with each other lies only in mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, no-confrontation, and win-win cooperation. The Taiwan question is purely an internal affair of China, and no other country is entitled to act as a judge on the Taiwan question.

“China strongly urges the United States to stop playing the ‘Taiwan card’ and using Taiwan to contain China. It should stop meddling on Taiwan and interfering in China’s internal affairs. It should stop supporting and conniving at ‘Taiwan independence’ separatist forces in any form. It should stop its acts of saying one thing but doing the opposite on the Taiwan question. It should stop distorting, obscuring, and hollowing out the One China principle. It must take credible actions to observe strictly the One China principle and the provisions of the three China-U.S. joint communiques, deliver on the ‘five noes’ commitment made by the U.S. leadership (i.e. not seek a “new Cold War”; not seek to change China’s system; the revitalization of its alliances is not against China; not support ‘Taiwan independence’; not look for conflict with China), and not go further down the wrong and dangerous path...

“In disregard of China’s grave concerns and firm opposition, Pelosi insisted on visiting China’s Taiwan region. This constitutes a gross interference in China’s internal affairs.

“Pelosi’s meddling gravely undermines China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, seriously tramples on the one-China principle, and severely threatens peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait.”

China’s reaction to Pelosi’s provocative visit to Taiwan

According to the Associated Press,

“The measures, which come amid cratering relations between Beijing and Washington, are the latest in a promised series of steps intended to punish the U.S. for allowing the visit to the island it claims as its own territory, to be annexed by force if necessary. China on Thursday launched threatening military exercises in six zones just off Taiwan’s coasts that it says will run through Sunday.

“Missiles have also been fired over Taiwan, defense officials told state media. China routinely opposes the self-governing island having its own contacts with foreign governments, but its response to the Pelosi visit has been unusually vociferous.

4.3 Militarism and money

Military-industrial complexes throughout the world involve a circular flow of money. The vast profits from arms industries are used to buy the votes of politicians, who then vote for obscenely bloated “defence” budgets. Military-industrial complexes need enemies. Without them they would wither. Thus, tensions are manufactured by corrupt politicians in the pay of arms industries. As Arundhati Roy famously observed, “Once weapons were manufactured to fight wars. Now wars are manufactured to sell weapons.” Donald Trump has recently threatened to attack both Iran and North Korea with nuclear weapons. The United States, under Trump, is also threatening both Russia and China. Any such conflict could escalate uncontrollably into an all-destroying global thermonuclear war.

4.4 Eisenhower’s farewell address

In his famous farewell address, US President Dwight Eisenhower eloquently described the terrible effects of an overgrown Military-industrial complex. Here are his words:

“We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.... This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence, economic, political, even spiritual, is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government...[and] we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

“In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the Military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.”

In another speech, he said: “Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.”

Today the world spends more than 1.7 trillion dollars (\$ 1,700,000,000,000) every year on armaments. This vast river of money, almost too large to be imagined, is the “devil’s dynamo” driving the institution of war. Politicians notoriously can be bought with a tiny fraction of this enormous amount; hence the decay of democracy. It is also plain that if the almost unbelievable sums now wasted on armaments were used constructively, most of the pressing problems now facing humanity could be solved.

Because the world spends two thousand billion dollars each year on armaments, it




Figure 4.1: “In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the Military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.”

follows that very many people make their living from war. This is the reason why it is correct to speak of war as an institution, and why it persists, although we know that it is the cause of much of the suffering that inflicts humanity.

4.5 The nuclear arms race

Flaws in the concept of nuclear deterrence

Before discussing other defects in the concept of deterrence, it must be said very clearly that the idea of “massive nuclear retaliation” is completely unacceptable from an ethical point of view. The doctrine of retaliation, performed on a massive scale, violates not only the principles of common human decency and common sense, but also the ethical principles of every major religion. Retaliation is especially contrary to the central commandment of Christianity which tells us to love our neighbor, even if he or she is far away from us, belonging to a different ethnic or political group, and even if our distant neighbor has seriously injured us. This principle has a fundamental place not only in Christianity but also in all other major religions. “Massive retaliation” completely violates these very central ethical principles, which are not only clearly stated and fundamental but also very practical, since they prevent escalatory cycles of revenge and counter-revenge.

Contrast Christian ethics with estimates of the number of deaths that would follow a US nuclear strike against Russia: Several hundred million deaths. These horrifying estimates shock us not only because of the enormous magnitude of the expected mortality, but also because the victims would include people of every kind: women, men, old people, children and infants, completely irrespective of any degree of guilt that they might have. As a result of such an attack, many millions of people in neutral countries would also die. This type of killing has to be classified as genocide.

When a suspected criminal is tried for a wrongdoing, great efforts are devoted to clarifying the question of guilt or innocence. Punishment only follows if guilt can be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. Contrast this with the totally indiscriminate mass slaughter that results from a nuclear attack!

It might be objected that disregard for the guilt or innocence of victims is a universal characteristic of modern war, since statistics show that, with time, a larger and larger percentage of the victims have been civilians, and especially children. For example, the air attacks on Coventry during World War II, or the fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo, produced massive casualties which involved all segments of the population with complete disregard for the question of guilt or innocence. The answer, I think, is that modern war has become generally unacceptable from an ethical point of view, and this unacceptability is epitomized in nuclear weapons.

The enormous and indiscriminate destruction produced by nuclear weapons formed the background for an historic 1996 decision by the International Court of Justice in the Hague. In response to questions put to it by WHO and the UN General Assembly, the Court ruled that “the threat and use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of



international law applicable in armed conflict, and particularly the principles and rules of Humanitarian law.”

The only *possible* exception to this general rule might be “an extreme circumstance of self-defense, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake”. But the Court refused to say that even in this extreme circumstance the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be legal. It left the exceptional case undecided. In addition, the World Court added unanimously that “there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith *and bring to a conclusion* negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict international control.”

This landmark decision has been criticized by the nuclear weapon states as being decided “by a narrow margin”, but the structuring of the vote made the margin seem more narrow than it actually was. Seven judges voted against Paragraph 2E of the decision (the paragraph which states that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be generally illegal, but which mentions as a possible exception the case where a nation might be defending itself from an attack that threatened its very existence.) Seven judges voted for the paragraph, with the President of the Court, Muhammad Bedjaoui of Algeria casting the deciding vote. Thus the Court adopted it, seemingly by a narrow margin. But three of the judges who voted against 2E did so because they believed that no possible exception should be mentioned! Thus, if the vote had been slightly differently structured, the result would have been ten to four.

Of the remaining four judges who cast dissenting votes, three represented nuclear weapons states, while the fourth thought that the Court ought not to have accepted the questions from WHO and the UN. However Judge Schwebel from the United States, who voted against Paragraph 2E, nevertheless added, in a separate opinion, “It cannot be accepted that the use of nuclear weapons on a scale which would - or could - result in the deaths of many millions in indiscriminate inferno and by far-reaching fallout, have per-

icious effects in space and time, and render uninhabitable much of the earth, could be lawful.” Judge Higgins from the UK, the first woman judge in the history of the Court, had problems with the word “generally” in Paragraph 2E and therefore voted against it, but she thought that a more profound analysis might have led the Court to conclude in favor of illegality in all circumstances. Judge Fleischhauer of Germany said in his separate opinion, “The nuclear weapon is, in many ways, the negation of the humanitarian considerations underlying the law applicable in armed conflict and the principle of neutrality. The nuclear weapon cannot distinguish between civilian and military targets. It causes immeasurable suffering. The radiation released by it is unable to respect the territorial integrity of neutral States.”

President Bedjaoui, summarizing the majority opinion, called nuclear weapons “the ultimate evil”, and said “By its nature, the nuclear weapon, this blind weapon, destabilizes Humanitarian law, the law of discrimination in the use of weapons... The ultimate aim of every action in the field of nuclear arms will always be nuclear disarmament, an aim which is no longer utopian and which all have a duty to pursue more actively than ever.”

Thus the concept of nuclear deterrence is not only unacceptable from the standpoint of ethics; it is also contrary to international law. The World Court’s 1996 advisory Opinion unquestionably also represents the opinion of the majority of the world’s peoples. Although no formal plebiscite has been taken, the votes in numerous resolutions of the UN General Assembly speak very clearly on this question. For example the New Agenda Resolution (53/77Y) was adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1998 by a massively affirmative vote, in which only 18 out of the 170 member states voted against the resolution.¹ The New Agenda Resolution proposes numerous practical steps towards complete nuclear disarmament, and it calls on the Nuclear-Weapon States “to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)”. Thus, in addition to being ethically unacceptable and contrary to international law, nuclear weapons also contrary to the principles of democracy.

Having said these important things, we can now turn to some of the other defects in the concept of nuclear deterrence. One important defect is that nuclear war may occur through accident or miscalculation - through technical defects or human failings. This possibility is made greater by the fact that despite the end of the Cold War, thousands of missiles carrying nuclear warheads are still kept on a “hair-trigger” state of alert with a quasi-automatic reaction time measured in minutes. There is a constant danger that a nuclear war will be triggered by error in evaluating the signal on a radar screen. For example, the BBC reported recently that a group of scientists and military leaders are worried that a small asteroid entering the earths atmosphere and exploding could trigger

¹Of the 18 countries that voted against the New Agenda resolution, 10 were Eastern European countries hoping for acceptance into NATO, whose votes seem to have been traded for increased probability of acceptance.

a nuclear war if mistaken for a missile strike.

A number of prominent political and military figures (many of whom have ample knowledge of the system of deterrence, having been part of it) have expressed concern about the danger of accidental nuclear war. Colin S. Grey² expressed this concern as follows: “The problem, indeed the enduring problem, is that we are resting our future upon a nuclear deterrence system concerning which we cannot tolerate even a single malfunction.” General Curtis E. LeMay³ has written, “In my opinion a general war will grow through a series of political miscalculations and accidents rather than through any deliberate attack by either side.” Bruce G. Blair⁴ has remarked that “It is obvious that the rushed nature of the process, from warning to decision to action, risks causing a catastrophic mistake.”... “This system is an accident waiting to happen.”

“But nobody can predict that the fatal accident or unauthorized act will never happen”, Fred Ikle of the Rand Corporation has written, “Given the huge and far-flung missile forces, ready to be launched from land and sea on on both sides, the scope for disaster by accident is immense... In a matter of seconds - through technical accident or human failure - mutual deterrence might thus collapse.”

Another serious failure of the concept of nuclear deterrence is that it does not take into account the possibility that atomic bombs may be used by terrorists. Indeed, the threat of nuclear terrorism has today become one of the most pressing dangers that the world faces, a danger that is particularly acute in the United States.

Since 1945, more than 3,000 metric tons (3,000,000 kilograms) of highly enriched uranium and plutonium have been produced - enough for several hundred thousand nuclear weapons. Of this, roughly a million kilograms are in Russia, inadequately guarded, in establishments where the technicians are poorly paid and vulnerable to the temptations of bribery. There is a continuing danger that these fissile materials will fall into the hands of terrorists, or organized criminals, or irresponsible governments. Also, an extensive black market for fissile materials, nuclear weapons components etc. has recently been revealed in connection with the confessions of Pakistan’s bomb-maker, Dr. A.Q. Khan. Furthermore, if Pakistan’s less-than-stable government should be overthrown, complete nuclear weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists.

On November 3, 2003, Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, made a speech to the United Nations in which he called for “limiting the processing of weapons-usable material (separated plutonium and high enriched uranium) in civilian nuclear programmes - as well as the production of new material through reprocessing and enrichment - by agreeing to restrict these operations to facilities exclusively under international control.” It is almost incredible, considering the dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, that such restrictions were not imposed long ago. Nuclear reactors used for “peaceful” purposes unfortunately also generate fissionable isotopes of plutonium, neptunium and americium. Thus all nuclear reactors must be re-

²Chairman, National Institute for Public Policy

³Founder and former Commander in Chief of the United States Strategic Air Command

⁴Brookings Institute




Figure 4.2: Recent studies by atmospheric scientists have shown that the smoke from burning cities produced by even a limited nuclear war would have a devastating effect on global agriculture. The studies show that the smoke would rise to the stratosphere, where it would spread globally and remain for a decade, blocking sunlight and destroying the ozone layer. Because of the devastating effect on global agriculture, darkness from even a small nuclear war (e.g. between India and Pakistan) would result in an estimated billion deaths from famine. Nuclear darkness resulting from a large-scale war involving all of the nuclear weapons that are now on high alert status would destroy all agriculture on earth for a period of ten years, and almost all humans would die of starvation. (See O. Toon, A. Robock, and R. Turco, “The Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War”, *Physics Today*, vol. 61, No. 12, 2008, p. 37-42).

garded as ambiguous in function, and all must be put under strict international control. One might ask, in fact, whether globally widespread use of nuclear energy is worth the danger that it entails.

The Italian nuclear physicist Francesco Calogero, who has studied the matter closely, believes that terrorists could easily construct a simple gun-type nuclear bomb if they were in possession of a critical mass of highly enriched uranium. In such a simple atomic bomb, two grapefruit-sized subcritical portions of HEU are placed at opposite ends of the barrel of an artillery piece and are driven together by means of a conventional explosive. Prof. Calogero estimates that the fatalities produced by the explosion of such a device in the center of a large city could exceed 100,000.

We must remember the remark of U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan after the 9/11/2001 attacks on the World Trade Center. He said, "*This time* it was not a nuclear explosion". The meaning of his remark is clear: If the world does not take strong steps to eliminate fissionable materials and nuclear weapons, it will only be a matter of time before they will be used in terrorist attacks on major cities. Neither terrorists nor organized criminals can be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, since they have no territory against which such retaliation could be directed. They blend invisibly into the general population. Nor can a "missile defense system" prevent terrorists from using nuclear weapons, since the weapons can be brought into a port in any one of the hundreds of thousands of containers that enter on ships each year, a number far too large to be checked exhaustively.

Today we must give special weight to the danger that a catastrophic nuclear war may occur through the mental instability of a political leader or an error of judgement, since we now are living with Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un. In the words of ICAN's Executive Director Beatrice Finn, the end of human civilization and much of the biosphere is "only a tantrum away". Donald Trump has repeatedly expressed his desire for more "usable" nuclear weapons. and if nuclear weapons are ever used, there is a strong danger of escalation to a full-scale thermonuclear war.

Another problem with the concept of nuclear deterrence is that even if the danger that a catastrophic nuclear war will occur in any given year is small, over a long period of time the danger builds up into a certainty. If the dangers for any given year are 1%, 2% or 3%, the probabilities of survival until 2100 are respectively 43%, 18% and 8%. If the period for which we must survive is extended to the year 2200, the chances of survival in the three cases are respectively .16%, .025%, and .0039%.

In this perilous situation, the only logical thing for the world to do is to get rid of both fissile materials and nuclear weapons as rapidly as possible. We must acknowledge that the idea of nuclear deterrence is a dangerous fallacy, and acknowledge that the development of military systems based on nuclear weapons has been a terrible mistake, a false step that needs to be reversed. If the most prestigious of the nuclear weapons states can sincerely acknowledge their mistakes and begin to reverse them, nuclear weapons will seem less glamorous to countries like India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iran, where they now are symbols of national pride and modernism.

Civilians have for too long played the role of passive targets, hostages in the power struggles of politicians. It is time for civil society to make its will felt. If our leaders

continue to enthusiastically support the institution of war, if they will not abolish nuclear weapons, then let us have new leaders.

4.6 Global famine produced by nuclear war

The danger of a catastrophic nuclear war casts a dark shadow over the future of our species. It also casts a very black shadow over the future of the global environment. The environmental consequences of a massive exchange of nuclear weapons have been treated in a number of studies by meteorologists and other experts from both East and West. They predict that a large-scale use of nuclear weapons would result in fire storms with very high winds and high temperatures, which would burn a large proportion of the wild land fuels in the affected nations. The resulting smoke and dust would block out sunlight for a period of many months, at first only in the northern hemisphere but later also in the southern hemisphere.

Temperatures in many places would fall far below freezing, and much of the earth's plant life would be killed. Animals and humans would then die of starvation. The nuclear winter effect was first discovered as a result of the Mariner 9 spacecraft exploration of Mars in 1971. The spacecraft arrived in the middle of an enormous dust-storm on Mars, and measured a large temperature drop at the surface of the planet, accompanied by a heating of the upper atmosphere. These measurements allowed scientists to check their theoretical models for predicting the effect of dust and other pollutants distributed in planetary atmospheres.

Using experience gained from the studies of Mars, R.P. Turco, O.B. Toon, T. Ackerman, J.B. Pollack and C. Sagan made a computer study of the climatic effects of the smoke and dust that would result from a large-scale nuclear war. This early research project is sometimes called the TTAPS Study, after the initials of the authors.

In April 1983, a special meeting was held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where the results of the TTAPS Study and other independent studies of the nuclear winter effect were discussed by more than 100 experts. Their conclusions were presented at a forum in Washington, D.C., the following December, under the chairmanship of U.S. Senators Kennedy and Hatfield. The numerous independent studies of the nuclear winter effect all agreed of the following main predictions:

High-yield nuclear weapons exploded near the earth's surface would put large amounts of dust into the upper atmosphere. Nuclear weapons exploded over cities, forests, oilfields and refineries would produce fire storms of the type experienced in Dresden and Hamburg after incendiary bombings during the Second World War. The combination of high-altitude dust and lower altitude soot would prevent sunlight from reaching the earth's surface, and the degree of obscuration would be extremely high for a wide range of scenarios.

A baseline scenario used by the TTAPS study assumes a 5,000-megaton nuclear exchange, but the threshold for triggering the nuclear winter effect is believed to be much lower than that. After such an exchange, the screening effect of pollutants in the atmosphere might be so great that, in the northern and middle latitudes, the sunlight reaching

the earth would be only 1% of ordinary sunlight on a clear day, and this effect would persist for many months. As a result, the upper layers in the atmosphere might rise in temperature by as much as 100 °C, while the surface temperatures would fall, perhaps by as much as 50 °C.

The temperature inversion produced in this way would lead to superstability, a condition in which the normal mixing of atmospheric layers is suppressed. The hydrological cycle (which normally takes moist air from the oceans to a higher and cooler level, where the moisture condenses as rain) would be strongly suppressed. Severe droughts would thus take place over continental land masses. The normal cleansing action of rain would be absent in the atmosphere, an effect which would prolong the nuclear winter.

In the northern hemisphere, forests would die because of lack of sunlight, extreme cold, and drought. Although the temperature drop in the southern hemisphere would be less severe, it might still be sufficient to kill a large portion of the tropical forests, which normally help to renew the earth's oxygen.

The oxygen content of the atmosphere would then fall dangerously, while the concentration of carbon dioxide and oxides of nitrogen produced by firestorms would remain high. The oxides of nitrogen would ultimately diffuse to the upper atmosphere, where they would destroy the ozone layer.

Thus, even when the sunlight returned after an absence of many months, it would be sunlight containing a large proportion of the ultraviolet frequencies which are normally absorbed by the ozone in the stratosphere, and therefore a type of light dangerous to life. Finally, after being so severely disturbed, there is no guarantee that the global climate would return to its normal equilibrium.

Even a nuclear war below the threshold of nuclear winter might have climatic effects very damaging to human life. Professor Paul Ehrlich, of Stanford University, has expressed this in the following words:

“...A smaller war, which set off fewer fires and put less dust into the atmosphere, could easily depress temperatures enough to essentially cancel grain production in the northern hemisphere. That in itself would be the greatest catastrophe ever delivered upon Homo Sapiens, just that one thing, not worrying about prompt effects. Thus even below the threshold, one cannot think of survival of a nuclear war as just being able to stand up after the bomb has gone off.”⁵

⁵<http://www.voanews.com/content/pope-francis-calls-for-nuclear-weapons-ban/2909357.html>
<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrence>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/avery300713.htm>
<https://www.wagingpeace.org/author/john-avery/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/06/70-years-after-bombing-hiroshima-calls-abolish-nuclear-weapons>
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42488.htm>
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42492.htm>
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-power>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/07/22/israel-iran-and-the-nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty/>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/06/25/militarisms-hostages/>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/05/24/the-path-to-zero-dialogues-on-nuclear-dangers-by-richard->

A 2012 report published by International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War states that even a small local nuclear war between India and Pakistan would put two billion people at risk of starvation.

4.7 Military-industrial complexes today

“We’re going to take out seven countries in five years”

In an interview with Amy Goodman⁶, retired 4-star General Wesley Clark said: “About ten days after 9/11, I went through the Pentagon and I saw Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz. I went downstairs just to say hello to some of the people on the Joint Staff who used to work for me, any one of the generals called me in. He said, “Sir, you’ve got to come in and talk to me a second.” I said, “Well, you’re too busy.” He said, “No, no.” He says, “We’ve made the decision we’re going to war with Iraq.” This was on or about the 20th of September. I said, “We’re going to war with Iraq? Why?” He said, “I don’t know.” He said, “I guess they don’t know what else to do.” So I said, “Well, did they find some information connecting Saddam to al-Qaeda?” He said, “No, no.” He says, “There’s nothing new that way. They just made the decision to go to war with Iraq.” He said, “I guess it’s like we don’t know what to do about terrorists, but we’ve got a good military and we can take down governments.” And he said, “I guess if the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem has to look like a nail.

So I came back to see him a few weeks later, and by that time we were bombing in Afghanistan. I said, “Are we still going to war with Iraq?” And he said, “Oh, it’s worse than that.” He reached over on his desk. He picked up a piece of paper. And he said, “I just got this down from upstairs” - meaning the Secretary of Defense’s office - “today.” And he said, “This is a memo that describes how we’re going to take out seven countries

falk-and-david-krieger/

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/03/30/europe-must-not-be-forced-into-a-nuclear-war-with-russia/>

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/32073-the-us-should-eliminate-its-nuclear-arsenal-not-modernize-it>

<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrance>

<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-6/arms-trade-treaty-opens-new-possibilities-u>

<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-6/article/remember-your-humanity>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42568.htm>

<https://firstlook.org/theintercept/2014/09/23/nobel-peace-prize-fact-day-syria-7th-country-bombed-obama/>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42577.htm>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42580.htm>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/us-unleashing-of-atomic-weapons-against-civilian-populations-was-a-criminal-act-of-the-first-order/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-the-power-of-peace/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-setsuko-thurlow/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-yasuaki-yamashita/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/03/why-nuclear-weapons/>

⁶<https://genius.com/General-wesley-clark-seven-countries-in-five-years-annotated>




Figure 4.3: **General Wesley Clark**

in five years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and, finishing off, Iran.” I said, “Is it classified?” He said, “Yes, sir.” I said, “Well, don’t show it to me.” And I saw him a year or so ago, and I said, “You remember that?” He said, “Sir, I didn’t show you that memo! I didn’t show it to you!”

The global trade in light arms

An important poverty-generating factor in the developing countries is war - often civil war. The five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council are, ironically, the five largest exporters of small arms. Small arms have a long life. The weapons poured into Africa by both sides during the Cold War are still there, and they contribute to political chaos and civil wars that block development and cause enormous human suffering.

The United Nations website on Peace and Security through Disarmament states that “Small arms and light weapons destabilize regions; spark, fuel and prolong conflicts; obstruct relief programmes; undermine peace initiatives; exacerbate human rights abuses; hamper development; and foster a ‘culture of violence’.”

An estimated 639 million small arms and light weapons are in circulation worldwide, one for every ten people. Approximately 300,000 people are killed every year by these weapons, many of them women and children.



Figure 4.4: 40,000 children die each day from starvation or from poverty-related diseases. Meanwhile, the world spends more than \$1,700,000,000,000 each year on armaments.

Examples of endemic conflict

In several regions of Africa, long-lasting conflicts have prevented development and caused enormous human misery. These regions include Ethiopia, Eritiria, Somalia (Darfur), Chad, Zimbabwe and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the Congo, the death toll reached 5.4 million in 2008, with most of the victims dying of disease and starvation, but with war as the root cause. In view of these statistics, the international community can be seen to have a strong responsibility to stop supplying small arms and ammunition to regions of conflict. There is absolutely no excuse for the large-scale manufacture and international sale of small arms that exists today.

The Wolfowitz Doctrine

The Wolfowitz Doctrine is the unofficial name given to the early version of the Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy report for the 1994-99 fiscal years. It was later released by then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney in 1993. It brazenly advocates that America do everything in its power to retain its global hegemony and superpower status, including ensuring that Russia, China, Iran and other regional powers - but especially Russia - be prevented from attaining enough power to seriously challenge the US. In short, it's another US blueprint for total global supremacy.

There are many quotable passages from the Wolfowitz Doctrine. Here's one which sums up its aims:

“Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia.”

Similar motives guide US policy today. In February, 2018, US Secretary of Defense James Mattis said: “We will continue to prosecute the campaign against terrorists, but great-power competition - not terrorism - is now the primary focus of US national security.”

Militarism in North Korea

The following states are now believed to currently possess nuclear weapons: The United states, Russia, The United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. The way in which North Korea obtained its nuclear weapons is described by Wikipedia in the following paragraphs:

“The nuclear program can be traced back to about 1962, when North Korea committed itself to what it called ‘all-fortressization’, which was the beginning of the hyper-militarized North Korea of today. In 1963, North Korea asked the Soviet Union for help in developing




Figure 4.5: **Countries by estimated nuclear warhead stockpiles according to the Federation of American scientists.**

nuclear weapons, but was refused. The Soviet Union agreed to help North Korea develop a peaceful nuclear energy program, including the training of nuclear scientists. Later, China, after its nuclear tests, similarly rejected North Korean requests for help with developing nuclear weapons.

“Soviet engineers took part in the construction of the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center and began construction of an IRT-2000 research reactor in 1963, which became operational in 1965 and was upgraded to 8 MW in 1974. In 1979 North Korea indigenously began to build in Yongbyon a second research reactor, an ore processing plant and a fuel rod fabrication plant. Soviet engineers took part in the construction of the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center, and began construction of an IRT-2000 research reactor in 1963, which became operational in 1965 and was upgraded to 8 MW in 1974. In 1979 North Korea indigenously began to build in Yongbyon a second research reactor, an ore processing plant and a fuel rod fabrication plant. ”

Thus like other new nuclear weapons states, North Korea obtained nuclear weapons by misuse of nuclear power generation facilities donated by other countries. In addition, North Korea spend a large fraction of its GDP on conventional armaments. Under the Songun policy, the Korean Peoples Army is the central institution of North Korean society. As of 2016, the Korean Peoples Army had 5,889,000 paramilitary personelle (25% of the population of North Korea) making it the largest paramilitary organization on earth.

Table 4.1: SIPRI Military Expenditure Database, 2016

Rank	Country	Annual Spending \$ Bn.	% of GDP
1	United State	611.2	3.3
2	China	215.7	1.9
3	Russia	69.2	5.3
4	Saudi Arabia	63.7	10
5	India	55.9	2.5
6	France	55.7	2.3
7	United Kingdom	48.3	1.9
8	Japan	46.1	1.0
9	Germany	41.1	1.2
10	South Korea	36.8	2.7
11	Italy	27.9	1.5
12	Australia	24.3	2.0

Table 4.2: SIPRI List of arms manufacturers, 2016

Rank	Company	Country	Annual Arms Sales \$ Mn.
1	Lockheed Martin	United States	40,830
2	Boeing	United States	29,510
3	Raytheon	United States	22,910
4	BAE Systems	United Kingdom	22,700
5	Northrop Grumman	United States	21,400
6	General Dynamics	United States	19,230
7	Airbus	European Union	12,520
8	L-3 Communications	United States	8,890
9	Leonardo-Finmeccanica	Italy	8,500
10	Thales Group	France	8,170
11	United Technologies Corporation	United States	6,870
12	Huntington Ingalls Industries	United States	6,720



Figure 4.6: North Korea’s dictator, Kim Jong-un. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence rests on the assumption that political leaders will always act rationally, an assumption that seems very uncertain in the case of the U.S.-North Korean conflict.

The SIPRI Yearbook, 2017

Dan Smith of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) wrote the following Introduction to the organization’s yearbook for 2017:

“An overall perspective on 2016 finds a balance between negative developments and the continued functioning of the international system. However, the year ended with clear grounds for concern that the balance sheet seemed to be tipping towards the negative amid growing unease about the durability of key parts of the international security architecture.

“Conflicts in the Middle East continued to generate humanitarian tragedies and large-scale movement of refugees, and violent conflict continued in several other parts of the world, most notably Africa, Asia and to a lesser extent Eastern Europe. Developments in North Korea’s nuclear programme contributed to international political instability with potentially serious knock-on effects. On the positive side, the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement entered into force in November 2016, the 2015 Iran nuclear deal began implementation on time in early 2016 and the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution to start negotiations in 2017 on eliminating nuclear weapons. Progress was also made on work to monitor the unfolding implementation of the UN’s Agenda 2030 for international social and economic development. A major contribution to the positive side of the balance sheet in 2016 was the peace agreement in Colombia.

“Nonetheless, virtually all the major global indicators for peace and security have moved in a negative direction: more military spending, increased arms trading, more violent conflicts and the continuing forward march of military technology.

“Existing multilateral and bilateral arms control agreements and processes are also under challenge-not least due to the deteriorating relationship between Russia and the United States-raising questions of global concern and potentially epochal scope. Were the great gains in peaceful relations since the end of the cold war now being reversed? Would the return of strategic competition between the major powers have negative implications for managing increased conflict risk? These uncertainties, combined with political developments in Europe and the USA- especially the vote by the United Kingdom to leave the European Union and the election of Donald J. Trump as US President-seemed to reveal

a much decreased commitment to international institutions and a renewed emphasis in several key states on a narrowly defined national interest.

“The scale of the challenges facing humanity has been summed up in the proposal to adopt the label of ‘the Anthropocene’ for the current era, thus designating it as one in which human activity is the dominant influence on climate and the environment. It is disconcerting to note that such cooperation risks becoming more elusive than it has seemed for most of the time since the end of the cold war, at a time when it is more needed than ever. Experience has shown that international cooperation can work. But is the international cooperative urge as persistent as the problems it needs to address?”

4.8 A culture of violence

Links with the entertainment industry

Here are a few films that glorify war:

- Black Hawk Down
- Top Gun
- Behind Enemy Lines
- Red Dawn (1984)
- American Sniper
- Iron Eagle
- Pearl Harbor
- Act of Valor
- We Were Soldiers
- The Green Berets

Making a game of killing

The mass media are an important part of our educational system. Perhaps it is time to look more closely at the values that they are transmitting. In particular, we should perhaps look at computer games designed for young boys. They often give the strongest imaginable support to a culture of violence.

For example, a game entitled “Full Spectrum Warrior” was recently reviewed in a Danish newspaper. According to the reviewer, “...An almost perfect combination of graphics, sound, band design, and gameplay makes it seem exactly like the film Black Hawk Down - with the player as the main character. This is not just a coincidence, because the game is based on an army training program... Full Spectrum Warrior is an extremely intense experience, and despite the advanced possibilities, the controls are simple enough so that young children can play it... The player is completely drawn into the screen, and remains there until the end of the mission.” The reviewer gave the game six stars (the maximum).



Figure 4.7: Tom Cruise in “Top Gun”.



Figure 4.8: A culture of violence supports the Devil’s Dynamo.




Figure 4.9: **A culture of violence:** In the United States the National Rifle Association has proposed guns in schools as the answer to the epidemic of school shootings.

Another genre of computer games has to do with building empires, ignoring the fact that imperialism is morally indefensible. For example, “Forge of Empires” is a browser-based strategy game. It is described as follows: “The game offers a single-player campaign for players to explore and conquer several provinces, gaining resources and new technology as they progress.” Conquering countries for the sake of gaining their resources is an all-too-familiar feature of the modern world. In the game “Forge of Empires”, our young people are indoctrinated with the ethos of resource wars.

During his trial, the Norwegian mass-murderer Anders Behring Breivik described how he trained for his attack on young people on the Island of UtÅ,ya using the computer game “Call of Duty: Modern Warfare”. The court also heard how he took what he called a “sabbatical” for a year between the summers of 2006 and 2007. During this year, he played a game called “World of Warcraft” full-time, in the bedroom of his mother’s Oslo flat, spending up to 16 hours a day using the game to distance himself from the human and moral significance of killing.

Is this not similar to the frame of mind of drone operators, sitting in comfort in their Nevada bunkers, distanced from the reality of killing? They are playing a computer game that kills targeted individuals and their families, in remote countries, by remote control. There is no need to look into the eyes of the victims. They are just abstract symbols in a computer game.




Figure 4.10: A culture of violence. Guns in schools?

4.9 The threats and costs of war

In the long run, because of the enormously destructive weapons, which have been produced through the misuse of science, the survival of civilization can only be insured if we are able to abolish the institution of war.

Modern warfare has become prohibitively dangerous and destructive because of the enormously powerful weapons that scientists and engineers have developed. The institution of war could not continue without their cooperation. Thus, scientists and engineers throughout the world have a special responsibility.

Wars are driven by the collective paranoia of voters, who are willing to allow colossal sums to be spent by ‘Defense Departments’. But are civilians really defended? Absolutely not!

We can see this most clearly if we think of nuclear war. Nations threaten each other with “Mutually Assured Destruction”, which has the very appropriate acronym MAD. What does this mean? Does it mean that civilians are being protected? Not at all. Instead they are threatened with complete destruction. Civilians here play the role of hostages in the power games of their leaders. Those leaders’ goal is not protection of ordinary people, but rather protection of the gargantuan profits of the military-industrial complex. As the Indian writer Arundhati Roy put it, “Once weapons were manufactured to fight wars. Now wars are manufactured to sell weapons.”

If a thermonuclear war occurs, it will be the end of human civilization and much of the biosphere. This will definitely happen in the future unless the world rids itself of nuclear weapons, since, in the long run, the finite chance of accidental nuclear war happening due to a technical or human failure during a given year will gradually build up into a certainty of disaster. Scientists and engineers must not sell their knowledge and talents to this march towards the precipice.

The direct and indirect costs of war

The costs of war, both direct and indirect, are so enormous that they are almost beyond comprehension. We face a direct threat because a thermonuclear war may destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere, and an indirect threat because the institution of war interferes seriously with the use of tax money for constructive and peaceful purposes.

Today, despite the end of the Cold War, the world spends roughly 2 trillion (i.e. 1.7 million million) US dollars each year on armaments. This colossal flood of money could have been used instead for education, famine relief, development of infrastructure, or on urgently needed public health measures.

The World Health Organization lacks funds to carry through an antimalarial program on as large a scale as would be desirable, but the entire program could be financed for less than our military establishments spend in a single day. Five hours of world arms spending is equivalent to the total cost of the 20-year WHO campaign that resulted in the eradication of smallpox. For every 100,000 people in the world, there are 556 soldiers, but only 85 doctors. Every soldier costs an average of \$20,000 per year, while the average spent on



Figure 4.11: **Children born with birth defects due to the US use of Agent Orange during the Vietnam War. Source: stopwarcoalition.org**

education is only \$380 per school-aged child. With a diversion of funds consumed by three weeks of military spending, the world could create a sanitary water supply for all its people, thus eliminating the cause of almost half of all human illness.

A new drug-resistant form of tuberculosis has recently become widespread in Asia and in the former Soviet Union. In order to combat this new and highly dangerous form of tuberculosis and to prevent its spread, WHO needs \$500 million, an amount equivalent to 1.2 hours of world arms spending.

Today's world is one in which roughly ten million children die every year from starvation or from diseases related to poverty. Besides this enormous waste of young lives through malnutrition and preventable disease, there is a huge waste of opportunities through inadequate education. The rate of illiteracy in the 25 least developed countries is 80%, and the total number of illiterates in the world is estimated to be 800 million. Meanwhile every 60 seconds the world spends \$6.5 million on armaments.

It is plain that if the almost unbelievable sums now wasted on the institution of war were used constructively, most of the pressing problems of humanity could be solved, but today the world spends more than 20 times as much on war as it does on development.

Medical and psychological consequences; loss of life

While in earlier epochs it may have been possible to confine the effects of war mainly to combatants, in the 20th century the victims of war were increasingly civilians, and especially children. For example, according to Quincy Wright's statistics, the First and Second World Wars cost the lives of 26 million soldiers, but the toll in civilian lives was much larger: 64 million.

Since the Second World War, despite the best efforts of the UN, there have been over 150 armed conflicts; and, if civil wars are included, there are on any given day an average of 12 wars somewhere in the world. In the conflicts in Indo-China, the proportion of civilian victims was between 80% and 90%, while in the Lebanese civil war some sources state that the proportion of civilian casualties was as high as 97%.

Civilian casualties often occur through malnutrition and through diseases that would be preventable in normal circumstances. Because of the social disruption caused by war,



Figure 4.12: A little girl cries as medics attend to her injuries at al-Shifa hospital in Gaza in 2014, during the conflict. Photo: UNICEF/Eyad El Baba

normal supplies of food, safe water and medicine are interrupted, so that populations become vulnerable to famine and epidemics.⁷

Effects of war on children

According to UNICEF figures, 90% of the casualties of recent wars have been civilians, and 50% children. The organization estimates that in recent years, violent conflicts have driven 20 million children from their homes. They have become refugees or internally displaced persons within their own countries.

During the last decade 2 million children have been killed and 6 million seriously injured or permanently disabled as the result of armed conflicts, while 1 million children have been orphaned or separated from their families. Of the ten countries with the highest rates of death of children under five years of age, seven are affected by armed conflicts. UNICEF estimates that 300,000 child soldiers are currently forced to fight in 30 armed conflicts throughout the world. Many of these have been forcibly recruited or abducted.

Even when they are not killed or wounded by conflicts, children often experience painful psychological traumas: the violent death of parents or close relatives, separation from their families, seeing family members tortured, displacement from home, disruption of ordinary life, exposure to shelling and other forms of combat, starvation and anxiety about the future.⁸

⁷<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/volume-2/issue-2-part-3/lessons-world-war-i>
<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27201-the-leading-terrorist-state>

⁸<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2080482/>



Figure 4.13: Asylum-seekers in a holding centre on Greece's Samos Island.

Refugees

Human Rights Watch estimates that in 2001 there were 15 million refugees in the world, forced from their countries by war, civil and political conflict, or by gross violations of human rights. In addition, there were an estimated 22 million internally displaced persons, violently forced from their homes but still within the borders of their countries.

In 2001, 78% of all refugees came from ten areas: Afghanistan, Angola, Burma, Burundi, Congo-Kinshasa, Eritrea, Iraq, the Palestinian territories, Somalia and Sudan. A quarter of all refugees are Palestinians, who make up the world's oldest and largest refugee population. 45% of the world's refugees have found sanctuaries in Asia, 30% in Africa, 19% in Europe and 5% in North America.

Refugees who have crossed an international border are in principle protected by Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which affirms their right "to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution". In 1950 the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees was created to implement Article 14, and in 1951 the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees was adopted by the UN. By 2002 this legally binding treaty had been signed by 140 nations. However the industrialized countries have recently adopted a very hostile and restrictive attitude towards refugees, subjecting them to arbitrary arrests, denial of social and economic rights, and even forcible return to countries in which they face persecution.

The status of internally displaced persons is even worse than that of refugees who have crossed international borders. In many cases the international community simply ignores their suffering, reluctant to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states. In fact, the United Nations Charter is self-contradictory in this respect, since on the one hand it calls for non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, but on the other hand, people everywhere are guaranteed freedom from persecution by the Charter's Universal

Declaration of Human Rights.⁹

Damage to infrastructure

Most insurance policies have clauses written in fine print exempting companies from payment of damage caused by war. The reason for this is simple. The damage caused by war is so enormous that insurance companies could never come near to paying for it without going bankrupt.

We mentioned above that the world spends 1.7 trillion dollars each year on preparations for war. A similarly colossal amount is needed to repair the damage to infrastructure caused by war. Sometimes this damage is unintended, but sometimes it is intentional.

During World War II, one of the main aims of air attacks by both sides was to destroy the industrial infrastructure of the opponent. This made some sense in a war expected to last several years, because the aim was to prevent the enemy from producing more munitions. However, during the Gulf War of 1990, the infrastructure of Iraq was attacked, even though the war was expected to be short. Electrical generating plants and water purification facilities were deliberately destroyed with the apparent aim of obtaining leverage over Iraq after the war.

In general, because war has such a catastrophic effect on infrastructure, it can be thought of as the opposite of development. War is the greatest generator of poverty.¹⁰

Ecological damage

Warfare during the 20th century has not only caused the loss of 175 million lives (primarily civilians) - it has also caused the greatest ecological catastrophes in human history. The damage takes place even in times of peace. Studies by Joni Seager, a geographer at the University of Vermont, conclude that “a military presence anywhere in the world is the single most reliable predictor of ecological damage”.

Modern warfare destroys environments to such a degree that it has been described as an “environmental holocaust.” For example, herbicides use in the Vietnam War killed an estimated 6.2 billion board-feet of hardwood trees in the forests north and west of Saigon, according to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Herbicides such as Agent Orange also made enormous areas of previously fertile land unsuitable for agriculture for many years to come. In Vietnam and elsewhere in the world, valuable agricultural land has also been lost because land mines or the remains of cluster bombs make it too dangerous for farming.

During the Gulf War of 1990, the oil spills amounted to 150 million barrels, 650 times the amount released into the environment by the notorious Exxon Valdez disaster. During

⁹<https://www.hrw.org/topic/refugees>

¹⁰<https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2002/11/iraq-n04.html>
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/crimes-against-humanity-the-destruction-of-iraqs-electricity-infrastructure-the-social-economic-and-environmental-impacts/5355665>
<http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/00157630-EN-ERP-48.PDF>



Figure 4.14: Image source: Greenpeace

the Gulf War an enormous number of shells made of depleted uranium were fired. When the dust produced by exploded shells is inhaled it often produces cancer, and it will remain in the environment of Iraq for decades.

Radioactive fallout from nuclear tests pollutes the global environment and causes many thousands of cases of cancer, as well as birth abnormalities. Most nuclear tests have been carried out on lands belonging to indigenous peoples. Agent Orange also produced cancer, birth abnormalities and other serious forms of illness both in the Vietnamese population and among the foreign soldiers fighting in Vietnam¹¹

4.10 The threat of nuclear war

As bad as conventional arms and conventional weapons may be, it is the possibility of a catastrophic nuclear war that poses the greatest threat to humanity. There are today roughly 16,000 nuclear warheads in the world. The total explosive power of the warheads that exist or that could be made on short notice is approximately equal to 500,000 Hiroshima bombs.

To multiply the tragedy of Hiroshima by a factor of half a million makes an enormous difference, not only quantitatively, but also qualitatively. Those who have studied the question believe that a nuclear catastrophe today would inflict irreversible damage on our civilization, genetic pool and environment.

Thermonuclear weapons consist of an inner core where the fission of uranium-235 or plutonium takes place. The fission reaction in the core is able to start a fusion reaction in the next layer, which contains isotopes of hydrogen. It is possible to add a casing of ordinary uranium outside the hydrogen layer, and under the extreme conditions produced

¹¹<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2401378/Agent-Orange-Vietnamese-children-suffering-effects-herbicide-sprayed-US-Army-40-years-ago.html>



Figure 4.15: **The 15 megaton explosion detonated by the United States at Bikini Atoll in 1954 produced lasting biological damage to humans and animals living on the distant Marshall Islands. Today, half a century later, the islanders still experience radiation sickness in the form of leukemia and birth defects. Source: www.theguardian.com**

by the fusion reaction, this ordinary uranium can undergo fission. In this way, a fission-fusion-fission bomb of almost limitless power can be produced.

For a victim of severe radiation exposure, the symptoms during the first week are nausea, vomiting, fever, apathy, delirium, diarrhoea, oropharyngeal lesions and leukopenia. Death occurs during the first or second week.

We can perhaps be helped to imagine what a nuclear catastrophe means in human terms by reading the words of a young university professor, who was 2,500 meters from the hypocenter at the time of the bombing of Hiroshima: “Everything I saw made a deep impression: a park nearby covered with dead bodies... very badly injured people evacuated in my direction... Perhaps most impressive were girls, very young girls, not only with their clothes torn off, but their skin peeled off as well. ... My immediate thought was that this was like the hell I had always read about. ... I had never seen anything which resembled it before, but I thought that should there be a hell, this was it.”

One argument that has been used in favor of nuclear weapons is that no sane political leader would employ them. However, the concept of deterrence ignores the possibility of war by accident or miscalculation, a danger that has been increased by nuclear proliferation and by the use of computers with very quick reaction times to control weapons systems.

Recent nuclear power plant accidents remind us that accidents frequently happen through human and technical failure, even for systems which are considered to be very “safe.” We must also remember the time scale of the problem. To assure the future of humanity, nuclear catastrophe must be avoided year after year and decade after decade. In the long run, the safety of civilization cannot be achieved except by the abolition of nuclear weapons, and ultimately the abolition of the institution of war.

In 1985, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War received the Nobel



Figure 4.16: A nuclear war would be an ecological disaster, making large portions of the world permanently uninhabitable because of long-lasting radioactivity. Chernobyl radiation map 1996 30km zone by CIA Factbook. Licensed under CC BY-SA 2.5 via Wikimedia Commons.



Figure 4.17: Sculpture depicting Saint George slaying the dragon. The dragon is created from fragments of Soviet SS-20 and United States Pershing nuclear missiles. UN Photo/Milton Grant

Peace Prize. IPPNW had been founded in 1980 by six physicians, three from the Soviet Union and three from the United States. Today, the organization has wide membership among the world's physicians. Professor Bernard Lowen of the Harvard School of Public Health, one of the founders of IPPNW, said in a recent speech:

"...No public health hazard ever faced by humankind equals the threat of nuclear war. Never before has man possessed the destructive resources to make this planet uninhabitable... Modern medicine has nothing to offer, not even a token benefit, in the event of nuclear war..."

"We are but transient passengers on this planet Earth. It does not belong to us. We are not free to doom generations yet unborn. We are not at liberty to erase humanity's past or dim its future. Social systems do not endure for eternity. Only life can lay claim to uninterrupted continuity. This continuity is sacred."

The danger of a catastrophic nuclear war casts a dark shadow over the future of our species. It also casts a very black shadow over the future of the global environment. The environmental consequences of a massive exchange of nuclear weapons have been treated in a number of studies by meteorologists and other experts from both East and West. They predict that a large-scale use of nuclear weapons would result in fire storms with very high winds and high temperatures, which would burn a large proportion of the wild land fuels in the affected nations. The resulting smoke and dust would block out sunlight for a period of many months, at first only in the northern hemisphere but later also in the southern hemisphere.

Temperatures in many places would fall far below freezing, and much of the earth's plant life would be killed. Animals and humans would then die of starvation. The nuclear winter effect was first discovered as a result of the Mariner 9 spacecraft exploration of Mars in 1971. The spacecraft arrived in the middle of an enormous dust-storm on Mars, and measured a large temperature drop at the surface of the planet, accompanied by a heating of the upper atmosphere. These measurements allowed scientists to check their theoretical models for predicting the effect of dust and other pollutants distributed in planetary atmospheres.

Using experience gained from the studies of Mars, R.P. Turco, O.B. Toon, T. Ackerman, J.B. Pollack and C. Sagan made a computer study of the climatic effects of the smoke and dust that would result from a large-scale nuclear war. This early research project is sometimes called the TTAPS Study, after the initials of the authors.

In April 1983, a special meeting was held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where the results of the TTAPS Study and other independent studies of the nuclear winter effect were discussed by more than 100 experts. Their conclusions were presented at a forum in Washington, D.C., the following December, under the chairmanship of U.S. Senators Kennedy and Hatfield. The numerous independent studies of the nuclear winter effect all agreed of the following main predictions:

High-yield nuclear weapons exploded near the earth's surface would put large amounts of dust into the upper atmosphere. Nuclear weapons exploded over cities, forests, oilfields and refineries would produce fire storms of the type experienced in Dresden and Hamburg after incendiary bombings during the Second World War. The combination of high-altitude

dust and lower altitude soot would prevent sunlight from reaching the earth's surface, and the degree of obscuration would be extremely high for a wide range of scenarios.

A baseline scenario used by the TTAPS study assumes a 5,000-megaton nuclear exchange, but the threshold for triggering the nuclear winter effect is believed to be much lower than that. After such an exchange, the screening effect of pollutants in the atmosphere might be so great that, in the northern and middle latitudes, the sunlight reaching the earth would be only 1% of ordinary sunlight on a clear day, and this effect would persist for many months. As a result, the upper layers in the atmosphere might rise in temperature by as much as 100 °C, while the surface temperatures would fall, perhaps by as much as 50 °C.

The temperature inversion produced in this way would lead to superstability, a condition in which the normal mixing of atmospheric layers is suppressed. The hydrological cycle (which normally takes moist air from the oceans to a higher and cooler level, where the moisture condenses as rain) would be strongly suppressed. Severe droughts would thus take place over continental land masses. The normal cleansing action of rain would be absent in the atmosphere, an effect which would prolong the nuclear winter.

In the northern hemisphere, forests would die because of lack of sunlight, extreme cold, and drought. Although the temperature drop in the southern hemisphere would be less severe, it might still be sufficient to kill a large portion of the tropical forests, which normally help to renew the earth's oxygen.

The oxygen content of the atmosphere would then fall dangerously, while the concentration of carbon dioxide and oxides of nitrogen produced by firestorms would remain high. The oxides of nitrogen would ultimately diffuse to the upper atmosphere, where they would destroy the ozone layer.

Thus, even when the sunlight returned after an absence of many months, it would be sunlight containing a large proportion of the ultraviolet frequencies which are normally absorbed by the ozone in the stratosphere, and therefore a type of light dangerous to life. Finally, after being so severely disturbed, there is no guarantee that the global climate would return to its normal equilibrium.

Even a nuclear war below the threshold of nuclear winter might have climatic effects very damaging to human life. Professor Paul Ehrlich, of Stanford University, has expressed this in the following words:

“...A smaller war, which set off fewer fires and put less dust into the atmosphere, could easily depress temperatures enough to essentially cancel grain production in the northern hemisphere. That in itself would be the greatest catastrophe ever delivered upon Homo Sapiens, just that one thing, not worrying about prompt effects. Thus even below the threshold, one cannot think of survival of a nuclear war as just being able to stand up after the bomb has gone off.”¹²

¹²<http://www.voanews.com/content/pope-francis-calls-for-nuclear-weapons-ban/2909357.html>
<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrance>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/avery300713.htm>
<https://www.wagingpeace.org/author/john-avery/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/06/70-years-after-bombing-hiroshima-calls-abolish->

4.11 Flaws in the concept of nuclear deterrence

Before discussing other defects in the concept of deterrence, it must be said very clearly that the idea of “massive nuclear retaliation” is completely unacceptable from an ethical point of view. The doctrine of retaliation, performed on a massive scale, violates not only the principles of common human decency and common sense, but also the ethical principles of every major religion. Retaliation is especially contrary to the central commandment of Christianity which tells us to love our neighbor, even if he or she is far away from us, belonging to a different ethnic or political group, and even if our distant neighbor has seriously injured us. This principle has a fundamental place not only in Christianity but also in Buddhism. “Massive retaliation” completely violates these very central ethical principles, which are not only clearly stated and fundamental but also very practical, since they prevent escalatory cycles of revenge and counter-revenge.

Contrast Christian ethics with estimates of the number of deaths that would follow a US nuclear strike against Russia: Several hundred million deaths. These horrifying estimates shock us not only because of the enormous magnitude of the expected mortality, but also because the victims would include people of every kind: women, men, old people, children and infants, completely irrespective of any degree of guilt that they might have. As a result of such an attack, many millions of people in neutral countries would also die. This type of killing has to be classified as genocide.

When a suspected criminal is tried for a wrongdoing, great efforts are devoted to clar-

nuclear-weapons

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42488.htm>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42492.htm>

<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-power>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/07/22/israel-iran-and-the-nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/06/25/militarisms-hostages/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/05/24/the-path-to-zero-dialogues-on-nuclear-dangers-by-richard-falk-and-david-krieger/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/03/30/europe-must-not-be-forced-into-a-nuclear-war-with-russia/>

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/32073-the-us-should-eliminate-its-nuclear-arsenal-not-modernize-it>

<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrance>

<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-6/arms-trade-treaty-opens-new-possibilities-u>

<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-6/article/remember-your-humanity>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42568.htm>

<https://firstlook.org/theintercept/2014/09/23/nobel-peace-prize-fact-day-syria-7th-country-bombed-obama/>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42577.htm>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42580.htm>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/us-unleashing-of-atomic-weapons-against-civilian-populations-was-a-criminal-act-of-the-first-order/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-the-power-of-peace/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-setsuko-thurlow/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-yasuaki-yamashita/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/03/why-nuclear-weapons/>

ifying the question of guilt or innocence. Punishment only follows if guilt can be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. Contrast this with the totally indiscriminate mass slaughter that results from a nuclear attack!

It might be objected that disregard for the guilt or innocence of victims is a universal characteristic of modern war, since statistics show that, with time, a larger and larger percentage of the victims have been civilians, and especially children. For example, the air attacks on Coventry during World War II, or the fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo, produced massive casualties which involved all segments of the population with complete disregard for the question of guilt or innocence. The answer, I think, is that modern war has become generally unacceptable from an ethical point of view, and this unacceptability is epitomized in nuclear weapons.

The enormous and indiscriminate destruction produced by nuclear weapons formed the background for an historic 1996 decision by the International Court of Justice in the Hague. In response to questions put to it by WHO and the UN General Assembly, the Court ruled that “the threat and use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and particularly the principles and rules of humanitarian law.” The only *possible* exception to this general rule might be “an extreme circumstance of self-defense, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake”. But the Court refused to say that even in this extreme circumstance the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be legal. It left the exceptional case undecided. In addition, the World Court added unanimously that “there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith *and bring to a conclusion* negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict international control.”

This landmark decision has been criticized by the nuclear weapon states as being decided “by a narrow margin”, but the structuring of the vote made the margin seem more narrow than it actually was. Seven judges voted against Paragraph 2E of the decision (the paragraph which states that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be generally illegal, but which mentions as a possible exception the case where a nation might be defending itself from an attack that threatened its very existence.) Seven judges voted for the paragraph, with the President of the Court, Muhammad Bedjaoui of Algeria casting the deciding vote. Thus the Court adopted it, seemingly by a narrow margin. But three of the judges who voted against 2E did so because they believed that no possible exception should be mentioned! Thus, if the vote had been slightly differently structured, the result would have been ten to four.

Of the remaining four judges who cast dissenting votes, three represented nuclear weapons states, while the fourth thought that the Court ought not to have accepted the questions from WHO and the UN. However Judge Schwebel from the United States, who voted against Paragraph 2E, nevertheless added, in a separate opinion, “It cannot be accepted that the use of nuclear weapons on a scale which would - or could - result in the deaths of many millions in indiscriminate inferno and by far-reaching fallout, have pernicious effects in space and time, and render uninhabitable much of the earth, could be lawful.” Judge Higgins from the UK, the first woman judge in the history of the Court, had problems with the word “generally” in Paragraph 2E and therefore voted against it,

but she thought that a more profound analysis might have led the Court to conclude in favor of illegality in all circumstances. Judge Fleischhauer of Germany said in his separate opinion, “The nuclear weapon is, in many ways, the negation of the humanitarian considerations underlying the law applicable in armed conflict and the principle of neutrality. The nuclear weapon cannot distinguish between civilian and military targets. It causes immeasurable suffering. The radiation released by it is unable to respect the territorial integrity of neutral States.”

President Bedjaoui, summarizing the majority opinion, called nuclear weapons “the ultimate evil”, and said “By its nature, the nuclear weapon, this blind weapon, destabilizes humanitarian law, the law of discrimination in the use of weapons... The ultimate aim of every action in the field of nuclear arms will always be nuclear disarmament, an aim which is no longer utopian and which all have a duty to pursue more actively than ever.”

Thus the concept of nuclear deterrence is not only unacceptable from the standpoint of ethics; it is also contrary to international law. The World Courts 1996 advisory Opinion unquestionably also represents the opinion of the majority of the world's peoples. Although no formal plebiscite has been taken, the votes in numerous resolutions of the UN General Assembly speak very clearly on this question. For example the New Agenda Resolution (53/77Y) was adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1998 by a massively affirmative vote, in which only 18 out of the 170 member states voted against the resolution.¹³ The New Agenda Resolution proposes numerous practical steps towards complete nuclear disarmament, and it calls on the Nuclear-Weapon States “to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)”. Thus, in addition to being ethically unacceptable and contrary to international law, nuclear weapons also contrary to the principles of democracy.

More recently, on 7 July, 2017, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons was passed by a massive majority in the General Assembly of the United Nations, It was opposed only by the nuclear weapons states and a few of their allies. The Nuclear Ban Treaty makes it very clear that nuclear weapons are illegal under international law. Although the nuclear weapons states still cling to their world-destroying weapons, it is to be hoped that the force of global public opinion will eventually force them to comply with the law.

Having said these important things, we can now turn to some of the other defects in the concept of nuclear deterrence. One important defect is that nuclear war may occur through accident or miscalculation - through technical defects or human failings. This possibility is made greater by the fact that despite the end of the Cold War, thousands of missiles carrying nuclear warheads are still kept on a “hair-trigger” state of alert with

¹³Of the 18 countries that voted against the New Agenda resolution, 10 were Eastern European countries hoping for acceptance into NATO, whose votes seem to have been traded for increased probability of acceptance.

a quasi-automatic reaction time measured in minutes. There is a constant danger that a nuclear war will be triggered by error in evaluating the signal on a radar screen. For example, the BBC reported recently that a group of scientists and military leaders are worried that a small asteroid entering the earth's atmosphere and exploding could trigger a nuclear war if mistaken for a missile strike.

A number of prominent political and military figures (many of whom have ample knowledge of the system of deterrence, having been part of it) have expressed concern about the danger of accidental nuclear war. Colin S. Grey¹⁴ expressed this concern as follows: "The problem, indeed the enduring problem, is that we are resting our future upon a nuclear deterrence system concerning which we cannot tolerate even a single malfunction." General Curtis E. LeMay¹⁵ has written, "In my opinion a general war will grow through a series of political miscalculations and accidents rather than through any deliberate attack by either side." Bruce G. Blair¹⁶ has remarked that "It is obvious that the rushed nature of the process, from warning to decision to action, risks causing a catastrophic mistake."... "This system is an accident waiting to happen."

Today, the system that is supposed to give us security is called Mutually Assured Destruction, appropriately abbreviated as MAD. It is based on the idea of deterrence, which maintains that because of the threat of massive retaliation, no sane leader would start a nuclear war.

One important defect in the concept of deterrence is the fact that nuclear war may occur through accident or miscalculation, through technical defects or human failings, or by terrorism. This possibility is made greater by the fact that despite the end of the Cold War, thousands of missiles carrying nuclear warheads are still kept on "hair-trigger alert" with a quasi-automatic reaction time measured in minutes. There is a constant danger that a nuclear war will be triggered by error in evaluating the signal on a radar screen.

Incidents in which global disaster is avoided by a hair's breadth are constantly occurring. For example, on the night of 26 September, 1983, Lt. Col. Stanislav Petrov, a young software engineer, was on duty at a surveillance center near Moscow. Suddenly the screen in front of him turned bright red.

An alarm went off. It's enormous piercing sound filled the room. A second alarm followed, and then a third, fourth and fifth. "The computer showed that the Americans had launched a strike against us", Petrov remembered later. His orders were to pass the information up the chain of command to Secretary General Yuri Andropov. Within minutes, a nuclear counterattack would be launched. However, because of certain inconsistent features of the alarm, Petrov disobeyed orders and reported it as a computer error, which indeed it was.

Most of us probably owe our lives to his coolheaded decision and knowledge of software systems. The narrowness of this escape is compounded by the fact that Petrov was on duty only because of the illness of another officer with less knowledge of software, who would

¹⁴Chairman, National Institute for Public Policy

¹⁵Founder and former Commander in Chief of the United States Strategic Air Command

¹⁶Brookings Institute

have accepted the alarm as real.

Narrow escapes such as this show us clearly that in the long run, the combination of space-age science and stone-age politics will destroy us. We urgently need new political structures and new ethics to match our advanced technology.

4.12 Dangers of nuclear power generation

The Chernobyl disaster

The dangers of nuclear power generation are exemplified by the Chernobyl disaster: On the 26th of April, 1986, during the small hours of the morning, the staff of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor in Ukraine turned off several safety systems in order to perform a test. The result was a core meltdown in Reactor 4, causing a chemical explosion that blew off the reactor's 1,000-ton steel and concrete lid. 190 tons of highly radioactive uranium and graphite were hurled into the atmosphere. The resulting radioactive fallout was 200 times greater than that caused by the nuclear bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The radioactive cloud spread over Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, Finland, Sweden and Eastern Europe, exposing the populations of these regions to levels of radiation 100 times the normal background. Ultimately, the radioactive cloud reached as far as Greenland and parts of Asia.

The exact number of casualties resulting from the Chernobyl meltdown is a matter of controversy, but according to a United Nations report, as many as 9 million people have been adversely affected by the disaster. Since 1986, the rate of thyroid cancer in affected areas has increased ten-fold. An area of 155,000 square kilometers (almost half the size of Italy) in Belarus, Ukraine and Russia is still severely contaminated. Even as far away as Wales, hundreds of farms are still under restrictions because of sheep eating radioactive grass.

Public opinion turned against nuclear power generation as a result of the Chernobyl disaster. Had the disaster taken place in Western Europe or North America, its effect on public opinion would have been still greater. Nevertheless, because of the current energy crisis, and because of worries about global warming, a number of people are arguing that nuclear energy should be given a second chance. The counter-argument is that a large increase in the share of nuclear power in the total spectrum of energy production would have little effect on climate change but it would involve unacceptable dangers, not only dangers of accidents and dangers associated with radioactive waste disposal, but above all, dangers of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Of the two bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one made use of the rare isotope of uranium, U-235, while the other used plutonium. Both of these materials can be made by a nation with a nuclear power generation program.

Reactors and nuclear weapons

Uranium has atomic number 92, i.e., a neutral uranium atom has a nucleus containing 92 positively-charged protons, around which 92 negatively-charged electrons circle. All of the isotopes of uranium have the same number of protons and electrons, and hence the same chemical properties, but they differ in the number of neutrons in their nuclei. For example, the nucleus of U-235 has 143 neutrons, while that of U-238 has 146. Notice that $92+143=235$, while $92+146=238$. The number written after the name of an element to specify a particular isotope is the number of neutrons plus the number of protons. This is called the "nucleon number", and the weight of an isotope is roughly proportional to it. This means that U-238 is slightly heavier than U-235. If the two isotopes are to be separated, difficult physical methods dependent on mass must be used, since their chemical properties are identical. In natural uranium, the amount of the rare isotope U-235 is only 0.7 percent.

A paper published in 1939 by Niels Bohr and John A. Wheeler indicated that it was the rare isotope of uranium, U-235, that undergoes fission. A bomb could be constructed, they pointed out, if enough highly enriched U-235 could be isolated from the more common isotope, U-238. Calculations later performed in England by Otto Frisch and Rudolf Peierls showed that the "critical mass" of highly enriched uranium needed is quite small: only a few kilograms.

The Bohr-Wheeler theory also predicted that an isotope of plutonium, Pu-239, should be just as fissionable as U-235¹⁷. Instead of trying to separate the rare isotope, U-235, from the common isotope, U-238, physicists could just operate a nuclear reactor until a sufficient amount of Pu-239 accumulated, and then separate it out by ordinary chemical means.

Thus in 1942, when Enrico Fermi and his coworkers at the University of Chicago produced the world's first controlled chain reaction within a pile of cans containing ordinary (nonenriched) uranium powder, separated by blocks of very pure graphite, the chain-reacting pile had a double significance: It represented a new source of energy for mankind, but it also had a sinister meaning. It represented an easy path to nuclear weapons, since one of the by-products of the reaction was a fissionable isotope of plutonium, Pu-239. The bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 used U-235, while the Nagasaki bomb used Pu-239.

By reprocessing spent nuclear fuel rods, using ordinary chemical means, a nation with a power reactor can obtain weapons-usable Pu-239. Even when such reprocessing is performed under international control, the uncertainty as to the amount of Pu-239 obtained is large enough so that the operation might superficially seem to conform to regulations while still supplying enough Pu-239 to make many bombs.

¹⁷Both U-235 and Pu-239 have odd nucleon numbers. When U-235 absorbs a neutron, it becomes U-236, while when Pu-239 absorbs a neutron it becomes Pu-240. In other words, absorption of a neutron converts both these species to nuclei with even nucleon numbers. According to the Bohr-Wheeler theory, nuclei with even nucleon numbers are especially tightly-bound. Thus absorption of a neutron converts U-235 to a highly-excited state of U-236, while Pu-239 is similarly converted to a highly excited state of Pu-240. The excitation energy distorts the nuclei to such an extent that fission becomes possible.

The enrichment of uranium¹⁸ is also linked to reactor use. Many reactors of modern design make use of low enriched uranium (LEU) as a fuel. Nations operating such a reactor may claim that they need a program for uranium enrichment in order to produce LEU for fuel rods. However, by operating their ultracentrifuges a little longer, they can easily produce highly enriched uranium (HEU), i.e., uranium containing a high percentage of the rare isotope U-235, and therefore usable in weapons.

Known reserves of uranium are only sufficient for the generation of 8×10^{20} joules of electrical energy¹⁹, i.e., about 25 TWy. It is sometimes argued that a larger amount of electricity could be obtained from the same amount of uranium through the use of fast breeder reactors, but this would involve totally unacceptable proliferation risks. In fast breeder reactors, the fuel rods consist of highly enriched uranium. Around the core, is an envelope of natural uranium. The flux of fast neutrons from the core is sufficient to convert a part of the U-238 in the envelope into Pu-239, a fissionable isotope of plutonium.

Fast breeder reactors are prohibitively dangerous from the standpoint of nuclear proliferation because both the highly enriched uranium from the fuel rods and the Pu-239 from the envelope are directly weapons-usable. It would be impossible, from the standpoint of equity, to maintain that some nations have the right to use fast breeder reactors, while others do not. If all nations used fast breeder reactors, the number of nuclear weapons states would increase drastically.

It is interesting to review the way in which Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, India and North Korea²⁰ obtained their nuclear weapons, since in all these cases the weapons were constructed under the guise of “atoms for peace”, a phrase that future generations may someday regard as being tragically self-contradictory.

Israel began producing nuclear weapons in the late 1960's (with the help of a “peaceful” nuclear reactor provided by France, and with the tacit approval of the United States) and the country is now believed to possess 100-150 of them, including neutron bombs. Israel's policy is one of visibly possessing nuclear weapons while denying their existence.

South Africa, with the help of Israel and France, also weaponized its civil nuclear program, and it tested nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean in 1979. In 1991 however, South Africa destroyed its nuclear weapons and signed the NPT.

India produced what it described as a “peaceful nuclear explosion” in 1974. By 1989 Indian scientists were making efforts to purify the lithium-6 isotope, a key component of the much more powerful thermonuclear bombs. In 1998, India conducted underground tests of nuclear weapons, and is now believed to have roughly 60 warheads, constructed from Pu-239 produced in “peaceful” reactors.

Pakistan's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons were spurred by India's 1974 “peaceful nuclear explosion”. As early as 1970, the laboratory of Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan, (a metallurgist who was to become Pakistan's leading nuclear bomb maker) had been able to obtain

¹⁸i.e. production of uranium with a higher percentage of U-235 than is found in natural uranium

¹⁹Craig, J.R., Vaugn, D.J. and Skinner, B.J., *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, page 210.

²⁰Israel, India and Pakistan have refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and North Korea, after signing the NPT, withdrew from it in 2003.

from a Dutch firm the high-speed ultracentrifuges needed for uranium enrichment. With unlimited financial support and freedom from auditing requirements, Dr. Khan purchased restricted items needed for nuclear weapon construction from companies in Europe and the United States. In the process, Dr. Khan became an extremely wealthy man. With additional help from China, Pakistan was ready to test five nuclear weapons in 1998. The Indian and Pakistani nuclear bomb tests, conducted in rapid succession, presented the world with the danger that these devastating weapons would be used in the conflict over Kashmir. Indeed, Pakistan announced that if a war broke out using conventional weapons, Pakistan's nuclear weapons would be used "at an early stage".

In Pakistan, Dr. A.Q. Khan became a great national hero. He was presented as the person who had saved Pakistan from attack by India by creating Pakistan's own nuclear weapons. In a Washington Post article²¹ Pervez Hoodbhoy wrote: "Nuclear nationalism was the order of the day as governments vigorously promoted the bomb as the symbol of Pakistan's high scientific achievement and self-respect..." Similar manifestations of nuclear nationalism could also be seen in India after India's 1998 bomb tests.

Early in 2004, it was revealed that Dr. Khan had for years been selling nuclear secrets and equipment to Libya, Iran and North Korea, and that he had contacts with Al-Qaeda. However, observers considered that it was unlikely that Khan would be tried, since a trial might implicate Pakistan's army as well as two of its former prime ministers.

Recent assassination attempts directed at Pakistan's President, Pervez Musharraf, emphasize the precariousness of Pakistan's government. There a danger that it may be overthrown, and that the revolutionists would give Pakistan's nuclear weapons to a subnational organization. This type of danger is a general one associated with nuclear proliferation. As more and more countries obtain nuclear weapons, it becomes increasingly likely that one of them will undergo a revolution, during the course of which nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of criminals or terrorists.

If nuclear reactors become the standard means for electricity generation as the result of a future energy crisis, the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons might ultimately be as high as 40. If this should happen, then over a long period of time the chance that one or another of these nations would undergo a revolution during which the weapons would fall into the hands of a subnational group would gradually grow into a certainty.

There is also a possibility that poorly-guarded fissionable material could fall into the hands of subnational groups, who would then succeed in constructing their own nuclear weapons. Given a critical mass of highly-enriched uranium, a terrorist group, or an organized criminal (Mafia) group, could easily construct a crude gun-type nuclear explosive device. Pu-239 is more difficult to use since it is highly radioactive, but the physicist Frank Barnaby believes that a subnational group could nevertheless construct a crude nuclear bomb (of the Nagasaki type) from this material.

We must remember the remark of U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan after the 9/11/2001 attacks on the World Trade Center. He said, "*This time* it was not a nuclear explosion". The meaning of his remark is clear: If the world does not take strong steps to eliminate

²¹1 February, 2004

fissionable materials and nuclear weapons, it will only be a matter of time before they will be used in terrorist attacks on major cities, or by organized criminals for the purpose of extortion. Neither terrorists nor organized criminals can be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, since they have no territory against which such retaliation could be directed. They blend invisibly into the general population. Nor can a “missile defense system” prevent criminals or terrorists from using nuclear weapons, since the weapons can be brought into a port in any one of the hundreds of thousands of containers that enter on ships each year, a number far too large to be checked exhaustively.

Finally we must remember that if the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons becomes very large, there will be a greatly increased chance that these weapons will be used in conflicts between nations, either by accident or through irresponsible political decisions.

On November 3, 2003, Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, made a speech to the United Nations in which he called for “limiting the processing of weapons-usable material (separated plutonium and high enriched uranium) in civilian nuclear programs - as well as the production of new material through reprocessing and enrichment - by agreeing to restrict these operations to facilities exclusively under international control.” It is almost incredible, considering the dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, that such restrictions were not imposed long ago.

From the facts that we have been reviewing, we can conclude that if nuclear power generation becomes widespread during a future energy crisis, and if equally widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons is to be avoided, the powers and budget of the IAEA will have to be greatly increased. All enrichment of uranium and Reprocessing fuel rods throughout the world will have to be placed be under direct international control, as has been emphasized by Mohamed ElBaradei. Because this will need to be done with fairness, such regulations will have to hold both in countries that at present have nuclear weapons and in countries that do not. It has been proposed that there should be an international fuel rod bank, to supply new fuel rods and reprocess spent ones. In addition to this excellent proposal, one might also consider a system where all power generation reactors and all research reactors would be staffed by the IAEA.

Nuclear reactors used for “peaceful” purposes unfortunately also generate fissionable isotopes of not only of plutonium, but also of neptunium and americium. Thus all nuclear reactors must be regarded as ambiguous in function, and all must be put under strict international control. One must ask whether globally widespread use of nuclear energy is worth the danger that it entails.

Let us now examine the question of whether nuclear power generation would appreciably help to prevent global warming. The fraction of nuclear power in the present energy generation spectrum is at present approximately 1/16. Nuclear energy is used primarily for electricity generation. Thus increasing the nuclear fraction would not affect the consumption of fossil fuels used directly in industry, transportation, in commerce, and in the residential sector. Coal is still a very inexpensive fuel, and an increase in nuclear power generation would do little to prevent it from being burned. Thus besides being prohibitively dangerous, and besides being unsustainable in the long run (because of finite stocks of

uranium and thorium), the large-scale use of nuclear power cannot be considered to be a solution to the problem of anthropogenic climate change.

Optimists point to the possibility of using fusion of light elements, such as hydrogen, to generate power. However, although this can be done on a very small scale (and at great expense) in laboratory experiments, the practical generation of energy by means of thermonuclear reactions remains a mirage rather than a realistic prospect on which planners can rely. The reason for this is the enormous temperature required to produce thermonuclear reactions. This temperature is comparable to that existing in the interior of the sun, and it is sufficient to melt any ordinary container. Elaborate “magnetic bottles” have been constructed to contain thermonuclear reactions, and these have been used in successful very small scale experiments. However, despite 50 years of heavily-financed research, there has been absolutely no success in producing thermonuclear energy on a large scale, or at anything remotely approaching commercially competitive prices.

Nuclear weapons are criminal! Every war is a crime!

War was always madness, always immoral, always the cause of unspeakable suffering, economic waste and widespread destruction, and always a source of poverty, hate, barbarism and endless cycles of revenge and counter-revenge. It has always been a crime for soldiers to kill people, just as it is a crime for murderers in civil society to kill people. No flag has ever been wide enough to cover up atrocities.

But today, the development of all-destroying modern weapons has put war completely beyond the bounds of sanity and elementary humanity.

Can we not rid ourselves of both nuclear weapons and the institution of war itself? We must act quickly and resolutely before everything that we love in our beautiful world is reduced to radioactive ashes.

4.13 Militarism is the US national religion

Here are some quotations from an article by William Astore entitled *Military Might Is Our National Religion*²². He lists the following facts to support his thesis:

- **We believe in wars. We may no longer believe in formal declarations of war (not since December 1941 has Congress made one in our name), but that sure hasn't stopped us from waging them. From Korea to Vietnam, Afghanistan to Iraq, the Cold War to the War on Terror, and so many military interventions in between, including Grenada, Panama, and Somalia, Americans are always fighting somewhere as if we saw great utility in thumbing our noses at the Prince of Peace. (That's Jesus Christ, if I remember my Catholic catechism correctly.)**

²²Truthout, August 13, 2019

- We believe in weaponry, the more expensive the better. The underperforming F-35 stealth fighter may cost \$1.45 trillion over its lifetime. An updated nuclear triad (land-based missiles, nuclear submarines, and strategic bombers) may cost that already mentioned \$1.7 trillion. New (and malfunctioning) aircraft carriers cost us more than \$10 billion each. And all such weaponry requests get funded, with few questions asked, despite a history of their redundancy, ridiculously high price, regular cost overruns, and mediocre performance. Meanwhile, Americans squabble bitterly over a few hundred million dollars for the arts and humanities.
- We believe in weapons of mass destruction. We believe in them so strongly that we're jealous of anyone nibbling at our near monopoly. As a result, we work overtime to ensure that "infidels" and atheists (that is, the Iranians and North Koreans, among others) don't get them. In historical terms, no country has devoted more research or money to deadly nuclear, biological, and chemical weaponry than the United States. In that sense, we've truly put our money where our mouths are (and where a devastating future might be).
- We believe with missionary zeal in our military and seek to establish our "faith" everywhere. Hence, our global network of perhaps 800 overseas military bases. We don't hesitate to deploy our elite missionaries, our equivalent to the Jesuits, the Special Operations forces to more than 130 countries annually. Similarly, the foundation for what we like to call foreign assistance is often military training and foreign military sales. Our present supreme leader, Pope Trump I, boasts of military sales across the globe, most notably to the "infidel" Saudis. Even when Congress makes what, until recently, was the rarest of attempts to rein in this deadly trade in arms, Pope Trump vetoes it. His rationale: weapons and profits should rule all.
- We believe in our college of cardinals, otherwise known as America's generals and admirals. We sometimes appoint them (or anoint them?) to the highest positions in the land. While Trump's generals - Michael Flynn, James Mattis, H.R. McMaster, and John Kelly - have fallen from grace at the White House, America's generals and admirals continue to rule globally. They inhabit proconsul-like positions in sweeping geographical commands that (at least theoretically) cover the planet and similarly lead commands aimed at dominating the digital-computer realm and special operations. One of them will head a new force meant to dominate space through time eternal. A "strategic" command (the successor to the Strategic Air Command, or SAC, so memorably satirized in Stanley Kubrick's *Dr. Strangelove*) continues to ensure that, at some future moment, the U.S. will be able to commit mass genocide by quite literally

destroying the world with nuclear weapons. Indeed, Pope Trump recently boasted that he could end America's Afghan War in a week, apparently through the mass nuclear genocide of (his figure) 10 million Afghans. Even as he then blandly dismissed the idea of wiping that country "off the face of the earth," he openly reflected the more private megalomania of those military professionals funded by the rest of us to think about "the unthinkable". In sum, everything is - theoretically at least - under the thumbs of our unelected college of cardinals. Their overblown term for it is "full-spectrum dominance," which, in translation, means they grant themselves god-like powers over our lives and that of our planet (though the largely undefeated enemies in their various wars don't seem to have acknowledged this reality).

- We believe that freedom comes through obedience. Those who break ranks from our militarized church and protest, like Chelsea Manning, are treated as heretics and literally tortured.
- We believe military spending brings wealth and jobs galore, even when it measurably doesn't. Military production is both increasingly automated and increasingly outsourced, leading to far fewer good-paying American jobs compared to spending on education, infrastructure repairs of and improvements in roads, bridges, levees, and the like, or just about anything else for that matter.
- We believe, and our most senior leaders profess to believe, that our military represents the very best of us, that we have the "finest" one in human history.
- We believe in planning for a future marked by endless wars, whether against terrorism or "godless" states like China and Russia, which means our military church must be forever strengthened in the cause of winning ultimate victory.



Figure 4.18: The peoples of the world must revolt against the endless wars of their governments. All-destroying modern weapons have made the institution of war prohibitively dangerous.

Suggestions for further reading

1. P.J. Bowler, *Evolution: The History of an Idea*, University of California Press, (1989).
2. D.J. Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology*, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland Mass., (1986).
3. B. Glass, O. Temkin, and W.L. Strauss, eds., *Forerunners of Darwin: 1745-1859*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, (1959).
4. R. Milner, *The Encyclopedia of Evolution*, an Owl Book, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1990).
5. T.A. Appel, *The Cuvier-Geoffroy Debate: French Biology in the Decades before Darwin*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
6. P.J. Bowler, *Fossils and Progress: Paleontology and the Idea of Progressive Evolution in the Nineteenth Century*, Science History Publications, New York, (1976).
7. P. Corsi, *The Age of Lamarck: Evolutionary Theories in France, 1790-1834*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (1988).
8. M. McNeil, *Under the Banner of Science: Erasmus Darwin and his Age*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, (1987).
9. L.G. Wilson, *Sir Charles Lyell's Scientific Journals on the Species Question*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1970).
10. A.B. Adams, *Eternal Quest: The Story of the Great Naturalists*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1969).
11. A.S. Packard, *Lamarck, the Founder of Evolution: His Life and Work*, Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, (1901).
12. C. Darwin, *An historical sketch of the progress of opinion on the Origin of Species, previously to the publication of this work*, Appended to third and later editions of *On the Origin of Species*, (1861).
13. L. Eiseley, *Darwin's Century: Evolution and the Men who Discovered It*, Doubleday, New York, (1958).
14. H.F. Osborne, *From the Greeks to Darwin: The Development of the Evolution Idea Through Twenty-Four Centuries*, Charles Scribner and Sons, New York, (1929).
15. Sir Julian Huxley and H.B.D. Kettlewell, *Charles Darwin and his World*, Thames and Hudson, London (1965).
16. Allan Moorehead, *Darwin and the Beagle*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1971).
17. Francis Darwin (editor), *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin and Selected Letters*, Dover, New York (1958).
18. Charles Darwin, *The Voyage of the Beagle*, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London (1975).
19. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Collier MacMillan, London (1974).
20. Charles Darwin, *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*, The University of Chicago Press (1965).
21. Ruth Moore, *Evolution*, Time-Life Books (1962).
22. L. Barber, *The Heyday of Natural History: 1820-1870*, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, New York, (1980).
23. A. Desmond, *Huxley*, Addison Wesley, Reading, Mass., (1994).
24. R. Owen, (P.R. Sloan editor), *The Hunterian Lectures in Comparative Anatomy, May-June, 1837*, University of Chicago Press, (1992).

25. C. Nichols, *Darwinism and the social sciences*, Phil. Soc. Scient. **4**, 255-277 (1974).
26. M. Ruse, *The Darwinian Revolution*, University of Chicago Press, (1979).
27. A. Desmond and J. Moore, *Darwin*, Penguin Books, (1992).
28. R. Dawkins, *The Extended Phenotype*, Oxford University Press, (1982).
29. R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, W.W. Norton, (1987).
30. R. Dawkins, *River out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*, Harper Collins, (1995).
31. R. Dawkins, *Climbing Mount Improbable*, W.W. Norton, (1996).
32. S.J. Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, W.W. Norton, (1977).
33. R.G.B. Reid, *Evolutionary Theory: The Unfinished Synthesis*, Croom Helm, (1985).
34. M. Ho and P.T. Saunders, editors, *Beyond Neo-Darwinism: An Introduction to a New Evolutionary Paradigm*, Academic Press, London, (1984).
35. J. Maynard Smith, *Did Darwin Get it Right? Essays on Games, Sex and Evolution*, Chapman and Hall, (1989).
36. E. Sober, *The Nature of Selection: Evolutionary Theory in Philosophical Focus*, University of Chicago Press, (1984).
37. B.K. Hall, *Evolutionary Developmental Biology*, Chapman and Hall, London, (1992).
38. J. Thompson, *Interaction and Coevolution*, Wiley and Sons, (1982).
39. R.A. Fischer, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1930).
40. J.B.S. Haldane, *Population genetics*, New Biology **18**, 34-51, (1955).
41. N. Tinbergen, *The Study of Instinct*, Oxford University Press, (1951).
42. N. Tinbergen, *The Herring Gull's World*, Collins, London, (1953).
43. N. Tinbergen, *Social Behavior in Animals*, Methuen, London, (1953).
44. N. Tinbergen, *Curious Naturalists*, Country Life, London, (1958).
45. N. Tinbergen, *The Animal in its World: Explorations of an Ethologist*, Allan and Unwin, London, (1973).
46. K. Lorenz, *On the evolution of behavior*, Scientific American, December, (1958).
47. K. Lorenz, *Evolution and Modification of Behavior* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, (1961).
48. K. Lorenz, *Studies in Animal and Human Behavior. I and II.*, Harvard University Press, (1970) and (1971).
49. P.H. Klopfer and J.P. Hailman, *An Introduction to Animal Behavior: Ethology's First Century*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, (1969).
50. J. Jaynes, *The historical origins of "Ethology" and "Comparative Psychology"*, Anim. Behav. **17**, 601-606 (1969).
51. W.H. Thorpe, *The Origin and Rise of Ethology: The Science of the Natural Behavior of Animals*, Heinemann, London, (1979).
52. R.A. Hinde, *Animal Behavior: A Synthesis of Ethological and Comparative Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1970).
53. J.H. Crook, editor, *Social Behavior in Birds and Mammals*, Academic Press, London, (1970).
54. P. Ekman, editor, *Darwin and Facial Expression*, Academic Press, New York, (1973).
55. P. Ekman, W.V. Friesen and P. Ekworth, *Emotions in the Human Face*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).

56. N. Blurton Jones, editor, *Ethological Studies of Child Behavior*, Cambridge University Press, (1975).
57. M. von Cranach, editor, *Methods of Inference from Animals to Human Behavior*, Chicago/Mouton, Haag, (1976); Aldine, Paris, (1976).
58. K. Lorenz, *On Aggression*, Bantem Books, (1977).
59. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Ethology, The Biology of Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, (1975).
60. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt and F.K. Salter, editors, *Indoctrinability, Ideology, and Warfare: Evolutionary Perspectives*, Berghahn Books, (1998).
61. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Human Ethology*, Walter De Gruyter Inc., (1989).
62. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Love and Hate*, Walter De Gruyter Inc., (1996).
63. J. Bowlby, *By ethology out of psychoanalysis: An experiment in interbreeding*, *Animal Behavior*, **28**, 649-656 (1980).
64. B.B. Beck, *Animal Tool Behavior*, Garland STPM Press, New York, (1980).
65. R. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books, New York, (1984).
66. J.D. Carthy and F.L. Ebling, *The Natural History of Aggression*, Academic Press, New York, (1964)
67. D.L. Cheney and R.M. Seyfarth, *How Monkeys See the World: Inside the Mind of Another Species*, University of Chicago Press, (1990).
68. F. De Waal, *Chimpanzee Politics*, Cape, London, (1982).
69. M. Edmunds, *Defense in Animals*, Longman, London, (1974).
70. R.D. Estes, *The Behavior Guide to African Mammals*, University of California Press, Los Angeles, (1991).
71. R.F. Ewer, *Ethology of Mammals*, Logos Press, London, (1968).
72. E. Morgan, *The Scars of Evolution*, Oxford University Press, (1990).
73. W.D. Hamilton, *The genetical theory of social behavior. I and II*, *J. Theor. Biol.* **7**, 1-52 (1964).
74. R. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, (1989).
75. R.W. Sussman, *The Biological Basis of Human Behavior*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, (1997).
76. Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of Peace and War*, Thames and Hudson, New York (1979).
77. R.A. Hinde, *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1977).
78. R.A. Hinde, *Towards Understanding Relationships*, Academic Press, London (1979).
79. Albert Szent-Györgyi, *The Crazy Ape*, Philosophical Library, New York (1970).
80. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press (1975).
81. C. Zhan-Waxler, *Altruism and Aggression: Biological and Social Origins*, Cambridge University Press (1986).
82. D.R. Griffin, *Animal Mind - Human Mind*, Dahlem Konferenzen 1982, Springer, Berlin, (1982).
83. R. Dart, *The predatory transition from ape to man*, *International Anthropological and Linguistic Review*, **1**, (1953).

84. S. Savage-Rumbaugh, R. Lewin, et al., *Kanzi: The Ape at the Brink of the Human Mind*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, (1996).
85. R. Dunbar, *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*, Harvard University Press, (1998).
86. M.E. Bitterman, *The evolution of intelligence*, Scientific American, January, (1965).
87. R. Fox, *In the beginning: Aspects of hominid behavioral evolution*, Man, **NS 2**, 415-433 (1967).
88. M.S. Gazzaniga, *The split brain in man*, Scientific American, **217**, 24-29 (1967).
89. D. Kimura, *The asymmetry of the human brain*, Scientific American, **228**, 70-78 (1973).
90. R.G. Klein, *Anatomy, behavior, and modern human origins*, Journal of World Prehistory, **9 (2)**, 167-198 (1995).
91. N.G. Jablonski and L.C. Aiello, editors, *The Origin and Diversification of Language*, Wattis Symposium Series in Anthropology. Memoirs of the California Academy of Sciences, No. 24, The California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, (1998).
92. S. Pinker, *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*, Harper-Collins Publishers, New York, (1995).
93. J.H. Barkow, L. Cosmides and J. Tooby, editors, *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture*, Oxford University Press, (1995).
94. D.R. Begun, C.V. Ward and M.D. Rose, *Function, Phylogeny and Fossils: Miocene Hominid Evolution and Adaptations*, Plenum Press, New York, (1997).
95. R.W. Byrne and A.W. Whitten, *Machiavellian Intelligence: Social Expertise and the Evolution of Intellect in Monkeys, Apes and Humans*, Cambridge University Press, (1988),
96. V.P. Clark, P.A. Escholz and A.F. Rosa, editors, *Language: Readings in Language and Culture*, St Martin's Press, New York, (1997).
97. T.W. Deacon, *The Symbolic Species: The Co-evolution of Language and the Brain*, W.W. Norton and Company, New York, (1997).
98. C. Gamble, *Timewalkers: The Prehistory of Global Colonization*, Harvard University Press, (1994).
99. K.R. Gibson and T. Ingold, editors, *Tools, Language and Cognition in Human Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, (1993).
100. P. Mellers, *The Emergence of Modern Humans: An Archaeological Perspective*, Edinburgh University Press, (1990).
101. P. Mellers, *The Neanderthal Legacy: An Archaeological Perspective of Western Europe*, Princeton University Press, (1996).
102. S. Mithen, *The Prehistory of the Mind*, Thames and Hudson, London, (1996).
103. D. Haraway, *Signs of dominance: from a physiology to a cybernetics of primate biology*, C.R. Carpenter, 1939-1970, Studies in History of Biology, **6**, 129-219 (1983).
104. D. Johanson and M. Edey, *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1981).
105. B. Kurtén, *Our Earliest Ancestors*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1992).
106. R.E. Leakey and R. Lewin, *Origins Reconsidered*, Doubleday, New York, (1992).

107. P. Lieberman, *The Biology and Evolution of Language*, Harvard University Press, (1984).
108. J.D. Wall and M. Przeworski, *When did the human population size start increasing?*, *Genetics*, **155**, 1865-1874 (2000).
109. L. Aiello and C. Dean, *An Introduction to Human Evolutionary Anatomy*, Academic Press, London, (1990).
110. F. Ikawa-Smith, ed., *Early Paleolithic in South and East Asia*, Mouton, The Hague, (1978).
111. R.R. Baker, *Migration: Paths Through Space and Time*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, (1982).
112. P. Bellwood, *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*, Academic Press, Sidney, (1985).
113. P.J. Bowler, *Theories of Human Evolution: A Century of Debate, 1884-1944*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, (1986).
114. G. Isaac and M. McCown, eds., *Human Origins: Louis Leaky and the East African Evidence*, Benjamin, Menlo Park, (1976).
115. F.J. Brown, R. Leaky, and A. Walker, *Early Homo erectus skeleton from west Lake Turkana, Kenya*, *Nature*, **316**, 788-92, (1985).
116. K.W. Butzer, *Archeology as Human Ecology*, Cambridge University Press, (1982).
117. A.T. Chamberlain and B.A. Wood, *Early hominid phylogeny*, *Journal of Human Evolution*, **16**, 119-33, (1987).
118. P. Mellars and C. Stringer, eds., *The Human Revolution: Behavioural and Biological Perspectives in the Origins of Modern Humans*, Edinburgh University Press, (1989).
119. G.C. Conroy, *Primate Evolution*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1990).
120. R.I.M. Dunbar, *Primate Social Systems*, Croom Helm, London, (1988).
121. B. Fagan, *The Great Journey: The Peopling of Ancient America*, Thames and Hudson, London, (1987).
122. R.A. Foley, ed., *Hominid Evolution and Community Ecology*, Academic Press, New York, (1984).
123. S.R. Binford and L.R. Binford, *Stone tools and human behavior*, *Scientific American*, **220**, 70-84, (1969).
124. G. Klein, *The Human Career, Human Biological and Cultural Origins*, University of Chicago Press, (1989).
125. B.F. Skinner and N. Chomsky, *Verbal behavior*, *Language*, **35** 26-58 (1959).
126. D. Bickerton, *The Roots of Language*, Karoma, Ann Arbor, Mich., (1981).
127. E. Lenneberg in *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, J.A. Fodor and J.A. Katz editors, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs N.J., (1964).
128. S. Pinker, *Talk of genetics and visa versa*, *Nature*, **413**, 465-466, (2001).
129. S. Pinker, *Words and rules in the human brain*, *Nature*, **387**, 547-548, (1997).
130. M. Ruhelen, *The Origin of Language*, Wiley, New York, (1994).
131. C.B. Stringer and R. McKie, *African Exodus: The Origins of Modern Humanity*, Johnathan Cape, London (1996).

132. R.W. Sussman, *The Biological Basis of Human Behavior*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, (1997).
133. D.P. Barash *Sociobiology and Behavior*, Elsevier, New York, (1977).
134. J.D. Carthy and F.J. Eblin, eds., *The Natural History of Aggression*, Academic Press, New York, (1964).
135. N.A. Chagnon and W. Irons, eds., *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior, an Anthropological Perspective*, Duxbury Press, N. Scituate, MA, (1979).
136. E. Danielson, *Vold, en Ond Arv?*, Gyldendal, Copenhagen, (1929).
137. M.R. Davie, *The Evolution of War*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1929).
138. T. Dobzhanski, *Mankind Evolving*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1962).
139. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Der Vorprogrammiert Mensch*, Molden, Vienna, (1973).
140. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Ethology, the Biology of Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, (1975).
141. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Liebe und Hass*, Molden, Vienna, (1973).
142. R.L. Holloway, *Primate Aggression: Territoriality and Xenophobia*, Academic Press, New York, (1974).
143. P. Kitcher, *Vaulting Ambition: Sociobiology and the Quest for Human Nature*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, (1985).
144. S.L.W. Mellen, *The Evolution of Love*, Freeman, Oxford, (1981).
145. A. Roe and G.G. Simpson, *Behavior and Evolution*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1958).
146. N.J. Smelser, *The Theory of Collective Behavior*, Free Press, New York, (1963).
147. R. Trivers, *Social Evolution*, Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, (1985).
148. W. Weiser, *Konrad Lorenz und seine Kritiker*, Piper, Munich, (1976).
149. W. Wickler, *Biologie der 10 Gebote*, Piper, Munich, (1971).
150. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press (1975).
151. E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, Bantam Books, New York, (1979).
152. C. Zahn-Waxler, *Altruism and Aggression: Biological and Social Origins*, Cambridge University Press, (1986).
153. J. Galtung, *A structural theory of aggression*, Journal of Peace Research, **1**, 95-119, (1964).
154. G.E. Kang, *Exogamy and peace relations of social units: A cross-cultural test*, Ethology, **18**, 85-99, (1979).
155. A. Montagu, *Man and Aggression*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1968).
156. W.A. Nesbitt, *Human Nature and War*, State Education Department of New York, Albany, (1973).
157. W. Suttles, *Subhuman and human fighting*, Anthropologica, **3**, 148-163, (1961).
158. V. Vale and Andrea Juno, editors, *Modern Primitives: An Investigation of Contemporary Adornment and Ritual*, San Francisco Re/Search, (1990).
159. R.A. Hinde, editor, *The Institution of War*, Cambridge University Press, (1991).
160. R.A. Hinde, *Individuals, Relationships and Culture: Links Between Ethology and the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, (1987).
161. R.A. Hinde, *Ethology: Its Nature and Relationship With Other Sciences*

162. R.A. Hinde, *Animal Behaviour: A Synthesis of Ethology and Comparative Psychology*
163. R.A. Hinde, *Non-Verbal Communication*, Cambridge University Press, (1972).
164. R.A. Hinde, *Why Gods Persist: A Scientific Approach to Religion*, Routledge, London, (1999).
165. P.P.G. Bateson and R.A. Hinde, editors, *Growing Points in Ethology: Based on a Conference Sponsored by St. John's College and King's College, Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press, (1976).
166. R.A. Hinde, A.-N. Perret-Clermont and J. Stevenson-Hinde, editors, *Social Relationships and Cognitive Development*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1985).
167. R.A. Hinde and J. Stevenson-Hinde, editors, *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1988).
168. P. Bateson, editor, *The Development and Integration of Behaviour: Essays in Honour of Robert Hinde*, Cambridge University Press, (1991).
169. C. Darwin, *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*, The University of Chicago Press (1965).
170. P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid, A Factor in Evolution*, Walter Heinemann, London, (1902).
171. R.A. Fischer, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1930).
172. J.B.S. Haldane, *Population genetics*, *New Biology* **18**, 34-51, (1955).
173. L. Margulis, *Symbiosis as a Source of Evolutionary Innovation: Speciation and Morphogenesis*, The MIT Press, (1991).
174. L. Margulis, *Symbiosis in Cell Evolution: Microbial Communities in the Archean and Proterozoic Eons*, W.H. Freeman, (1992).
175. N. Tinbergen, *The Study of Instinct*, Oxford University Press, (1951).
176. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of Peace and War*, Thames and Hudson, New York (1979).
177. E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, Bantam Books, New York, (1979).
178. R.A. Hinde, *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1977).
179. R.A. Hinde, *Individuals, Relationships and Culture: Links Between Ethology and the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, (1987).
180. W.M. Senner, editor, *The Origins of Writing*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, (1989).
181. A. Robock, L. Oman, G. L. Stenchikov, O. B. Toon, C. Bardeen, and R. Turco, *Climatic consequences of regional nuclear conflicts*, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, Vol. 7, p. 2003-2012, (2007).
182. M. Mills, O. Toon, R. Turco, D. Kinnison, R. Garcia, *Massive global ozone loss predicted following regional nuclear conflict*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)*, vol. 105(14), pp. 5307-12, Apr 8, (2008).
183. O. Toon, A. Robock, and R. Turco, *The Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War*, *Physics Today*, vol. 61, No. 12, p. 37-42, (2008).

184. R. Turco, O. Toon, T. Ackermann, J. Pollack, and C. Sagan, *Nuclear Winter: Global consequences of multiple nuclear explosions*, Science, Vol. 222, No. 4630, pp. 1283-1292, December (1983).
185. A. Robock, L. Oman, G. Stenchikov, *Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences*, Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, Vol. 112, No. D13, p. 4 of 14, (2007).
186. I. Helfand, *An Assessment of the Extent of Projected Global Famine Resulting From Limited, Regional Nuclear War*, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Leeds, MA, (2007).
187. George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn, *A World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, The Wall Street Journal, January 4, 2007, page A15 and January 15, (2008), page A15.
188. Mikhail Gorbachev, *The Nuclear Threat*, The Wall Street Journal, January 30, (2007), page A15.
189. Massimo D'Alema, Gianfranco Fini, Giorgio La Malfa, Arturo Parisi and Francesco Calogero, *For a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Corriere Della Sera, July 24, (2008).
190. Hoover Institution, *Reykjavik Revisited; Steps Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, October, (2007).
191. Douglas Hurd, Malcolm Rifkind, David Owen and George Robertson, *Start Worrying and Learn to Ditch the Bomb*, The Times, June 30, (2008).
192. Des Brown, Secretary of State for Defense, UK, *Laying the Foundations for Multilateral Disarmament*, Geneva Conference on Disarmament, February 5, (2008).
193. Government of Norway, International Conference on *Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Oslo, Norway, February 26-27, (2008).
194. Jonas Gahr Støre, Foreign Minister, Norway, *Statement at the Conference on Disarmament*, Geneva, March 4, (2008).
195. Anne-Grete Strøm-Erichsen, Defense Minister, Norway, *Emerging Opportunities for Nuclear Disarmament*, Pugwash Conference, Canada, July 11, (2008).
196. Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister, Australia, *International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament*, Media Release, July 9, (2008).
197. Helmut Schmidt, Richard von Weizsäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, *Towards a Nuclear-Free World: a German View*, International Herald Tribune, January 9, (2009).
198. Hans M. Kristensen and Elliot Negin, *Support Growing for Removal of U.S. Nuclear Weapons from Europe*, Common Dreams Newscenter, first posted May 6, (2005).
199. David Krieger, *President-elect Obama and a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Website, (2008).
200. J.L. Henderson, *Hiroshima*, Longmans (1974).
201. A. Osada, *Children of the A-Bomb, The Testament of Boys and Girls of Hiroshima*, Putnam, New York (1963).
202. M. Hachiya, M.D., *Hiroshima Diary*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. (1955).
203. M. Yass, *Hiroshima*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York (1972).

204. R. Jungk, *Children of the Ashes*, Harcourt, Brace and World (1961).
205. B. Hirschfield, *A Cloud Over Hiroshima*, Baily Brothers and Swinfin Ltd. (1974).
206. J. Hersey, *Hiroshima*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1975).
207. R. Rhodes, *Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1995)
208. R. Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1988).
209. D.V. Babst et al., *Accidental Nuclear War: The Growing Peril*, Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario, (1984).
210. S. Britten, *The Invisible Event: An Assessment of the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Detonation of Nuclear Weapons and of War by Miscalculation*, Menard Press, London, (1983).
211. M. Dando and P. Rogers, *The Death of Deterrence*, CND Publications, London, (1984).
212. N.F. Dixon, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, Futura, London, (1976).
213. D. Frei and C. Catrina, *Risks of Unintentional Nuclear War*, United Nations, Geneva, (1982).
214. H. L'Etang, *Fit to Lead?*, Heinemann Medical, London, (1980).
215. SPANW, *Nuclear War by Mistake - Inevitable or Preventable?*, Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear War, Lulea, (1985).
216. J. Goldblat, *Nuclear Non-proliferation: The Why and the Wherefore*, (SIPRI Publications), Taylor and Francis, (1985).
217. J. Schear, ed., *Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Nuclear Risk*, Gower, London, (1984).
218. D.P. Barash and J.E. Lipton, *Stop Nuclear War! A Handbook*, Grove Press, New York, (1982).
219. C.F. Barnaby and G.P. Thomas, eds., *The Nuclear Arms Race: Control or Catastrophe*, Francis Pinter, London, (1982).
220. L.R. Beres, *Apocalypse: Nuclear Catastrophe in World Politics*, Chicago University press, Chicago, IL, (1980).
221. F. Blackaby et al., eds., *No-first-use*, Taylor and Francis, London, (1984).
222. NS, ed., *New Statesman Papers on Destruction and Disarmament* (NS Report No. 3), New Statesman, London, (1981).
223. H. Caldicot, *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War*, William Morrow, New York, (1984).
224. R. Ehrlich, *Waging the Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, (1985).
225. W. Epstein, *The Prevention of Nuclear War: A United Nations Perspective*, Gunn and Hain, Cambridge, MA, (1984).
226. W. Epstein and T. Toyoda, eds., *A New Design for Nuclear Disarmament*, Spokesman, Nottingham, (1975).
227. G.F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion*, Pantheon, New York, (1983).
228. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).

229. J.R. Macy, *Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, PA, (1983).
230. A.S. Miller et al., eds., *Nuclear Weapons and Law*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, (1984).
231. MIT Coalition on Disarmament, eds., *The Nuclear Almanac: Confronting the Atom in War and Peace*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, (1984).
232. UN, *Nuclear Weapons: Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*, United Nations, New York, (1980).
233. IC, *Proceedings of the Conference on Understanding Nuclear War*, Imperial College, London, (1980).
234. B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1959).
235. F. Barnaby, *The Nuclear Age*, Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, (1974).
236. D. Albright, F. Berkhout and W. Walker, *Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (1997).
237. G.T. Allison et al., *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, (1996).
238. B. Bailin, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy, and the Post-colonial State*, Zed Books, London, (1998).
239. P. Bidawi and A. Vanaik, *South Asia on a Short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and the Future of Global Disarmament*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2001).
240. F.A. Boyle, *The Criminality of Nuclear Deterrence: Could the U.S. War on Terrorism Go Nuclear?*, Clarity Press, Atlanta GA, (2002).
241. G. Burns, *The Atomic Papers: A Citizen's Guide to Selected Books and Articles on the Bomb, the Arms Race, Nuclear Power, the Peace Movement, and Related Issues*, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen NJ, (1984).
242. L. Butler, *A Voice of Reason*, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, **54**, 58-61, (1998).
243. R. Butler, *Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defense*, Westview Press, Boulder CO, (2001).
244. R.P. Carlisle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Atomic Age*, Facts on File, New York, (2001).
245. G.A. Cheney, *Nuclear Proliferation: The Problems and Possibilities*, Franklin Watts, New York, (1999).
246. A. Cohen, *Israel and the Bomb*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1998).
247. S.J. Diehl and J.C. Moltz, *Nuclear Weapons and Nonproliferation: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-Clio Information Services, Santa Barbara CA, (2002).
248. H.A. Feiveson (Ed.), *The Nuclear Turning Point: A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting of Nuclear Weapons*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., (1999).
249. R. Hilsman, *From Nuclear Military Strategy to a World Without War: A History and a Proposal*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, (1999).
250. International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research *Plutonium: Deadly Gold of the Nuclear Age*, International Physicians Press, Cambridge MA, (1992).

251. R.W. Jones and M.G. McDonough, *Tracking Nuclear Proliferation: A Guide in Maps and Charts, 1998*, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1998).
252. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
253. R.E. Powaski, *March to Armageddon: The United States and the Nuclear Arms Race, 1939 to the Present*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
254. J. Rotblat, J. Steinberger and B. Udgaonkar (Eds.), *A Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: Desirable? Feasible?*, Westview Press, (1993).
255. The United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, Graded Press, Nashville, (1986).
256. U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (Ed.), *Dismantling the Bomb and Managing the Nuclear Materials*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., (1993).
257. S.R. Weart, *Nuclear Fear: A History of Images*, Harvard University Press, (1988).
258. P. Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, University of North Carolina Press, (1985).
259. C. Perrow, *Normal Accidents: Living With High-Risk Technologies*, Basic Books, (1984).
260. P. Rogers, *The Risk of Nuclear Terrorism in Britain*, Oxford Research Group, Oxford, (2006).
261. MIT, *The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*, <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower> (2003).
262. Z. Mian and A. Glaser, *Life in a Nuclear Powered Crowd*, INES Newsletter No. 52, 9-13, April, (2006).
263. K. Bergeron, *Nuclear Weapons: The Death of No Dual-use*, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 15-17, January, (2004).
264. E. Chivian, and others (eds.), *Last Aid: The Medical Dimensions of Nuclear War*, W.H. Freeman, San Fransisco, (1982).
265. Medical Association's Board of Science and Education, *The Medical Effects of Nuclear War*, Wiley, (1983).
266. Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister, Australia, "International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", Media Release, July 9, 2008.
267. Global Zero, www.globalzero.org/paris-conference
268. Helmut Schmidt, Richard von Weizäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, "Towards a Nuclear-Free World: a German View", International Herald Tribune, January 9, 2009.
269. Hans M. Kristensen and Elliot Negin, "Support Growing for Removal of U.S. Nuclear Weapons from Europe", Common Dreams Newscenter, first posted May 6, 2005.
270. David Krieger, "President-elect Obama and a World Free of Nuclear Weapons", Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Website, 2008.
271. J.L. Henderson, *Hiroshima*, Longmans (1974).

272. A. Osada, *Children of the A-Bomb, The Testament of Boys and Girls of Hiroshima*, Putnam, New York (1963).
273. M. Hachiya, M.D., *Hiroshima Diary*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. (1955).
274. M. Yass, *Hiroshima*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York (1972).
275. R. Jungk, *Children of the Ashes*, Harcourt, Brace and World (1961).
276. B. Hirschfield, *A Cloud Over Hiroshima*, Baily Brothers and Swinfin Ltd. (1974).
277. J. Hersey, *Hiroshima*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1975).
278. R. Rhodes, *Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1995)
279. R. Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1988).
280. D.V. Babst et al., *Accidental Nuclear War: The Growing Peril*, Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario, (1984).
281. S. Britten, *The Invisible Event: An Assessment of the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Detonation of Nuclear Weapons and of War by Miscalculation*, Menard Press, London, (1983).
282. M. Dando and P. Rogers, *The Death of Deterrence*, CND Publications, London, (1984).
283. N.F. Dixon, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, Futura, London, (1976).
284. D. Frei and C. Catrina, *Risks of Unintentional Nuclear War*, United Nations, Geneva, (1982).
285. H. L'Etang, *Fit to Lead?*, Heinemann Medical, London, (1980).
286. SPANW, *Nuclear War by Mistake - Inevitable or Preventable?*, Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear War, Lulea, (1985).
287. J. Goldblat, *Nuclear Non-proliferation: The Why and the Wherefore*, (SIPRI Publications), Taylor and Francis, (1985).
288. IAEA, *International Safeguards and the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, (1985).
289. J. Schear, ed., *Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Nuclear Risk*, Gower, London, (1984).
290. D.P. Barash and J.E. Lipton, *Stop Nuclear War! A Handbook*, Grove Press, New York, (1982).
291. C.F. Barnaby and G.P. Thomas, eds., *The Nuclear Arms Race: Control or Catastrophe*, Francis Pinter, London, (1982).
292. L.R. Beres, *Apocalypse: Nuclear Catastrophe in World Politics*, Chicago University press, Chicago, IL, (1980).
293. F. Blackaby et al., eds., *No-first-use*, Taylor and Francis, London, (1984).
294. NS, ed., *New Statesman Papers on Destruction and Disarmament* (NS Report No. 3), New Statesman, London, (1981).
295. H. Caldicot, *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War*, William Morrow, New York, (1984).
296. R. Ehrlich, *Waging the Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, (1985).

297. W. Epstein, *The Prevention of Nuclear War: A United Nations Perspective*, Gunn and Hain, Cambridge, MA, (1984).
298. W. Epstein and T. Toyoda, eds., *A New Design for Nuclear Disarmament*, Spokesman, Nottingham, (1975).
299. G.F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion*, Pantheon, New York, (1983).
300. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
301. J.R. Macy, *Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, PA, (1983).
302. A.S. Miller et al., eds., *Nuclear Weapons and Law*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, (1984).
303. MIT Coalition on Disarmament, eds., *The Nuclear Almanac: Confronting the Atom in War and Peace*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, (1984).
304. UN, *Nuclear Weapons: Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*, United Nations, New York, (1980).
305. IC, *Proceedings of the Conference on Understanding Nuclear War*, Imperial College, London, (1980).
306. B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1959).
307. F. Barnaby, *The Nuclear Age*, Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, (1974).
308. D. Albright, F. Berkhout and W. Walker, *Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (1997).
309. G.T. Allison et al., *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, (1996).
310. B. Bailin, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy, and the Post-colonial State*, Zed Books, London, (1998).
311. G.K. Bertsch and S.R. Grillot, (Eds.), *Arms on the Market: Reducing the Risks of Proliferation in the Former Soviet Union*, Routledge, New York, (1998).
312. P. Bidawi and A. Vanaik, *South Asia on a Short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and the Future of Global Disarmament*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2001).
313. F.A. Boyle, *The Criminality of Nuclear Deterrence: Could the U.S. War on Terrorism Go Nuclear?*, Clarity Press, Atlanta GA, (2002).
314. G. Burns, *The Atomic Papers: A Citizen's Guide to Selected Books and Articles on the Bomb, the Arms Race, Nuclear Power, the Peace Movement, and Related Issues*, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen NJ, (1984).
315. L. Butler, *A Voice of Reason*, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, **54**, 58-61, (1998).
316. R. Butler, *Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defense*, Westview Press, Boulder CO, (2001).
317. R.P. Carlisle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Atomic Age*, Facts on File, New York, (2001).
318. G.A. Cheney, *Nuclear Proliferation: The Problems and Possibilities*, Franklin Watts, New York, (1999).
319. A. Cohen, *Israel and the Bomb*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1998).

320. S.J. Diehl and J.C. Moltz, *Nuclear Weapons and Nonproliferation: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-Clio Information Services, Santa Barbara CA, (2002).
321. H.A. Feiveson (Ed.), *The Nuclear Turning Point: A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting of Nuclear Weapons*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., (1999).
322. R. Hilsman, *From Nuclear Military Strategy to a World Without War: A History and a Proposal*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, (1999).
323. International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research *Plutonium: Deadly Gold of the Nuclear Age*, International Physicians Press, Cambridge MA, (1992).
324. R.W. Jones and M.G. McDonough, *Tracking Nuclear Proliferation: A Guide in Maps and Charts, 1998*, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1998).
325. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
326. J. Rotblat, J. Steinberger and B. Udgaonkar (Eds.), *A Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: Desirable? Feasible?*, Westview Press, (1993).
327. The United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, Graded Press, Nashville, (1986).
328. U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (Ed.), *Dismantling the Bomb and Managing the Nuclear Materials*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., (1993).
329. S.R. Weart, *Nuclear Fear: A History of Images*, Harvard University Press, (1988).
330. P. Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, University of North Carolina Press, (1985).
331. A. Makhijani and S. Saleska, *The Nuclear Power Deception: Nuclear Mythology From Electricity 'Too Cheap to Meter' to 'Inherently Safe' Reactors*, Apex Press, (1999).
332. C. Perrow, *Normal Accidents: Living With High-Risk Technologies*, Basic Books, (1984).
333. P. Rogers, *The Risk of Nuclear Terrorism in Britain*, Oxford Research Group, Oxford, (2006).
334. MIT, *The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*, <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpow> (2003).
335. Z. Mian and A. Glaser, *Life in a Nuclear Powered Crowd*, INES Newsletter No. 52, 9-13, April, (2006).
336. E. Chivian, and others (eds.), *Last Aid: The Medical Dimensions of Nuclear War*, W.H. Freeman, San Fransisco, (1982).
337. P.B. Smith, J.D. Schilling and A.P. Haines, *Introduction and Summary*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
338. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
339. J.R. Craig, D.J. Vaughan and B.J. Skinner, *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, (2001).

340. W. Youngquist, *Geodesinies: The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources Over Nations and Individuals*, National Book Company, Portland Oregon, (1997).
341. M. Tanzer, *The Race for Resources. Continuing Struggles Over Minerals and Fuels*, Monthly Review Press, New York, (1980).
342. C.B. Reed, *Fuels, Minerals and Human Survival*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers Inc., Ann Arbor Michigan, (1975).
343. A.A. Bartlett, *Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis*, American Journal of Physics, **46**, 876-888, (1978).
344. N. Gall, *We are Living Off Our Capital*, Forbes, September, (1986).

Chapter 5

THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY

5.1 Contrasting responses to the pandemic and the climate crisis

There is a remarkable contrast in the way that governments around the world have responded to the COVID-19 pandemic and the way that they have responded to the climate emergency. The pandemic, which indeed represents an extremely grave danger to humanity, has produced a massive global response. Borders have been closed, airlines have become virtually inoperative, industries, restaurants and entertainments have been closed, sporting events have been cancelled or postponed, people have been asked to stay at home and practice social distancing, and the everyday life of citizens around the world has been drastically changed.

By contrast, let us consider the threat that if immediate action is not taken to halt the extraction and use of fossil fuels, irreversible feedback loops will be initiated which will make catastrophic climate change inevitable despite human any human efforts to prevent it.

This threat is even more serious than the COVID-19 pandemic. Climate change could make much of the earth too hot for human life. It could produce a famine involving billions of people, rather than millions.

My own belief is that catastrophic climate change would not lead do the extinction of the human species; but I think that because much of the world would become uninhabitable, the global population of humans would be very much reduced.

How have governments responded to the climate emergency? A minority, for example the Scandinavian countries, have taken appropriate action. Most governments pay lip service to the emergency, but do not take effective action; and a few countries, such as the United States under Donald Trump, Bolsonaro's Brazil, and Saudi Arabia, deny that there is a climate emergency and actively sabotage action.

The world's net response has been totally inadequate. The Keeling Curve, which measures CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere, continues to rise, and the rate of rising is even increasing.

What is the reason for this remarkable contrast in our response to two serious emergencies? We see clearly and respond to what is close to us, and are relatively indifferent to what is far away. We hear of people dying every day from the COVID-19 pandemic, and there is a danger that as many as 100 million people could die before it is over.

By contrast, although immediate climate action is needed today to avoid disaster, the worst consequences of climate change lie in the long-term future. Old people, like me, will not live to see massive deaths from starvation and overheating.

However, we have a responsibility to our children and grandchildren, and to all future generations. A large-scale global famine could occur by the middle of the present century, and children who are alive today could experience it.

5.2 Recovery from the pandemic offers climate action opportunities

When the COVID-19 pandemic is over, governments will be faced by the task of repairing the enormous economic damage that it has caused. The situation will be similar to the crisis that faced US President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he took office during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Roosevelt, encouraged by John Maynard Keynes, used federal funds to build much-needed infrastructure around the United States. His programs, the New Deal, ended the Great Depression in his country.

Today, the concept of a similar Green New Deal is being put forward globally. This concept visualizes government-sponsored programs aimed at simultaneously creating both jobs and urgently-needed renewable energy infrastructure. The Green New Deal programs could be administered in such a way as to correct social injustices.

5.3 Quick action is needed to save the long-term future

The worst effects of catastrophic climate change lie in the distant future, a century or even many centuries from the present; but disaster can only be avoided if quick action is taken. The nations of the world must act immediately to reduce and eventually stop the use of fossil fuels and the destruction of forests. If decisive action is not taken within the next few decades, feedback loops will make human intervention useless. These feedback loops include the albedo effect, the methane hydrate feedback loop, and the fact as tropical forests become drier, they become vulnerable to fires ignited by lightning. These fires accelerate the drying, and thus a feed-back loop is formed.

As time passes, and as the disastrous consequences of climate change become more apparent, the political will required for action will increase; but by that time it may be too late. We are rapidly approaching several crucial tipping points.

At present, the average global rate of use of primary energy is roughly 2 kW_t per person.




Figure 5.1: **The Carbon Bubble** according to data by the Carbon Tracker Initiative 2013. In order to avoid tipping points that will make human attempts to avoid catastrophic climate change useless, we must leave most of the known fossil fuel reserves in the ground!

In North America, the rate is 12 kW_t per capita, while in Europe, the figure is 6 kW_t. In Bangladesh, it is only 0.2 kW_t. This wide variation implies that considerable energy savings are possible, through changes in lifestyle, and through energy efficiency.

5.4 Is the transition to 100% renewable energy possible?

If we ask whether the transition to 100% renewable energy is possible, the answer is very simple: It is not only possible; it is inevitable! This is because the supply of fossil fuels is finite, and at the present rate of use they will be exhausted in less than a century. While the transition to 100% renewables is inevitable, the vitally important point to remember is that if we are to avoid disaster, the transition must come quickly.

	Reserves	2005 rate of use	Years remaining
Coal	780 TWy	3.5 TW	217 years
Oil	250 TWy	6.0 TW	42 years
Natural gas	250 TWy	3.7 TW	68 years
Total	1260 TWy	13.2 TW	(95 years)

Year	Demand	Population	Per Capita
1980	9.48 TW	4.45 bil.	2.13 kW
1985	10.3 TW	4.84 bil.	2.11 kW
1990	11.6 TW	5.99 bil.	2.20 kW
1995	12.3 TW	5.68 bil.	2.16 kW
2003	14.1 TW	6.30 bil.	2.23 kW
2010	17.1 TW	6.84 bil.	2.50 kW
2015	18.9 TW	7.23 bil.	2.58 kW
2020	20.5 TW	7.61 bil.	2.70 kW
2025	22.3 TW	7.91 bil.	2.82 kW
2030	24.2 TW	8.30 bil.	2.93 kW

In this book, we will use kilowatts (kW), megawatts (MW) and terawatts (TW) as the units in which we discuss the rate of use of energy. A megawatt is equal to a thousand kilowatts or a million watts. A terawatt is equal to a thousand megawatts, or a million kilowatts or a billion (1,000,000,000) watts. A citizen of the European Union uses energy at the rate of about 6 kilowatts, while in North America, the rate of energy use is double that amount. The global average rate of energy use is a little over 2 kilowatts. Since there are now 7.5 billion people in the world, our present rate of energy use is roughly 15 terawatts,




Figure 5.2: A map of the world showing per capita rates of energy use.

The total available energy from fossil fuels can be measured in terawatt.years (TWy). Rough estimates of global coal reserves of coal, oil and natural gas are given by the table shown above.

The present rate of use of fossil fuels is greater than the 2005 rate shown in the table, and the remaining reserves are smaller than those shown. It is assumed that as oil becomes exhausted, coal will be converted into liquid fuels, as was done in Germany during World War II.

A second table, shown below, illustrates the historical and projected total global energy demand as a function of time between 1980 and 2030. In this slightly out-of-date table, the last year using historical data is 2003, later years being estimates based on projections.

Notice that the per capita energy use is almost constant. Our rapidly growing demand for energy is primarily the result of the world's rapidly growing population of humans. It would be wise to stabilize human populations because of the threat of human-caused ecological catastrophes and the danger of an extremely large-scale famine, involving billions of people rather than millions. Such a famine is threatened because growing populations require a growing food supply, climate changes threaten agriculture through droughts, melting glaciers and loss of agricultural land. The end of the fossil fuel era will also mean the end of high-yield petroleum-based agriculture.

The rate of growth of renewable energy

There is reason for hope that even the high energy demands show in the second table can be met by renewables. The basis of this hope can be found in the extremely high present rate of growth of renewable energy, and in the remarkable properties of exponential growth. According to figures recently released by the Earth Policy Institute, the global installed photovoltaic capacity is currently able to deliver 242,000 megawatts, and it is increasing at the rate of 27.8% per year. Wind energy can now deliver 370,000 megawatts, and it is increasing at the rate of roughly 20% per year.




Figure 5.3: **Energy use per capita by country (World Bank data)**

Because of the astonishing properties of exponential growth, we can calculate that if these growth rates are maintained, renewable energy can give us 24.8 terawatts within only 15 years! This is far more than the world's present use of all forms of energy.

5.5 Renewables are now much cheaper than fossil fuels!

According to an article written by Megan Darby and published in *The Guardian* on 26 January, 2016, “Solar power costs are tumbling so fast the technology is likely to fast outstrip mainstream energy forecasts.

“That is the conclusion of Oxford University researchers, based on a new forecasting model published in *Research Policy*¹.

“Commercial prices have fallen by 58% since 2012 and by 16

“Since the 1980s, panels to generate electricity from sunshine have got 10% cheaper each year. That is likely to continue, the study said, putting solar on course to meet 20% of global energy needs by 2027.’ ’

Solar energy

Unlike the burning of fossil fuels, renewables like solar energy do not release pollutants into the atmosphere. In China, public opinion has shifted in favor of renewables because of air pollution in cities.

¹<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733315001699>




Figure 5.4: The cost of photovoltaic cell panels is falling rapidly




Figure 5.5: Driven by falling prices, new solar installations in the United States are increasing rapidly. The acronym ITC stands for Solar Investment Tax Credit. Commercial prices have fallen by 58% since 2012 and by 16% in the last year



Figure 5.6: Air pollution from the burning of coal has become a serious problem in China. This problem has helped to shift Chinese public opinion away from the burning of coal and towards renewables. China has now become a major manufacturer of photovoltaic cells.

Photovoltaic cells

The price of solar photovoltaic panels has declined 99 percent over the last four decades, from \$74 a watt in 1972 to less than 70 cents a watt in 2014.

Between 2009 and 2014, solar panel prices dropped by three fourths, helping global PV installations grow 50 percent per year.

Deutsche Bank notes that as of early 2014, solar PV was already competitive with average residential, commercial or industrial electricity rates in 14 countries, and in California - even without subsidies. By late 2014 there were nearly 600,000 individual PV systems in the United States, almost twice as many as in 2012. This number may well pass 1 million in 2016.

In 2013, just 12 percent of U.S. homebuilders offered solar panels as an option for new single-family homes. More than half of them anticipate doing so by 2016. Four of the top five U.S. home construction firms - DR Horton, Lennar Corp, PulteGroup and KB Home - now automatically include solar panels on every new house in certain markets.

In 2007 there were only 8,000 rooftop solar installations in coal-heavy Australia; now there are over a million.

Saudi Arabia has 41,000 megawatts of solar PV operating, under construction and planned - enough to generate up to two thirds of the country's electricity.

For the roughly 1.3 billion people without access to electricity, it is now often cheaper and more efficient simply to install solar panels rooftop-by-rooftop than to build a central power plant and transmission infrastructure.

Wind energy

Over the past decade, world wind power capacity grew more than 20 percent a year, its increase driven by its many attractive features, by public policies supporting its expansion, and by falling costs.

By the end of 2014, global wind generating capacity totaled 369,000 megawatts, enough to power more than 90 million U.S. homes. Wind currently has a big lead on solar PV, which has enough worldwide capacity to power roughly 30 million U.S. homes.

China is now generating more electricity from wind farms than from nuclear plants, and should have little trouble meeting its official 2020 wind power goal of 200,000 megawatts. For perspective, that would be enough to satisfy the annual electricity needs of Brazil.

In nine U.S. states, wind provides at least 12 percent of electricity. Iowa and South Dakota are each generating more than one quarter of their electricity from wind.

In the Midwestern United States, contracts for wind power are being signed at a price of 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh), which compares with the nationwide average grid price of 10-12 cents per kWh.

Although a wind farm can cover many square miles, turbines occupy little land. Coupled with access roads and other permanent features, a wind farm's footprint typically comes to just over 1 percent of the total land area covered by the project.

Wind energy yield per acre is off the charts. For example, a farmer in northern Iowa could plant an acre in corn that would yield enough grain to produce roughly \$1,000 worth of fuel-grade ethanol per year, or the farmer could put on that same acre a turbine that generates \$300,000 worth of electricity per year. Farmers typically receive \$3,000 to \$10,000 per turbine each year in royalties. As wind farms spread across the U.S. Great Plains, wind royalties for many ranchers will exceed their earnings from cattle sales.

The problem of intermittency

Many forms of renewable energy encounter the problem of intermittency. For example, on windy days, Denmark's windmills generate more than enough electricity to meet the needs of the country, but on days when the wind is less strong, the electrical energy generated is insufficient. Denmark solves this problem by selling surplus electrical power to Germany on windy days, and buying power from hydroelectric-rich Norway on less windy days.

The problem of intermittency can alternatively be solved by pumping water to uphill reservoirs when the wind is strong, and letting the stored water drive turbines when the wind is weak. The problem of intermittency can also be solved with lithium ion storage batteries, by splitting water into hydrogen and oxygen, or by using other types of fuel cells.

Developing countries: No need for grids

When cell phones came into general use, developing countries with no telephone networks were able to use the new technology through satellites, thus jumping over the need for country-wide telephone lines. Similarly, village solar or wind installations in the developing countries can supply power locally, bypassing the need for a grid.

5.6 An economic tipping point

Renewables are now cheaper than fossil fuels

Solar energy and wind energy have recently become cheaper than fossil fuels. Thus a tipping point has been passed. From now on, despite frantic efforts of giant fossil fuel corporations to prevent it from happening, the transition to 100% renewable energy will be driven by economic forces alone.

Subsidies to the fossil fuel industry

<http://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2015/09/28/04/53/sonew070215a>

<http://priceofoil.org/fossil-fuel-subsidies/>

5.7 An unprecedented investment opportunity

Investment in electric vehicles

On July 5, 2017, the Volvo Car Group made the following announcement: ²

“Volvo Cars, the premium car maker, has announced that every Volvo it launches from 2019 will have an electric motor, marking the historic end of cars that only have an internal combustion engine (ICE) and placing electrification at the core of its future business.

“The announcement represents one of the most significant moves by any car maker to embrace electrification and highlights how over a century after the invention of the internal combustion engine electrification is paving the way for a new chapter in automotive history.

“‘This is about the customer,’ said Håkan Samuelsson, president and chief executive. ‘People increasingly demand electrified cars and we want to respond to our customers’ current and future needs. You can now pick and choose whichever electrified Volvo you wish.’

“Volvo Cars will introduce a portfolio of electrified cars across its model range, embracing fully electric cars, plug in hybrid cars and mild hybrid cars.

“It will launch five fully electric cars between 2019 and 2021, three of which will be Volvo models and two of which will be high performance electrified cars from Polestar, Volvo Cars’ performance car arm. Full details of these models will be announced at a later date.”

The electric vehicle investment opportunity was also illustrated by the 2017 vote of Germany’s Bundesrat to ban the manufacture of internal combustion engines after 2030 ³.

The article announcing the vote adds that “It’s a strong statement in a nation where the auto industry is one of the largest sectors of the economy; Germany produces more automobiles than any other country in Europe and is the third largest in the world. The resolution passed by the Bundesrat calls on the European Commission (the executive arm of the European Union) to ‘evaluate the recent tax and contribution practices of Member States on their effectiveness in promoting zero-emission mobility,’ which many are taking to mean an end to the lower levels of tax currently levied on diesel fuel across Europe.”

France plans to end the sale of vehicles powered by gasoline and diesel by 2040, environment minister Nicolas Hulot announced recently.

Hulot made the announcement on Thursday, June 13, 2017, in Paris as he launched the country’s new Climate Plan to accelerate the transition to clean energy and to meet its targets under the Paris climate agreement.

To ease the transition, Hulot said the French government will offer tax incentives to replace fossil-fuel burning cars with clean alternatives.

Furthermore, the government of India has recently announced its intention to only

²<https://www.media.volvocars.com/global/en-gb/media/pressreleases/210058/volvo-cars-to-go-all-electric>

³<https://arstechnica.com/cars/2016/10/germanys-bundesrat-votes-to-ban-the-internal-combustion-engine-by-2030/>

nave electric vehicles by 2030⁴. This hugely ambitious plan was announced during the 2017 Confederation of Indian Industry Annual Session. Besides the avoidance of climate change, which might make many regions of India uninhabitable, the motive for replacing 28 million combustion engine vehicles by electric ones was the severe air pollution from which India suffers. Severe air pollution also motivates efforts by the government of China to promote the transition to electric vehicles.

The governments of Norway and the Netherlands have taken steps towards banning the internal combustion engine⁵. Both the upper and lower houses of the Netherlands' government voted to ban cars driven by internal combustion engines by 2025, the same year in which Norway plans to sell nothing but zero-emission vehicles.

In a report commissioned by the investment bankers Cowan & Co, managing director and senior research analyst Jeffrey Osborne, predicted that electric vehicles will cost less than gasoline-powered cars by the early- to mid-2020s due to falling battery prices as well as the costs that traditional carmakers will incur as they comply to new fuel-efficiency standards. Osborne pointed out that a number of major car brands are hopping onto the electric bandwagon to compete in a space carved out by industry disrupter, Tesla.

“We see the competitive tides shifting in 2019 and beyond as European [car makers] roiled by the diesel scandal and loss of share to Tesla in the high margin luxury segment step on the gas and accelerate the pace of EV introductions”, he wrote.

Bloomberg New Energy Finance reported similar predictions: “Falling battery costs will mean electric vehicles will also be cheaper to buy in the U.S. and Europe as soon as 2025,” the report said. “Batteries currently account for about half the cost of EVs, and their prices will fall by about 77 percent between 2016 and 2030.”

In October, 2017, General Motors unveiled plans to roll out 20 new entirely electric car models by 2023, with two of the new EVs coming out in the next 18 months. Meanwhile, Ford announced the creation of “Team Edison,” intended to accelerate the company’s EV development and partnership work. The name, is “seemingly in direct response to Elon Musk’s Tesla, which recently surpassed Ford’s market capitalization.”

Tesla’s Chairman, highly successful inventor and entrepreneur Elon Musk, has made massive investments in factories manufacturing electric vehicles, improved lithium ion storage cells, and photovoltaic panels, as will be discussed in Chapter 2.

Investment in wind turbine energy

In Denmark, the wind turbine industry contributes substantially to the country’s positive balance of payments. According to Wikipedia, “The Danish wind turbine industry is the world’s largest. Around 90% of the national output is exported, and Danish companies accounted for 38% of the world turbine market in 2003, when the industry employed some 20,000 people and had a turnover of around 3 billion euro.”

⁴<https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/what-country-will-become-the-first-to-ban-internal-combustion-cars>

⁵<http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/the-dutch-revolution-in-smart-charging-of-electric-vehicles-597268791.html>

Denmark's two largest wind turbine manufacturers are Vestas and Simiens Wind Power. Vestas employs more than 21,000 people globally. In February 2016, Vestas got its largest order of 1,000 MW (278 x 3.6 MW) for the Fosen project near Trondheim in Norway. It costs DKK 11 billion, and should deliver 3.4 TWh per year.

In 2015 Siemens Wind had a combined market share of 63% of European offshore wind turbines (nearly 75% in 2009 by capacity and number). In 2011, Siemens Wind Power had 6.3% share of the world wind turbine market, and was the second largest in 2014.

In many countries, including Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, India, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, and United States, wind turbine cooperatives have sprung up. In these cooperatives, communities share the costs and profits of wind turbine projects. For example, the Hepburn Wind Project in Victoria, Australia, owns two 2MW wind turbines which produce enough power for 2,300 households.

Investment in solar energy

Global revenues from solar photovoltaic installations are expected to reach \$1.2 trillion between the present and 2024 according to a recent article⁶

Another article⁷ states that "The global electric power industry is evolving into a model that offers more diversity, both in terms of generation and in the ownership of generation assets, and solar PV is one technology at the head of this change. Following years of unsustainable pricing and oversupply, demand for solar PV systems has finally caught up, with 2015 expected to be the year when the global solar PV market shifts and starts to compete with other technologies. According to a recent report from Navigant Research, global revenue from solar PV installations is expected to total more than \$1.2 trillion from 2015 to 2024."

5.8 For creating jobs, renewables beat fossil fuels

Here are some excerpts from a 2016 report issued by the Solar Foundation:

- One out of every 50 new jobs added in the United States in 2016 was created by the solar industry, representing 2 percent of all new jobs.
- Solar jobs in the United States have increased at least 20 percent per year for the past four years, and jobs have nearly tripled since the first Solar Jobs Census was released in 2010.
- Over the next 12 months, employers surveyed expect one out of every 50 new jobs added in the United States in 2016 was created by the solar industry, representing 2 percent of all new jobs.

⁶<https://cleantechnica.com/2016/01/25/global-revenue-solar-pv-installations-expected-reach-1-2-trillion/>

⁷<http://www.navigantresearch.com/newsroom/global-revenue-from-solar-pv-installations-is-expected-to-total-more-than-1-2-trillion-from-2015-to-2024>

- In 2016, the five states with the most solar jobs were California, Massachusetts, Texas, Nevada, and Florida.
- The solar industry added \$84 billion to the US GDP in 2016 to see total solar industry employment increase by 10 percent to 286,335 solar workers.
- The solar industry added \$84 billion to the US GDP in 2016.

5.9 The Stern Review

Background of the Stern Review

The Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change is a 700 page document commissioned by the government of the United Kingdom and released on 30 October, 2006. The research behind this report was conducted by a team led by Nicolas Stern (Baron Stern of Brentford), chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment.

The Stern Review discusses the catastrophic climate change which will result if prompt action is not taken, and it proposes that 1% of global GDP be used annually to prevent such disasters. In 2014, the global GDP was estimated to be 77.9 trillion dollars, so that the 1% investment in renewable energy recommended by Lord Stern and his research team would have amounted to nearly a trillion dollars.

The Middle East

According to current estimates, 81.5% of the world's proven crude oil reserves are located in OPEC Member Countries, with the bulk of OPEC oil reserves in the Middle East, amounting to 65.5% of the OPEC total.

China

China's large reserves of coal lie near to the surface, and are thus very easily accessible. Mining of coal has driven the country's rapid industrial growth, but it has also produced a severe public health problem because of air pollution.

In April, 2017, China's rate of economic growth was 6.9%⁸. This rate of growth, if continued, would mean that China's economy would double every ten years. and increase by a factor of 1024 every century. Obviously this is impossible. Never-ending economic growth on a finite planet is a logical absurdity. China's high economic growth rate, is driven by its use of coal, and this must quickly stop if ecological disaster is to be avoided.



Figure 5.7: Protesters at the 2017 G20 meeting in Hamburg Germany.




Figure 5.8: India's installed and future energy mix, as visualized by the World Coal Association

India

The MIT Technology Review recently published an important article entitled *India's Energy Crisis*⁹.

The article makes alarming reading in view of the world's urgent need to make a very rapid transition from fossil fuels to 100% renewable energy. We must make this change quickly in order to avoid a tipping point beyond which catastrophic climate change will be unavoidable.

The MIT article states that "Since he took power in May, 2014, Prime Minister Narendra Modi has made universal access to electricity a key part of his administration's ambitions. At the same time, he has pledged to help lead international efforts to limit climate change. Among other plans, he has promised to increase India's total power generating capacity to 175 gigawatts, including 100 gigawatts of solar, by 2022. (That's about the total power generation of Germany.)"

However India plans to expand its industrial economy, and to do this, it is planning to very much increase its domestic production and use of coal. The MIT article continues, pointing out that

However India plans to expand its industrial economy, and to do this, it is planning to very much increase its domestic production and use of coal. The MIT article continues, pointing out that "Such growth would easily swamp efforts elsewhere in the world to curtail carbon emissions, dooming any chance to head off the dire effects of global climate change. (Overall, the world will need to reduce its current annual emissions of 40 billion tons by 40 to 70 percent between now and 2050.) By 2050, India will have roughly 20 percent of the world's population. If those people rely heavily on fossil fuels such as coal to expand the economy and raise their living standards to the level people in the rich world have enjoyed for the last 50 years, the result will be a climate catastrophe regardless of anything the United States or even China does to decrease its emissions. Reversing these trends will require radical transformations in two main areas: how India produces electricity, and how it distributes it."

The Indian Minister of Power, Piyush Goyal, is an enthusiastic supporter of renewable energy expansion, but he also supports, with equal enthusiasm, the large-scale expansion of domestic coal production in India.

Meanwhile, the consequences of global warming are being felt by the people of India. For example, last May, a heat wave killed over 1,400 people and melted asphalt streets.¹⁰

Have India's economic planners really thought about the long-term future? Have they considered the fact that drastic climate change could make India completely uninhabitable?

⁸<https://tradingeconomics.com/china/gdp-growth-annual>

⁹<http://www.technologyreview.com/featuredstory/542091/indias-energy-crisis/>

¹⁰<https://www.rt.com/news/262641-india-heat-wave-killed/>



Figure 5.9: Oil production on the shelf in the Russian Arctic.

Russia

According to Wikipedia, “The petroleum industry in Russia is one of the largest in the world. Russia has the largest reserves, and is the largest exporter, of natural gas. It has the second largest coal reserves, the eighth largest oil reserves, and is one of the largest producer of oil. It is the third largest energy user.”

One of the difficulties of reducing Russia’s fossil fuel production is that the Russian economy depends so heavily on its oil and gas industries. Many European countries also depend on natural gas from Russia for winter heating of homes and workplaces.

North America

Canadian oil sands

Canada’s oil-sands deposits contain an amount of carbon comparable to the world’s total reserves of conventional oil. Oil is currently being extracted by methods that release four times as much carbon into the atmosphere as is contained in the refined oil from the deposits. Nevertheless, the government of Canada wholeheartedly supports extraction of oil from the tar sands.

The position of the Canadian government has been strongly criticized by leading climate scientist Professor James Hansen. A recent article in *The Guardian*¹¹, reported him as saying; “To leave our children with a manageable situation, we need to leave the unconventional fuel in the ground. Canada’s ministers are acting as salesmen for those people

¹¹<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/may/19/tar-sands-exploitation-climate-scientist>



Figure 5.10: **Get rich quick at the oil sands.**

who will gain from the profits of that industry. But I don't think they are looking after the rights and wellbeing of the population as a whole.

“The thing we are facing overall is that the fossil fuel industry has so much money that they are buying off governments. Our democracies are seriously handicapped by the money that is driving decisions in Washington and other capitals.”

Fracking in the United States

According to the US Department of Energy (DOE), in 2013 at least two million oil and gas wells in the US have been hydraulically fractured, and that of new wells being drilled, up to 95% are hydraulically fractured. The output from these wells makes up 43% of the oil production and 67% of the natural gas production in the United States.

Because of earthquakes and poisoning of water supplies caused by fracking, this practice has been banned by several states in the US, and nine countries or regions in Europe: France, Bulgaria, Roumania, Germany, The Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Northern Ireland, Spain and Switzerland,

Latin America

Venezuela's Belt of Tar

The Orinoco River Basin in Venezuela contains the world's largest deposit of extra-heavy oil and tar. The amount of carbon contained in this deposit is comparable to the carbon content of all the world's known reserves of conventional oil, and also larger than the carbon contained in Canada's oil sands.




Figure 5.11: The sharply increased number of earthquakes in the United States has been linked to fracking. The use of fracking has also caused poisoning of water supplies.



Figure 5.12: Venezuela's Belt of Tar under the Orinoco River Basin is the world's largest deposit of extra-heavy oil and tar. Desire for control of Venezuela's huge oil reserves lies behind US interference in the internal politics of the country.

The Belt of Tar follows the line of the Orinoco river. It is approximately 600 kilometers (370 mi) from east to west, and 70 kilometers (43 mi) from north to south, with an area about 55,314 square kilometers (21,357 sq mi). The Orinoco deposit is estimated to contain 1.2 trillion barrels of extra-heavy oil.

The government of Venezuela has no plans for halting extraction from the Belt of Tar. On the contrary, detailed plans have been made for expanded exploitation of the deposit¹².

Extraction of oil in Brazil

According to a recent article in *The Guardian*¹³ “The discovery of tens of billions of barrels of oil in fields far off the coast of Rio de Janeiro was billed as one of the biggest finds of this century when it was announced in 2006.

“Many hoped it would deliver a bonanza for education and health and make Brazil one of world’s major economies.

“But with the country’s biggest energy company, Petrobras, mired in debt and scandal, the low price of oil and the dangers of a second Deepwater Horizon, the viability of this massive undertaking has never been under more scrutiny.”

The Brazilian offshore deposits are called “presalt oil”, since they lie under a thick layer of salt deposits.

According to the article in *The Guardian*, “Suggestions by climate campaigners that this reservoir of fossil fuel is a ‘carbon bomb’ that should be left in the ground, are dismissed as hypocrisy.”

The article quotes the geologist who discovered the off-shore fields as saying “The big countries of the world today developed without any concern for the environment. The base of US development was the oil in the Gulf of Mexico. The base of the UK’s industrial revolution was coal. How can they now say we can’t use our own pre-salt?”

The European Union

Coal in Germany and Poland

In 2016, Germany produced 176,100,000 tonnes of coal while Poland produced 131,100,000 tonnes. In the past, Poland experienced severe ecological effects from acid rain due to the burning of coal. Polish forests were destroyed by the effects of acid rain, and the facades of statues and buildings in Krakow and elsewhere were dissolved by the acid. Today the situation is improving, but the two countries are still heavily dependant on coal.

¹²<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PDVSA>

¹³<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2015/jun/25/brazils-gamble-on-deep-water-oil-guanabara-bay>

North Sea oil

According to Wikipedia, “The British and Norwegian sections hold most of the remainder of the large oil reserves. It is estimated that the Norwegian section alone contains 54% of the sea’s oil reserves and 45% of its gas reserves- More than half of the North Sea oil reserves have been extracted, according to official sources in both Norway and the UK. For Norway, the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate [28] gives a figure of 4,601 million cubic meters of oil (corresponding to 29 billion barrels) for the Norwegian North Sea alone (excluding smaller reserves in Norwegian Sea and Barents Sea) of which 2,778 million cubic meters (60%) has already been produced prior to January 2007. UK sources give a range of estimates of reserves, but even using the most optimistic ‘maximum’ estimate of ultimate recovery, 76% had been recovered at end 2010.[citation needed] Note the UK figure includes fields which are not in the North Sea (onshore, West of Shetland).

5.10 Major producers of fossil fuels

The top 20 oil-producing nations in 2016

Wikipedia’s article entitles *List of countries by oil production* gives information shown in the table below. In the table. which is based on data from the International Energy Agency, production is measured in barrels of oil per day

1	Russia	10,551,497
2	Saudi Arabia	10,460,710
3	United States	8,875,817
4	Iraq	4,451,516
5	Iran	3,990,956
6	China	3,980,650
7	Canada	3,662,694
8	United Arab Emirates	3,106,077
9	Kuwait	2,923,825
10	Brazil	2,515,459
11	Venezuela	2,276,967
12	Mexico	2,186,877
13	Nigeria	1,999,885
14	Angola	1,769,615
15	Norway	1,647,975
16	Kazakhstan	1,595,199
17	Qatar	1,522,902
18	Algeria	1,348,361
19	Oman	1,006,841
20	United Kingdom	939,760

The top 10 coal producing nations in 2016

Wikipedia gives a similar list of coal producing nations. Only the top 10 are shown here, since these countries completely dominate global coal production. In the table, production is measured in millions of tonnes per year.

1	China	3411.0
2	India	692.4
3	United States	660.6
4	Australia	492.8
5	Indonesia	434.0
6	Russia	385.4
7	South Africa	251.3
8	Germany	176.1
9	Poland	131.1
10	Kazakhstan	102.4
	World	7,460.4

The world production of coal is falling. In 2014 it was 8,164.9 tonnes, in 2015, 7,861.1 tonnes, and in 2016 7,460.4 tonnes. Nevertheless, global production of coal remains worryingly high. If catastrophic climate change is to be avoided, it must stop altogether within one or two decades. At the moment the world is still producing roughly 1 tonne of coal per capita each year.

List of countries by natural gas production

Here is a similar table for natural gas. Production is measured in m³ per year. The final column indicates the date of the data.

1	United States	728,200,000,000	2014
2	Russia	578,700,000,000	2014
3	Iran	438,000,000,000	2017
4	Canada	143,100,000,000	2012
5	Qatar	133,200,000,000	2011
6	Norway	114,700,000,000	2012
7	China	107,200,000,000	2012
8	Saudi Arabia	103,200,000,000	2012
9	Algeria	82,760,000,000	2011
10	Netherlands	80,780,000,000	2012
	World	4,359,000,000,000	2010

5.11 Blood for oil

There is a close relationship between petroleum and war. James A. Paul, Executive Director of the Global Policy Forum, has described this relationship very clearly in the following words:

“Modern warfare particularly depends on oil, because virtually all weapons systems rely on oil-based fuel - tanks, trucks, armored vehicles, self-propelled artillery pieces, airplanes, and naval ships. For this reason, the governments and general staffs of powerful nations seek to ensure a steady supply of oil during wartime, to fuel oil-hungry military forces in far-flung operational theaters.”

“Just as governments like the US and UK need oil companies to secure fuel for their global war-making capacity, so the oil companies need their governments to secure control over global oilfields and transportation routes. It is no accident, then, that the world ’s largest oil companies are located in the world ’s most powerful countries.”

“Almost all of the world ’s oil-producing countries have suffered abusive, corrupt and undemocratic governments and an absence of durable development. Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Iraq, Iran, Angola, Colombia, Venezuela, Kuwait, Mexico, Algeria - these and many other oil producers have a sad record, which includes dictatorships installed from abroad, bloody coups engineered by foreign intelligence services, militarization of government and intolerant right-wing nationalism.”

The resource curse

The way in which the industrialized countries maintain their control over less developed nations can be illustrated by the “resource curse”, i.e. the fact that resource-rich developing countries are no better off economically than those that lack resources, but are cursed with corrupt and undemocratic governments. This is because foreign corporations extracting local resources under unfair agreements exist in a symbiotic relationship with corrupt local officials.

One might think that taxation of foreign resource-extracting firms would provide developing countries with large incomes. However, there is at present no international law governing multinational tax arrangements. These are usually agreed to on a bilateral basis, and the industrialized countries have stronger bargaining powers in arranging the bilateral agreements.

5.12 Fossil fuel extraction must stop!

“Leave the oil in the soil! Leave the coal in the hole! Leave the gas under the grass!” That was message of protesters at the 2017 G20 meeting. But from the facts shown in this chapter, we can see that on the whole, fossil fuels are not being left in the ground, where they have to remain if an ecological disaster is to be avoided. On the contrary, the extraction of coal, oil and gas continues almost as though the climate emergency did

not exist. Most politicians, with their eyes focused on the present, seem blind to future dangers. They think primarily about the jobs and living standards of their constituents, and about the next election. Meanwhile, the future of human civilization is neglected and remains in peril.¹⁴

The fact that historically, the highly industrialized nations were primarily responsible for atmospheric CO₂ increases does not excuse the developing countries from their responsibility for saving the future. Today China's coal, India's coal, Venezuela's tar sands and Brazil's pre-salt oil are among the greatest threats, and in these countries as elsewhere, extraction must stop.

We have to wake up! Business as usual cannot continue!

5.13 Extinction events and feedback loops

Scientists warn that if the transition to renewable energy does not happen within very few decades, there is a danger that we will reach a tipping point beyond which feedback loops, such as the albedo effect and the methane hydrate feedback loop, will take over and produce an out-of-control and fatal increase in global temperature.

In 2012, the World Bank issued a report warning that without quick action to curb CO₂ emissions, global warming is likely to reach 4 °C during the 21st century. This is dangerously close to the temperature which initiated the Permian-Triassic extinction event: 6 °C above normal. During the Permian-Triassic extinction event, which occurred 252 million years ago, 96% of all marine species were wiped out, as well as 70% of all terrestrial vertebrates.¹⁵

¹⁴See <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/sep/18/enough-tiptoeing-around-lets-make-this-clear-coal-kills-people>

¹⁵<http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/prehistoric-world/permian-extinction/>
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/18/Climate-change-report-warns-dramatically-warmer-world-this-century>




Figure 5.13: Monthly September ice extent for 1979 to 2012 shows a decline of 13.0% per decade. One can also see that the straight line does not really fit the data, which more nearly resemble a downward curve will that reach zero in the period 2016-2019. Source: National Snow and Ice Data Center. Wikimedia Commons




Figure 5.14: Loss of species caused by the Permian-Triassic extinction event. Unless quick steps are taken to lower our greenhouse gas emissions, we may cause a similar extinction event, which will threaten the survival of our own species. Source: Australian Frontiers of Science, www.sciencearchive.org.au

5.14 A warning from the World Bank

In 2012, the World Bank issued a report warning that without quick action to curb CO₂ emissions, global warming is likely to reach 4 °C during the 21st century. This is dangerously close to the temperature which initiated the Permian-Triassic extinction event: 6 °C above normal. During the Permian-Triassic extinction event, which occurred 252 million years ago, 96% of all marine species were wiped out, as well as 70% of all terrestrial vertebrates.¹⁶

The 4°C scenarios are devastating: the inundation of coastal cities; increasing risks for food production potentially leading to higher malnutrition rates; many dry regions becoming dryer, wet regions wetter; unprecedented heat waves in many regions, especially in the tropics; substantially exacerbated water scarcity in many regions; increased frequency of high-intensity tropical cyclones; and irreversible loss of biodiversity, including coral reef systems.

And most importantly, a 4°C world is so different from the current one that it comes with high uncertainty and new risks that threaten our ability to anticipate and plan for future adaptation needs. The lack of action on climate change not only risks putting prosperity out of reach of millions of people in the developing world, it threatens to roll back decades of sustainable development. It is clear that we already know a great deal about the threat before us. The science is unequivocal that humans are the cause of global warming, and major changes are already being observed: global mean warming is 0.8°C above pre industrial levels; oceans have warmed by 0.09°C since the 1950s and are acidifying; sea levels rose by about 20 cm since pre-industrial times and are now rising at 3.2 cm per decade; an exceptional number of extreme heat waves occurred in the last decade; major food crop growing areas are increasingly affected by drought.

Despite the global community's best intentions to keep global warming below a 2°C increase above pre-industrial climate, higher levels of warming are increasingly likely. Scientists agree that countries' current United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change emission pledges and commitments would most likely result in 3.5 to 4°C warming. And the longer those pledges remain unmet, the more likely a 4°C world becomes.

Data and evidence drive the work of the World Bank Group. Science reports, including those produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, informed our decision to ramp up work on these issues, leading to, a World Development Report on climate change designed to improve our understanding of the implications of a warming planet; a Strategic Framework on Development and Climate Change, and a report on Inclusive Green Growth. The World Bank is a leading advocate for ambitious action on climate change, not only because it is a moral imperative, but because it makes good economic sense.

But what if we fail to ramp up efforts on mitigation? What are the implications of a 4°C world? We commissioned this report from the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact

¹⁶<http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/prehistoric-world/permian-extinction/>
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/18/Climate-change-report-warns-dramatically-warmer-world-this-century>

Research and Climate Analytics to help us understand the state of the science and the potential impact on development in such a world.

It would be so dramatically different from today's world that it is hard to describe accurately; much relies on complex projections and interpretations. We are well aware of the uncertainty that surrounds these scenarios and we know that different scholars and studies sometimes disagree on the degree of risk. But the fact that such scenarios cannot be discarded is sufficient to justify strengthening current climate change policies. Finding ways to avoid that scenario is vital for the health and welfare of communities around the world. While every region of the world will be affected, the poor and most vulnerable would be hit hardest. A 4°C world can, and must, be avoided.

The World Bank Group will continue to be a strong advocate for international and regional agreements and increasing climate financing. We will redouble our efforts to support fast growing national initiatives to mitigate carbon emissions and build adaptive capacity as well as support inclusive green growth and climate smart development. Our work on inclusive green growth has shown that, through more efficiency and smarter use of energy and natural resources, many opportunities exist to drastically reduce the climate impact of development, without slowing down poverty alleviation and economic growth.

This report is a stark reminder that climate change affects everything. The solutions don't lie only in climate finance or climate projects. The solutions lie in effective risk management and ensuring all our work, all our thinking, is designed with the threat of a 4°C degree world in mind. The World Bank Group will step up to the challenge.

5.15 Permian-Triassic extinction event

The geological record shows five major extinction events.

- Ordovician-Silurian Extinction. around 439 million years ago.
- Late Devonian Extinction. 375-360 million years ago.
- Permian-Triassic extinction. 352 million years ago.
- Triassic-Jurassic extinction, 201 million years ago.
- Cretaceous-Paleogene extinction, 66 million years ago.

The most devastating of these was the Permian-Triassic extinction, which occurred 252 million years ago.¹⁷ In the Permian-Triassic extinction, 96% of all marine species and 76% of all terrestrial vertebrates disappeared forever. The cause of this extremely severe

¹⁷ <https://www.thomhartmann.com/bigpicture/last-hours-climate-change>
The Last Hours of Humanity: Warming the World To Extinction (book), by Thom Hartmann
<https://www.amazon.com/Last-Hours-Humanity-Warming-Extinction/dp/1629213640>
<http://www.mediaite.com/online/leonardo-dicaprio-boosts-thom-hartmann-apocalyptic-global-warming-film-last-hours/>

event is disputed, but according to one of the most plausible theories it was triggered by a massive volcanic eruption in Siberia, which released enormous amounts of CO₂ into the earth's atmosphere.

The region where massive volcanic eruptions are known to have occurred 252 million years ago called the "Siberian Traps". (The "Traps" part of the name comes from the fact that many of the volcanic rock formations in the region resemble staircases. The Swedish word for staircase is "trapped".) The eruptions continued for about a million years.

Today the area covered is about 2 million square kilometers, roughly equal to western Europe in land area. Estimates of the original coverage are as high as 7 million square kilometers. The original volume of lava is estimated to range from 1 to 4 million cubic kilometers.

The CO₂ released by the Siberian Traps eruption is believed to have caused a global temperature increase of 6°C, and this was enough to trigger the methane-hydrate feedback loop, which will be discussed below, The earth's temperature is thought to have continued to rise for 85,000 years, finally reaching 15° above normal.

5.16 The Holocene (Anthropocene) extinction

We are now living in the midst of a sixth, human-caused, mass extinction. How severe it becomes is up to us.

Recently a group of scientists stated that the scope of human impact on planet Earth is so great that the *Anthropocene* warrants a formal place in the Geological Time Scale.

In a statement issued by University of Leicester Press Office on 2 October 2017, professor Jan Zalasiewicz from the University of Leicester's School of Geography, Geology, and the Environment said: "Our findings suggest that the Anthropocene should follow on from the Holocene Epoch that has seen 11.7 thousand years of relative environmental stability, since the retreat of the last Ice Age, as we enter a more unstable and rapidly evolving phase of our planet's history,"¹⁸

"We conclude that human impact has now grown to the point that it has changed the course of Earth history by at least many millennia, in terms of the anticipated long-term climate effects (e.g. postponement of the next glacial maximum: see Ganopolski et al., 2016; Clark et al., 2016), and in terms of the extensive and ongoing transformation of the biota, including a geologically unprecedented phase of human-mediated species invasions, and by species extinctions which are accelerating (Williams et al., 2015, 2016)."

The report stated that defining characteristics of the period include "marked acceleration of rates of erosion and sedimentation; large-scale chemical perturbations to the cycles of carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and other elements; the inception of significant change in global climate and sea level; and biotic changes including unprecedented levels of species invasions across the Earth. Many of these changes are geologically long-lasting, and some are effectively irreversible."

¹⁸<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/press/press-releases/2017/october/significant-scale-of-human-impact-on-planet-has-changed-course-of-earth2019s-history-scientists-suggest>

Loss of biodiversity

Tropical rain forests are the most biologically diverse places in the world. This is because they have not been affected by the periods of glaciation that have periodically destroyed the forests of temperate and boreal regions. The destruction of species-rich tropical rain forests is one of the mechanisms driving the present high rate of species loss.

According to a recent article published in *The Guardian*¹⁹ “Conservation experts have already signalled that the world is in the grip of the “sixth great extinction” of species, driven by the destruction of natural habitats, hunting, the spread of alien predators and disease, and climate change.

“The IUCN²⁰ created shock waves with its major assessment of the world’s biodiversity in 2004, which calculated that the rate of extinction had reached 100-1,000 times that suggested by the fossil records before humans.

“No formal calculations have been published since, but conservationists agree the rate of loss has increased since then, and Stuart said it was possible that the dramatic predictions of experts like the renowned Harvard biologist E O Wilson, that the rate of loss could reach 10,000 times the background rate in two decades, could be correct.”

A recent article by Profs. Gerardo Ceballos, Paul R. Ehrlich and Rodolfo Dirzo in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* was entitled “Biological Annihilation via the Ongoing Sixth Mass Extinction Signaled by Vertebrate Population Losses and Declines”.

The Abstract of the paper reads as follows: “The population extinction pulse we describe here shows, from a quantitative viewpoint, that Earth’s sixth mass extinction is more severe than perceived when looking exclusively at species extinctions. Therefore, humanity needs to address anthropogenic population extirpation and decimation immediately. That conclusion is based on analyses of the numbers and degrees of range contraction (indicative of population shrinkage and/or population extinctions according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature) using a sample of 27,600 vertebrate species, and on a more detailed analysis documenting the population extinctions between 1900 and 2015 in 177 mammal species. We find that the rate of population loss in terrestrial vertebrates is extremely high, even in ‘species of low concern.’ In our sample, comprising nearly half of known vertebrate species, 32% (8,851/27,600) are decreasing; that is, they have decreased in population size and range. In the 177 mammals for which we have detailed data, all have lost 30% or more of their geographic ranges and more than 40% of the species have experienced severe population declines (>80% range shrinkage). Our data indicate that beyond global species extinctions Earth is experiencing a huge episode of population declines and extirpations, which will have negative cascading consequences on ecosystem functioning and services vital to sustaining civilization. We describe this as a ‘biological annihilation’ to highlight the current magnitude of Earth’s ongoing sixth major extinction event.”

¹⁹<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/mar/07/extinction-species-evolve>

²⁰International Union for the Conservation of Nature

5.17 Global warming and atmospheric water vapor

A feedback loop is a self-re-enforcing trend. One of the main positive feedback loops in global warming is the tendency of warming to increase the atmospheric saturation pressure for water vapor, and hence amount of water vapor in the atmosphere, which in turn leads to further warming, since water vapor is a greenhouse gas.

Wikipedia's article on greenhouse gases states that, "Water vapor accounts for the largest percentage of the greenhouse effect, between 36% and 66% for clear sky conditions and between 66% and 85% when including clouds."

5.18 The albedo effect

Albedo is defined to be the fraction of solar energy (shortwave radiation) reflected from the Earth back into space. It is a measure of the reflectivity of the earth's surface. Ice, especially with snow on top of it, has a high albedo: most sunlight hitting the surface bounces back towards space.

Loss of sea ice

Especially in the Arctic and Antarctic regions, there exists a dangerous feedback loop involving the albedo of ice and snow. As is shown in Figure 4.1, Arctic sea ice is rapidly disappearing. It is predicted that during the summers, the ice covering arctic seas may disappear entirely during the summers. As a consequence, incoming sunlight will encounter dark light-absorbing water surfaces rather than light-reflecting ice and snow.

This effect is self-re-enforcing. In other words, it is a feedback loop. The rising temperatures caused by the absorption of more solar radiation cause the melting of more ice, and hence even more absorption of radiation rather than reflection, still higher temperatures, more melting, and so on.

The feedback loop is further strengthened by the fact that water vapor acts like a greenhouse gas. As polar oceans become exposed, more water vapor enters the atmosphere, where it contributes to the greenhouse effect and rising temperatures.

Darkened snow on Greenland's icecap

Greenland's icecap is melting, and as it melts, the surface becomes darker and less reflective because particles of soot previously trapped in the snow and ice become exposed. This darkened surface absorbs an increased amount of solar radiation, and the result is accelerated melting.




Figure 5.15: The worrying thing about the methane/hydrate feedback loop is the enormous amount of carbon in the form of hydrate crystals, 10,000 gigatons most of it on the continental shelves of oceans. This greater than the amount of carbon in all other forms that might potentially enter the earth's atmosphere.



Figure 5.16: When ocean temperatures rise, methane hydrate crystals become unstable, and methane gas bubbles up to ocean surfaces.




Figure 5.17: This diagram shows two important feedback loops, one involving the albedo effect, and the other involving methane hydrates.




Figure 5.18: A “hockey stick” graph showing atmospheric concentrations of three important greenhouse gases during the last 2,000 years. The most dramatically increasing of these is methane.

5.19 The methane hydrate feedback loop

If we look at the distant future, by far the most dangerous feedback loop involves methane hydrates or methane clathrates. When organic matter is carried into the oceans by rivers, it decays to form methane. The methane then combines with water to form hydrate crystals, which are stable at the temperatures and pressures which currently exist on ocean floors. However, if the temperature rises, the crystals become unstable, and methane gas bubbles up to the surface. Methane is a greenhouse gas which is 70 times as potent as CO₂.

The worrying thing about the methane hydrate deposits on ocean floors is the enormous amount of carbon involved: roughly 10,000 gigatons. To put this huge amount into perspective, we can remember that the total amount of carbon in world CO₂ emissions since 1751 has only been 337 gigatons.

A runaway, exponentially increasing, feedback loop involving methane hydrates could lead to one of the great geological extinction events that have periodically wiped out most of the animals and plants then living. This must be avoided at all costs.

5.20 A feedback loop from warming of soils

On October 6, 2017, the journal *Science* published an article entitled *Long-term pattern and magnitude of soil carbon feedback to the climate system in a warming world*²¹. The

²¹J.M. Melillo et al., *Long-term pattern and magnitude of soil carbon feedback to the climate system in a warming world*, *Science*, Vol. 358, pp. 101-105, (2017).

lead author, Jerry Melillo, is an ecologist working at the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole Massachusetts. In an interview with *Newsweek*, he said: “This self-reinforcing feedback is potentially a global phenomenon with soils, and once it starts it may be very difficult to turn off. It’s that part of the problem that I think is sobering... We think that one of the things that may be happening is both a reorganization of the microbial community structure and its functional capacity,”

The study reported on three decades of observations of heated sections of a forest owned by Harvard University. The heated sections were 5°C warmer than control sections.

5.21 Drying of forests and forest fires

According to a recent article in *Nature*²², “Across the American west, the area burned each year has increased significantly over the past several decades, a trend that scientists attribute both to warming and drying and to a century of wildfire suppression and other human activities. Allen suggests that the intertwined forces of fire and climate change will take ecosystems into new territory, not only in the American west but also elsewhere around the world. In the Jemez, for example, it could transform much of the ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) forest into shrub land. ‘We’re losing forests as we’ve known them for a very long time,’ says Allen. ‘We’re on a different trajectory, and we’re not yet sure where we’re going.’

“All around the American west, scientists are seeing signs that fire and climate change are combining to create a ‘new normal’. Ten years after Colorado’s largest recorded fire burned 56,000 hectares southwest of Denver, the forest still has not rebounded in a 20,000-hectare patch in the middle, which was devastated by an intense crown fire. Only a few thousand hectares, which the US Forest Service replanted, look anything like the ponderosa-pine stands that previously dominated the landscape.”

5.22 Tipping points and feedback loops

A tipping point is usually defined as the threshold for an abrupt and irreversible change²³. To illustrate this idea, we can think of a book lying on a table. If we gradually push the book towards the edge of the table, we will finally reach a point after which more than half of the weight of the book will not be supported by the table. When this “tipping point” is passed the situation will suddenly become unstable, and the book will fall to the floor. Analogously, as the earth’s climate gradually changes, we may reach tipping points. If we pass these points, sudden instabilities and abrupt climatic changes will occur.

Greenland ice cores supply a record of temperatures in the past, and through geological evidence we have evidence of sea levels in past epochs. These historical records show that

²²<http://www.nature.com/news/forest-fires-burn-out-1.11424>

²³Other definitions of tipping points are possible. A few authors define these as points beyond which change is inevitable, emphasizing that while inevitable, the change may be slow.

abrupt climatic changes have occurred in the past.

Timothy Michael Lenton, FRS, Professor of Climate Change and Earth System Science at the University of Exeter, lists the following examples of climatic tipping points:

- Boreal forest dieback
- Amazon rainforest dieback
- Loss of Arctic and Antarctic sea ice (Polar ice packs) and melting of Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets
- Disruption to Indian and West African monsoon
- Formation of Atlantic deep water near the Arctic ocean, which is a component process of the thermohaline circulation.
- Loss of permafrost, leading to potential Arctic methane release and clathrate gun effect

It can be seen from this list that climate tipping points are associated with feedback loops. For example, the boreal forest dieback and the Amazon rainforest dieback tipping points are associated with the feedback loop involving the drying of forests and forest fires, while the tipping point involving loss of Arctic and Antarctic sea ice is associated with the Albedo effect feedback loop. The tipping point involving loss of permafrost is associated with the methane hydrate feedback loop.

Once a positive feedback loop starts to operate in earnest, change may be abrupt.

5.23 Greta Thunberg's TED talk

While political leaders and the older generation have been slow to react to the climate crisis, young people, whose future is at stake, are wide awake and are warning the world that action must be taken immediately if disaster is to be avoided. Massive global demonstrations have been initiated by the teenage activist, Greta Thunberg, who has succeeded where others have failed by speaking with extraordinary clarity, honesty and forcefulness.

Greta was born in Sweden in 2003. Her father, Svante Thunberg, is related to Svante Arrhenius, one of the important pioneers of climate science, and is named after him. Greta's mother was a successful opera singer. Greta Thunberg's strong belief in the urgency of action to prevent catastrophic climate change converted her parents, so that they made changes in their lives. For example, Greta's mother gave up her career as an opera singer because it involved air travel.

In November, 2018, Greta Thunberg gave an impressively clear TEDx talk in Stockholm, the video of which was recently released.²⁴ Here is a transcript of the talk.

²⁴<https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/16/1819508/-A-Call-to-Action-on-Climate-Change-by-15-year-Old-Greta-Thunberg>

When I was about 8 years old, I first heard about something called ‘climate change’ or ‘global warming’. Apparently, that was something humans had created by our way of living. I was told to turn off the lights to save energy and to recycle paper to save resources. I remember thinking that it was very strange that humans, who are an animal species among others, could be capable of changing the Earth’s climate. Because, if we were, and if it was really happening, we wouldn’t be talking about anything else. As soon as you turn on the TV, everything would be about that. Headlines, radio, newspapers: You would never read or hear about anything else. As if there was a world war going on, but no one ever talked about it. If burning fossil fuels was so bad that it threatened our very existence, how could we just continue like before? Why were there no restrictions? Why wasn’t it made illegal?

To me, that did not add up. It was too unreal.

So, when I was 11, I became ill, I fell into depression, I stopped talking, and I stopped eating. In two months, I lost about 10 kilos of weight. Later on, I was diagnosed with Asperger’s syndrome, OCD and selective mutism. This basically means, I only speak, when I think it is necessary.

Now is one of those moments.

For those of us, who are on the spectrum, almost everything is black or white. We aren’t very good at lying and we usually don’t enjoy participating in the social games that the rest of you seem so fond of. I think, in many ways, that we autistic are the normal ones and the rest of the people are pretty strange. Especially when it comes to the sustainability crisis: Where everyone keeps saying that climate change is an existential threat and the most important issue of all. And yet, they just carry on like before.

I don’t understand that. Because if the emissions have to stop, then we must stop the emissions. To me, that is black or white. There are no gray areas when it comes to survival. Either we go on as a civilization or we don’t.

We have to change.

Rich countries like Sweden need to start reducing emissions by at least 15% every year. And that is so that we can stay below a 2 degrees warming target. Yet, as the IPCC has recently demonstrated, aiming instead for 1.5 degrees Celsius would significantly reduce the climate impacts. But we can only imagine what that means for reducing emissions.

You would think the media and every one of our leaders would be talking about nothing else. But they never even mention it.

Nor does anyone ever mentioned the greenhouse gases already locked in the system. Nor that air pollution is hiding some warming; so that, when we stop burning fossil fuels, we already have an extra level of warming - perhaps as high as 0.5 to 1.1 degrees Celsius.

Furthermore, does hardly anyone speak about the fact that we are in the midst of the sixth mass extinction: With up to 200 species going extinct every single day. That the extinction rate is today between 1000 and 10,000 times

higher than what is seen as normal.

Nor does hardly anyone ever speak about the aspect of equity or climate justice, clearly stated everywhere in the Paris agreement, which is absolutely necessary to make it work on a global scale. That means that rich countries need to get down to zero emissions within 6 to 12 years with today's emission speed. And that is so that people in poorer countries can have a chance to heighten their standard of living by building some of the infrastructures that we have already built, such as roads, schools, hospitals, clean drinking water, electricity, and so on. Because, how can we expect countries like India or Nigeria to care about the climate crisis if we, who already have everything, don't care even a second about it or our actual commitments to the Paris agreement?

So why are we not reducing our emissions? Why are they in fact still increasing? Are we knowingly causing a mass extinction? Are we evil?

No, of course, not. People keep doing what they do because the vast majority doesn't have a clue about the actual consequences for their everyday life. And they don't know that rapid change is required.

We all think we know and we all think everybody knows. But we don't.

Because, how could we? If there really was a crisis, and if this crisis was caused by our emissions, you would at least see some signs. Not just flooded cities. Tens of thousands of dead people and whole nations leveled to piles of torn down buildings. You would see some restrictions.

But no. And no one talks about it. There are no emergency meetings, no headlines, no breaking news. No one is acting as if we were in a crisis.

Even most climate scientists or green politicians keep on flying around the world, eating meat and dairy.

If I live to be 100, I will be alive in the year 2103. When you think about the future today, you don't think beyond the year 2050. By then I will, in the best case, not even have lived half of my life. What happens next? In the year 2078, I will celebrate my 75th birthday. If I have children or grandchildren, maybe they will spend that day with me. Maybe they will ask me about you, the people who were around back in 2018. Maybe they will ask why you didn't do anything while there still was time to act. What we do or don't do right now, will affect my entire life and the lives of my children and grandchildren. What we do or don't do right now, me and my generation can't undo in the future.

So, when school started in August of this year, I decided that this was enough. I set myself down on the ground outside the Swedish parliament. I school-striking for the climate.

Some people say that I should be in school instead. Some people say that I should study, to become a climate scientist so that I can solve the climate crisis.

But the climate crisis has already been solved. We already have all the facts

and solutions. All we have to do is to wake up and change.

And why should I be studying for a future that soon will be no more, when no one is doing anything whatsoever to save that future? And what is the point of learning facts in the school system, when the most important facts given by the finest science of that same school system clearly means nothing to our politicians and our society?

Some people say that Sweden is just a small country and that it doesn't matter what we do. But I think that if a few children can get headlines all over the world just by not coming to school for a few weeks, imagine what we could all do together if we wanted to?

Now we're almost at the end of my talk and this is where people usually people usually start talking about hope. Solar panels, wind power, circular economy, and so on. But I'm not going to do that. We've had 30 years of pep talking and selling positive ideas. And I'm sorry but it doesn't work because if it would have, the emissions would have gone down by now. They haven't.

And yes, we do need hope. Of course, we do. But the one thing we need more than hope is action. Once we start to act, hope is everywhere. So instead of looking for hope, look for action. Then and only then, hope will come today.

Today we use 100 million barrels of oil every single day. There are no politics to change that. There are no rules to keep that oil in the ground. So, we can't save the world by playing by the rules, because the rules have to be changed.

Everything needs to change and it has to start today.

Thank you.

5.24 Only immediate climate action can save the future

Immediate action to halt the extraction of fossil fuels and greatly reduce the emission of CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses is needed to save the long-term future of human civilization and the biosphere.

At the opening ceremony of United Nations-sponsored climate talks in Katowice, Poland, Sir David Attenborough said "Right now, we are facing a man-made disaster of global scale. Our greatest threat in thousands of years. Climate change. If we don't take action, the collapse of our civilizations and the extinction of much of the natural world is on the horizon. The world's people have spoken. Their message is clear. Time is running out. They want you, the decision-makers, to act now."

Antonio Guterres, UN Secretary-General, said climate change was already "a matter of life and death" for many countries. He added that the world is "nowhere near where it needs to be" on the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Swedish student Greta Thunberg, is a 16-year-old who has launched a climate protest

movement in her country. She said, in a short but very clear speech after that of UN leader Antonio Guterres: “Some people say that I should be in school instead. Some people say that I should study to become a climate scientist so that I can ‘solve the climate crisis’. But the climate crisis has already been solved. We already have all the facts and solutions.”

She added: “Why should I be studying for a future that soon may be no more, when no one is doing anything to save that future? And what is the point of learning facts when the most important facts clearly mean nothing to our society?”

Thunberg continued: “Today we use 100 million barrels of oil every single day. There are no politics to change that. There are no rules to keep that oil in the ground. So we can’t save the world by playing by the rules. Because the rules have to be changed.”

She concluded by saying that “since our leaders are behaving like children, we will have to take the responsibility they should have taken long ago.”

Appearing among billionaires, corporate CEO’s and heads of state at the Davos Economic Forum in Switzerland, like a new Joan of Arc, 16-year-old Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg called on decision-makers to fulfil their responsibilities towards future generations. Here are some excerpts from her speech:

Greta’s speech at Davos

Our house is on fire. I am here to say, our house is on fire. According to the IPCC, we are less than 12 years away from not being able to undo our mistakes. In that time, unprecedented changes in all aspects of society need to have taken place, including a reduction of our CO₂ emissions by at least 50%...

Here in Davos - just like everywhere else - everyone is talking about money. It seems money and growth are our only main concerns.

And since the climate crisis has never once been treated as a crisis, people are simply not aware of the full consequences on our everyday life. People are not aware that there is such a thing as a carbon budget, and just how incredibly small that remaining carbon budget is. That needs to change today.

No other current challenge can match the importance of establishing a wide, public awareness and understanding of our rapidly disappearing carbon budget, that should and must become our new global currency and the very heart of our future and present economics.

We are at a time in history where everyone with any insight of the climate crisis that threatens our civilization - and the entire biosphere - must speak out in clear language, no matter how uncomfortable and unprofitable that may be.

We must change almost everything in our current societies. The bigger your carbon footprint, the bigger your moral duty. The bigger your platform, the bigger your responsibility.





Figure 5.19: Greta Thunberg on the cover of Time Magazine, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in their October 2018 report, used strong enough language to wake up at least part of the public: the children whose future is at stake. Here is an excerpt from a speech which 16-year-old Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg made at the Davos Economic Forum in January, 2019: “Our house is on fire. I am here to say, our house is on fire. According to the IPCC, we are less than 12 years away from not being able to undo our mistakes. In that time, unprecedented changes in all aspects of society need to have taken place, including a reduction of our CO₂ emissions by at least 50%...”

5.25 Worldwide school strike, 15 March, 2019

Over 1.4 million young students across all continents took to the streets on Friday March 15th for the first ever global climate strike. Messages in more than 40 languages were loud and clear: world leaders must act now to address the climate crisis and save our future. The school strike was the largest climate action in history. Nevertheless it went almost unmentioned in the media,

Here are some of the statements by the students explaining why they took part in the strikes:

In India, no one talks about climate change. You don't see it on the news or in the papers or hear about it from government. We want global leaders to declare a climate emergency. If we don't act today, then we will have no tomorrow. - Vidit Baya, 17, Udaipur, India.

We face heartbreaking loss due to increasingly extreme weather events. We urge the Taiwanese government to implement mitigation measures and face up to the vulnerability of indigenous people, halt construction projects in the indigenous traditional realm, and recognize the legal status of Plains Indigenous People, in order to implement environmental protection as a bottom-up approach - Kaisanan Ahuan, Puli City, Taiwan.

We have reached a point in history when we have the technical capacities to solve poverty, malnutrition, inequality and of course global warming. The deciding factors for whether we take advantage of our potential will be our activism, our international unity and our ability to develop the art of making the impossible possible. Whether we succeed or not depends on our political will - Eyal Weintraub, 18, and Bruno Rodriguez, 18, Argentina.

The damage done by multinationals is enormous: the lack of transparency, dubious contracts, the weakening of the soil, the destruction of flora and fauna, the lack of respect for mining codes, the contamination of groundwater. In Mali, the state exercises insufficient control over the practices of the multinationals, and it is us, the citizens, who suffer the consequences. The climate alarm has sounded, and the time has come for us all to realize that there is still time to act locally, in our homes, our villages, our cities - Mone Fousseny, 22, Mali.

25

²⁵<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/apr/03/parents-around-the-world-mobilise-behind-youth-climate-strikes>








Figure 5.20: Eve White and her children join climate protesters in Tasmania. According to an article in *The Guardian*, parents and grandparents around the world are mobilizing in support of the youth climate movement that has swept the globe.

Concerns of young protesters are justified

In an article in the journal *Science* dated 12 April, 2019,²⁶ 20 prominent climate scientists stated that the concerns of student protesters around the world are fully justified. Here are some quotations from the article:

The world's youth have begun to persistently demonstrate for the protection of the climate and other foundations of human well-being. As scientists and scholars who have recently initiated similar letters of support in our countries, we call for our colleagues across all disciplines and from the entire world to support these young climate protesters. We declare: Their concerns are justified and supported by the best available science. The current measures for protecting the climate and biosphere are deeply inadequate.

Nearly every country has signed and ratified the Paris Agreement of 2015, committing under international law to hold global warming well below 2°C above preindustrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C. The scientific community has clearly concluded that a global warming of 2°C instead of 1.5°C would substantially increase climate-related impacts and the risk of some becoming irreversible. Moreover, given the uneven distribution of most impacts, 2°C of warming would further exacerbate existing global inequalities.

It is critical to immediately begin a rapid reduction in CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions. The degree of climate crisis that humanity will experience in the future will be determined by our cumulative emissions; rapid reduction now will limit the damage. For example, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has recently assessed that halving CO₂ emissions by 2030 (relative to 2010 levels) and globally achieving net-zero CO₂ emissions by 2050 (as well as strong reductions in other greenhouse gases) would allow a 50% chance of staying below 1.5°C of warming. Considering that industrialized countries produced more of and benefited more from previous emissions, they have an ethical responsibility to achieve this transition more quickly than the world as a whole.

Many social, technological, and nature-based solutions already exist. The young protesters rightfully demand that these solutions be used to achieve a sustainable society. Without bold and focused action, their future is in critical danger. There is no time to wait until they are in power...

The enormous grassroots mobilization of the youth climate movement - including Fridays for Future, School (or Youth) Strike 4 Climate, Youth for (or 4) Climate, and Youth Climate Strike - shows that young people understand the situation. We approve and support their demand for rapid and forceful action. We see it as our social, ethical, and scholarly responsibility to state in no uncertain terms: Only if humanity acts quickly and resolutely can we limit

²⁶<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/364/6436/139.2>



global warming, halt the ongoing mass extinction of animal and plant species, and preserve the natural basis for the food supply and well-being of present and future generations. This is what the young people want to achieve. They deserve our respect and full support.



Figure 5.21: Greta Thunberg addressing a meeting of the European Parliament in April, 2019. She complained that Brexit was treated as an emergency by the European Union, but climate change, which is a far greater emergency has been almost neglected. The 16-year-old, who is due to meet the Pope on Wednesday, said, “We face an end to civilization as we know it unless permanent changes take place in our society...European elections are coming soon and many like me who are affected most by this crisis, are not allowed to vote. That is why millions of children are taking to the street to draw attention to the climate crisis... It is not too late to act but it will take far-reaching vision and fierce determination... My plea is: Please wake up and do the seemingly impossible.”

5.26 The World Meteorological Organization's report

According to a recent United Nations report, extreme weather events displaced 2 million people during 2018. While no single event can be unambiguously attributed to anthropogenic climate change, scientists believe the the increasing frequency of extreme weather events is definitely linked to global warming. The same is true of their increasing severity.

The report states that during 2018, extreme weather events impacted roughly 62 million people, of whom 2 million were displaced from their homes. In the words of the WMO report, "The physical signs and socio-economic impacts of climate change are accelerating, as record greenhouse gas concentrations drive global temperatures towards increasingly dangerous levels."

UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres, speaking at the launching of the WMO report, used the occasion to remind global leaders of the urgency of the climate emergency. Guterres has convened a climate summit meeting scheduled for September 23, 2019, and referring to the meeting, he said: "Don't come with a speech, come with a plan. This is what science says is needed. It is what young people around the globe are rightfully demanding." Two weeks previously, on March 15, one and a half million students from more than 130 countries had skipped school to participate in the largest climate demonstration in history, demanding action to save the future from the threat of catastrophic climate change.

5.27 Only 12 years left to limit climate change catastrophe

The world's leading scientists met at the Forty-Eighth Session of the IPCC and First Joint Session of Working Groups I, II, and III, 1-5 October 2018 in Incheon, Republic of Korea and openly declared that civilization is on track for collapse because of reckless use of fossil fuels, unless immediate action is taken to drastically cut the extraction and use of fossil fuels.

The report finds that limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require "rapid and far-reaching" transitions in land, energy, industry, buildings, transport, and cities. Global net human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide would need to fall by about 45 percent from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching 'net zero' around 2050.

"It's a line in the sand and what it says to our species is that this is the moment and we must act now," said Debra Roberts, a co-chair of the working group on impacts. "This is the largest clarion bell from the science community and I hope it mobilizes people and dents the mood of complacency."

"We have presented governments with pretty hard choices. We have pointed out the enormous benefits of keeping to 1.5C, and also the unprecedented shift in energy systems and transport that would be needed to achieve that," said Jim Skea, a co-chair of the working group on mitigation. "We show it can be done within laws of physics and chemistry.



Figure 5.22: A firefighter battles fire in California. The world is currently 1 degree Centigrade warmer than preindustrial levels.

Then the final tick box is political will. We cannot answer that. Only our audience can - and that is the governments that receive it.”

Bob Ward, of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change, said the final document was “incredibly conservative” because it did not mention the likely rise in climate-driven refugees or the danger of tipping points that could push the world on to an irreversible path of extreme warming.

Policymakers commissioned the report at the Paris climate talks in 2016, but since then the gap between science and politics has widened. Donald Trump has promised to withdraw the US - the world’s biggest source of historical emissions - from the accord. Brazil’s president, Jair Bolsonaro, threatens to do the same and also open the Amazon rainforest to agribusiness.

5.28 COP24, the climate summit in Poland

The UN Secretary General’s address to the opening session

Welcome to COP 24.

I thank President Duda, Minister Kowalczyk and COP President Designate Mijal Kurtyka for their warm welcome.

We are in trouble. We are in deep trouble with climate change.

Climate change is running faster than we are and we must catch up sooner rather than later before it is too late.

For many, people, regions even countries this is already a matter of life and death.

This meeting is the most important gathering on climate change since the Paris Agreement was signed.



Figure 5.23: UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres: “It is hard to overstate the urgency of our situation. Even as we witness devastating climate impacts causing havoc across the world, we are still not doing enough, nor moving fast enough, to prevent irreversible and catastrophic climate disruption. Nor are we doing enough to capitalize on the enormous social, economic and environmental opportunities of climate action.”

It is hard to overstate the urgency of our situation.

Even as we witness devastating climate impacts causing havoc across the world, we are still not doing enough, nor moving fast enough, to prevent irreversible and catastrophic climate disruption.

Nor are we doing enough to capitalize on the enormous social, economic and environmental opportunities of climate action.

And so, I want to deliver four simple messages.

First: science demands a significantly more ambitious response.

Second: the Paris Agreement provides the framework for action, so we must operationalize it.

Third: we have a collective responsibility to invest in averting global climate chaos, to consolidate the financial commitments made in Paris and to assist the most vulnerable communities and nations.

Fourth: climate action offers a compelling path to transform our world for the better.

Let me turn first to science.

According to the World Meteorological Organization, the 20 warmest years on record have been in the past 22 years, with the top four in the past four years.

The concentration of carbon dioxide is the highest it has been in 3 million years.

Emissions are now growing again.

The recent special report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change finds that warming could reach 1.5 degrees as soon as 2030, with devastating impacts.

The latest UN Environment Programme Emissions Gap Report tells us that the current Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement will lead to global warming of about 3 degrees by the end of the century.

Furthermore, the majority of countries most responsible for greenhouse gas emissions are behind in their efforts to meet their Paris pledges.

So, it is plain we are way off course.

We need more action and more ambition.

We absolutely have to close this emissions gap.

If we fail, the Arctic and Antarctic will continue to melt, corals will bleach and then die, the oceans will rise, more people will die from air pollution, water scarcity will plague a significant proportion of humanity, and the cost of disasters will skyrocket.

Last year I visited Barbuda and Dominica, which were devastated by hurricanes. The destruction and suffering I saw was heart-breaking. That story is repeated almost daily somewhere in the world.

These emergencies are preventable.

Emissions must decline by 45 per cent from 2010 levels by 2030 and be net zero by 2050.

Renewable energy will need to supply half to two-thirds of the world's primary energy by 2050 with a corresponding reduction in fossil fuels.

In short, we need a complete transformation of our global energy economy, as well as how we manage land and forest resources.

We need to embrace low-carbon, climate-resilient sustainable development.

I am hopeful that the Talanoa Dialogue will provide a very strong impulse for increased ambition in the commitments for climate action.

Excellencies,

This brings me to my second point.

The Paris Agreement provides a framework for the transformation we need.

It is our job here in Katowice is to finalize the Paris Agreement Work Programme – the rule book for implementation.

I remind all Parties that this is a deadline you set for yourselves and it is vital you meet it.

We need a unifying implementation vision that sets out clear rules, inspires action and promotes raised ambition, based on the principle of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.

We have no time for limitless negotiations.

A completed Work Programme will unleash the potential of the Paris Agreement.

It will build trust and make clear that countries are serious about addressing climate change.

Dear Friends,

This brings me to my third point: the central importance of finance.

We need concerted resource mobilization and investment to successfully combat climate change.

We need transformative climate action in five key economic areas - energy, cities, land use, water and industry.

Some 75 per cent of the infrastructure needed by 2050 still remains to be built.

How this is done will either lock us in to a high-emissions future or steer us towards truly sustainable low-emissions development.

Governments and investors need to bet on the green economy, not the grey.

That means embracing carbon pricing, eliminating harmful fossil fuel subsidies and investing in clean technologies.

It also means providing a fair transition for those workers in traditional sectors that face disruption, including through retraining and social safety nets.

We also have a collective responsibility to assist the most vulnerable communities and countries - such as small island nations and the least developed countries - by supporting adaptation and resilience.

Making clear progress to mobilize the pledged \$100 billion dollars a year will provide a much-needed positive political signal.

I have appointed the President of France and Prime Minister of Jamaica to lead the mobilization of the international community, both public and private, to reach that target in the context of preparation of the Climate Summit I have convened in September of next year.

I also urge Member States to swiftly implement the replenishment of the Green Climate Fund.

It is an investment in a safer, less costly future.

Dear Friends,

All too often, climate action is seen as a burden. My fourth point is this: decisive climate action today is our chance to right our ship and set a course for a better future for all.

We have the knowledge.

Many technological solutions are already viable and affordable.

Cities, regions, civil society and the business community around the world are moving ahead.

What we need is political more will and more far-sighted leadership.

This is the challenge on which this generation's leaders will be judged.

Climate action is not just the right thing to do - it makes social and economic sense.

Meeting the goals of the Paris Agreement would reduce air pollution - saving more than a million lives each year by 2030, according to the World Health

Organization.

According to the recent New Climate Economy report, ambitious climate action could yield 65 million jobs and a direct economic gain of \$26 trillion US dollars compared to business as usual over the next 12 years.

We are seeing early signs of this economic transformation, but we are nowhere near where we need to be.

The transition to a low-carbon economy needs political impetus from the highest levels.

And it requires inclusivity, because everyone is affected by climate change. That is the message of the Talanoa Dialogue.

We need a full-scale mobilization of young people.

And we need a global commitment to gender equality, because women's leadership is central to durable climate solutions.

A successful conference here in Katowice can provide the catalyst.

There is now significant global momentum for climate action.

It has galvanized private business and investors around the world, while cities and regional governments are also showing that ambitious climate action is possible and desirable.

Let us build on this momentum.

I am convening a Climate Summit in September next year to raise ambition and mobilize the necessary resources.

But that ambition needs to begin here, right now, in Katowice, driven by governments and leaders who understand that their legacies and the well-being of future generations are at stake.

We cannot afford to fail in Katowice.

Some might say that it will be a difficult negotiation. I know it is not easy. It requires a firm political will for compromise. But, for me, what is really difficult is to be a fisherman in Kiribati seeing his country in risk of disappearing or a farmer or herder in the Sahel losing livelihoods and losing peace. Or being a woman in Dominica or any other Caribbean nation enduring hurricane after hurricane destroying everything in its path.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Climate change is the single most important issue we face.

It affects all our plans for sustainable development and a safe, secure and prosperous world.

So, it is hard to comprehend why we are collectively still moving too slowly - and even in the wrong direction.

The IPCC's Special Report tells us that we still have time to limit temperature rise.

But that time is running out.

We achieved success in Paris because negotiators were working towards a common goal.



Figure 5.24: Greta: “Many people say that Sweden is just a small country, and it doesn’t matter what we do. But I’ve learned that you are never too small to make a difference. And if a few children can get headlines all over the world just by not going to school, then imagine what we could all do together if we really wanted to.”

I implore you to maintain the same spirit of urgent collaboration here in Katowice with a dynamic Polish leadership in the negotiations.

Katowice must ensure that the bonds of trust established in Paris will endure.

Incredible opportunity exists if we embrace a low-carbon future and unleash the power of the Paris Agreement.

But we must start today building the tomorrow we want.

Let us rise to the challenge and finish the work the world demands of us.

Thank you.

Greta Thunberg’s address to the opening session

Greta Thunberg (born 3 January 2003) is a Swedish climate activist. She is known for protesting outside the Swedish parliament building to raise climate change activism.

On 20 August 2018, Thunberg, then in 9th grade, decided to not attend school until the 2018 Sweden general election on 9 September after heat waves and wildfires in Sweden. Her demands were that the Sweden government reduce carbon emissions as per the Paris Agreement, and she protested via sitting outside the Riksdag every day during school hours with the sign “Skolstrejk för klimatet” (school strike for the climate). After the general elections, she continued to strike only on Fridays. The strike is now in its 17th week. The



Figure 5.25: Greta: “You only talk about moving forward with the same bad ideas that got us into this mess, even when the only sensible thing to do is pull the emergency brake. You are not mature enough to tell it like it is. Even that burden you leave to us children.”



Figure 5.26: Greta: “Until you start focusing on what needs to be done, rather than what is politically possible, there is no hope. We cannot solve a crisis without treating it as a crisis. We need to keep the fossil fuels in the ground, and we need to focus on equity. And if solutions within the system are so impossible to find, then maybe we should change the system itself.”

transcript of her address to the opening session of COP24²⁷²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ is given below,

My name is Greta Thunberg. I am 15 years old, and I'm from Sweden. I speak on behalf of Climate Justice Now!

Many people say that Sweden is just a small country, and it doesn't matter what we do. But I've learned that you are never too small to make a difference. And if a few children can get headlines all over the world just by not going to school, then imagine what we could all do together if we really wanted to.

But to do that, we have to speak clearly, no matter how uncomfortable that may be. You only speak of green eternal economic growth because you are too scared of being unpopular. You only talk about moving forward with the same bad ideas that got us into this mess, even when the only sensible thing to do is pull the emergency brake. You are not mature enough to tell it like it is. Even that burden you leave to us children.

But I don't care about being popular. I care about climate justice and the living planet. Our civilization is being sacrificed for the opportunity of a very small number of people to continue making enormous amounts of money. Our biosphere is being sacrificed so that rich people in countries like mine can live in luxury. It is the sufferings of the many which pay for the luxuries of the few.

The year 2078, I will celebrate my 75th birthday. If I have children, maybe they will spend that day with me. Maybe they will ask me about you. Maybe they will ask why you didn't do anything while there still was time to act. You say you love your children above all else, and yet you are stealing their future in front of their very eyes.

Until you start focusing on what needs to be done, rather than what is politically possible, there is no hope. We cannot solve a crisis without treating it as a crisis. We need to keep the fossil fuels in the ground, and we need to focus on equity. And if solutions within the system are so impossible to find, then maybe we should change the system itself.

We have not come here to beg world leaders to care. You have ignored us in the past, and you will ignore us again. We have run out of excuses, and we are running out of time. We have come here to let you know that change is coming, whether you like it or not. The real power belongs to the people. Thank you.

²⁷<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VFkQSGyeCWg>

²⁸<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0TYyBtb1PH4>

²⁹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdAOgNTxxt0>

³⁰<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJ1HRGA8g10>



Figure 5.27: Greta Thunberg addresses the National Assembly In Paris on July 23, 2019 in Paris, France.



Figure 5.28: Greta Thunberg crossing the Atlantic on a small emission-free boat.

5.29 The UK declares a climate emergency

Introducing the motion in the House of Commons, Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn said: **“We have no time to waste. We are living in a climate crisis that will spiral dangerously out of control unless we take rapid and dramatic action now. This is no longer about a distant future. We’re talking about nothing less than the irreversible destruction of the environment within our lifetimes of members of this house.”**

Here are some excerpts from an article by Amy Goodman and Nermeen Shaikh of Democracy Now published in Truthout on May 2, 2019.³¹:

On Wednesday, the House of Commons became the first parliament in the world to declare a climate emergency. The resolution came on the heels of the recent Extinction Rebellion mass uprising that shut down Central London last month in a series of direct actions. Activists closed bridges, occupied public landmarks and even superglued themselves to buildings, sidewalks and trains to demand urgent action to combat climate change. Police arrested more than 1,000 protesters. Labour Party Leader Jeremy Corbyn told Parliament, **“We are witnessing an unprecedented upsurge of climate activism, with groups like Extinction Rebellion forcing the politicians in this building to listen. For all the dismissive and defensive column inches the processes have provoked, they are a massive and, I believe, very necessary wake-up call. Today we have the opportunity to say, ‘We hear you.’”** We speak with George Monbiot, British journalist, author and columnist with The Guardian. His recent piece for The Guardian is headlined **“Only rebellion will prevent an ecological apocalypse.”** Monbiot says capitalism **“is like a gun pointed at the heart of the planet. It will essentially, necessarily destroy our life-support systems. Among those characteristics is the drive for perpetual economic growth on a finite planet.”**

³¹<https://truthout.org/video/george-monbiot-on-the-uk-climate-emergency/>



5.30 Understatement of existential climate risk

Here are some excerpts from a 44-page report entitled *What Lies Beneath: The Understanding of Existential Climate Risk*, by David Spratt and Ian Dunlop³²:

Three decades ago, when serious debate on human-induced climate change began at the global level, a great deal of statesmanship was on display. There was a preparedness to recognize that this was an issue transcending nation states, ideologies and political parties which had to be addressed pro-actively in the long-term interests of humanity as a whole. This was the case even though the existential nature of the risk it posed was far less clear cut than it is today.

As global institutions, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which was established at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, were developed to take up this challenge, and the extent of change this would demand of the fossil-fuel-dominated world order became clearer, the forces of resistance began to mobilize. Today, as a consequence, and despite the diplomatic triumph of the 2015 Paris Agreement, the debate around climate change policy has never been more dysfunctional, indeed Orwellian.

In his book 1984, George Orwell describes a double-think totalitarian state where most of the population accepts “the most flagrant violations of reality, because they never fully grasped the enormity of what was demanded of them, and were not sufficiently interested in public events to notice what was

³²<https://www.breakthroughonline.org.au/>

happening. By lack of understanding they remained sane.”

Orwell could have been writing about climate change and policymaking. International agreements talk of limiting global warming to 1.5-2 degrees Celsius ($^{\circ}\text{C}$), but in reality they set the world on a path of 3-5 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ of warming. Goals are reaffirmed, only to be abandoned. Coal is “clean”. Just 1 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ of warming is already dangerous, but this cannot be admitted. The planetary future is hostage to myopic national self-interest. Action is delayed on the assumption that as yet unproven technologies will save the day, decades hence. The risks are existential, but it is “alarmist” to say so.

A one-in-two or one-in-three chance of missing a goal is normalized as reasonable. Moral hazard permeates official thinking, in that there is an incentive to ignore the risks in the interests of political expediency.

Climate policymaking for years has been cognitively dissonant, “a flagrant violation of reality”. So it is unsurprising that there is a lack of understanding amongst the public and elites of the full measure of the climate challenge. Yet most Australians sense where we are heading: three-quarters of Australians see climate change as catastrophic risk, and half see our way of life ending within the next 100 years.

Politics and policymaking have norms: rules and practices, assumptions and boundaries, that constrain and shape them. In recent years, the previous norms of statesmanship and long-term thinking have disappeared, replaced by an obsession with short-term political and commercial advantage. Climate policymaking is no exception. Since 1992, short-term economic interest has trumped environmental and future human needs.

The world today emits 50% more carbon dioxide (CO_2) from the consumption of energy than it did 25 years ago, and the global economy has more than doubled in size. The UNFCCC strives “to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner”, but every year humanity’s ecological footprint becomes larger and less sustainable. Humanity now requires the biophysical capacity of 1.7 Earths annually as it rapidly chews up natural capital.

A fast, emergency-scale transition to a post-fossil fuel world is absolutely necessary to address climate change. But this is excluded from consideration by policymakers because it is considered to be too disruptive. The orthodoxy is that there is time for an orderly economic transition within the current short-termist political paradigm. Discussion of what would be safe - less warming than we presently experience - is non-existent. And so we have a policy failure of epic proportions.

Policymakers, in their magical thinking, imagine a mitigation path of gradual change to be constructed over many decades in a growing, prosperous world. The world not imagined is the one that now exists: of looming financial instability; of a global crisis of political legitimacy and “fake news”; of a sustainability crisis that extends far beyond climate change to include all the fundamentals of human existence and most significant planetary boundaries

(soils, potable water, oceans, the atmosphere, biodiversity, and so on); and of severe global energy-sector dislocation.

In anticipation of the upheaval that climate change would impose upon the global order, the IPCC was established by the United Nations (UN) in 1988, charged with regularly assessing the global consensus on climate science as a basis for policymaking. The IPCC Assessment Reports (AR), produced every five-to-eight years, play a large part in the public framing of the climate narrative: new reports are a global media event.

AR5 was produced in 2013-14, with AR6 due in 2022. The IPCC has done critical, indispensable work of the highest standard in pulling together a periodic consensus of what must be the most exhaustive scientific investigation in world history.

It does not carry out its own research, but reviews and collates peer-reviewed material from across the spectrum of this incredibly complex area, identifying key issues and trends for policymaker consideration. However, the IPCC process suffers from all the dangers of consensus-building in such a wide-ranging and complex arena. For example, IPCC reports, of necessity, do not always contain the latest available information. Consensus-building can lead to “least drama”, lowest-common-denominator outcomes, which overlook critical issues. This is particularly the case with the “fat-tails” of probability distributions, that is, the high-impact but lower-probability events where scientific knowledge is more limited.

Vested-interest pressure is acute in all directions; climate denialists accuse the IPCC of alarmism, whereas many climate action proponents consider the IPCC to be far too conservative. To cap it all, the IPCC conclusions are subject to intense political oversight before being released, which historically has had the effect of substantially watering-down sound scientific findings.

These limitations are understandable, and arguably were not of overriding importance in the early period of the IPCC. However, as time has progressed, it is now clear that the risks posed by climate change are far greater than previously anticipated. We have moved out of the twilight period of much talk, but relatively limited climate impacts, into the harsh light of physically-evident existential threats. Climate change is now turning nasty, as we have witnessed recently in the North America, East and South Asia, the Middle East and Europe, with record-breaking heatwaves and wildfires, more intense flooding and more damaging hurricanes.

The distinction between climate science and risk is the critical issue, for the two are not the same. Scientific reticence - a reluctance to spell out the full risk implications of climate science in the absence of perfect information - has become a major problem. Whilst this is understandable, particularly when scientists are continually criticized by denialists and political apparatchiks for speaking out, it is extremely dangerous given the fat-tail risks of climate change. Waiting for perfect information, as we are continually urged to do

by political and economic elites, means it will be too late to act. Time is not on our side. Sensible risk management addresses risk in time to prevent it happening, and that time is now.

Irreversible, adverse climate change on the global scale now occurring is an existential risk to human civilization. Many of the world's top climate scientists - Kevin Anderson, James Hansen, Michael E. Mann, Michael Oppenheimer, Naomi Oreskes, Stefan Rahmstorf, Eric Rignot, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, Kevin Trenberth and others - who are quoted in this report well understand these implications and are forthright about their findings, where we are heading, and the limitations of IPCC reports.

This report seeks to alert the wider community and business and political leaders to these limitations and urges changes to the IPCC approach, to the wider UNFCCC negotiations, and to national policymaking. It is clear that existing processes will not deliver the transformation to a carbon-negative world in the limited time now available. We urgently require a re-framing of scientific research within an existential risk-management framework. This requires special precautions that go well beyond conventional risk management. Like an iceberg, there is great danger in "what lies beneath".

Existential Risk to Human Civilization

In 2016, the World Economic Forum survey of the most impactful risks for the years ahead elevated the failure of climate change mitigation and adaptation to the top of the list, ahead of weapons of mass destruction, ranking second, and water crises, ranking third. By 2018, following a year characterized by high-impact hurricanes and extreme temperatures, extreme-weather events were seen as the single most prominent risk. As the survey noted: "We have been pushing our planet to the brink and the damage is becoming increasingly clear."

Climate change is an existential risk to human civilization: that is, an adverse outcome that would either annihilate intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.

Temperature rises that are now in prospect, after the Paris Agreement, are in the range of 3-5 °C. At present, the Paris Agreement voluntary emission reduction commitments, if implemented, would result in planetary warming of 3.4 °C by 2100, without taking into account "long-term" carbon-cycle feedbacks. With a higher climate sensitivity figure of 4.5 °C, for example, which would account for such feedbacks, the Paris path would result in around 5 °C of warming, according to a MIT study.

A study by Schroeder Investment Management published in June 2017 found - after taking into account indicators across a wide range of the political, financial, energy and regulatory sectors - the average temperature increase implied for the Paris Agreement across all sectors was 4.1 °C.

Yet 3 °C of warming already constitutes an existential risk. A 2007 study

by two US national security think-tanks concluded that 3 °C of warming and a 0.5 meter sea-level rise would likely lead to “outright chaos” and “nuclear war is possible”, emphasizing how “massive non-linear events in the global environment give rise to massive nonlinear societal event”.

The Global Challenges Foundation (GCF) explains what could happen: “If climate change was to reach 3 °C, most of Bangladesh and Florida would drown, while major coastal cities - Shanghai, Lagos, Mumbai - would be swamped, likely creating large flows of climate refugees. Most regions in the world would see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, whether heat waves, floods or storms. This likely scenario for a 3 °C rise does not take into account the considerable risk that self-reinforcing feedback loops set in when a certain threshold is reached, leading to an ever increasing rise in temperature. Potential thresholds include the melting of the Arctic permafrost releasing methane into the atmosphere, forest die-back releasing the carbon currently stored in the Amazon and boreal forests, or the melting of polar ice caps that would no longer reflect away light and heat from the sun.”

Warming of 4 °C or more could reduce the global human population by 80% or 90%, and the World Bank reports “there is no certainty that adaptation to a 4 °C world is possible.”

Prof. Kevin Anderson says a 4 °C future “is incompatible with an organized global community, is likely to be beyond ‘adaptation’, is devastating to the majority of ecosystems, and has a high probability of not being stable”.

This is a commonly-held sentiment amongst climate scientists. A recent study by the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre found that if the global temperature rose 4 °C, then extreme heatwaves with “apparent temperatures” peaking at over 55 °C will begin to regularly affect many densely populated parts of the world, forcing much activity in the modern industrial world to stop. (“Apparent temperatures” refers to the Heat Index, which quantifies the combined effect of heat and humidity to provide people with a means of avoiding dangerous conditions.)

In 2017, one of the first research papers to focus explicitly on existential climate risks proposed that “mitigation goals be set in terms of climate risk category instead of a temperature threshold”, and established a “dangerous” risk category of warming greater than 1.5 °C, and a “catastrophic” category for warming of 3 °C or more. The authors focussed on the impacts on the world’s poorest three billion people, on health and heat stress, and the impacts of climate extremes on such people with limited adaptation resources. They found that a 2 °C warming “would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population (to deadly heat). A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented.”

A 2017 survey of global catastrophic risks by the Global Challenges Foundation found that: “In high-end [climate] scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilization coming to an end.”

84% of 8000 people in eight countries surveyed for the Foundation considered climate change a “global catastrophic risk”.

Existential risk may arise from a fast rate of system change, since the capacity to adapt, in both the natural and human worlds, is inversely proportional to the pace of change, amongst other factors. In 2004, researchers reported on the rate of warming as a driver of extinction...

At 4 °C of warming “the limits for adaptation for natural systems would largely be exceeded throughout the world”.

Ecological breakdown of this scale would ensure an existential human crisis. By slow degrees, these existential risks are being recognized. In May 2018, an inquiry by the Australian Senate into national security and global warming recognized “climate change as a current and existential national security risk... defined as ‘one that threatens the premature extinction of Earth-originating intelligent life or the permanent and drastic destruction of its potential for desirable future development’”.

In April 2018, the Intelligence on European Pensions and Institutional Investment think-tank warned business leaders that “climate change is an existential risk whose elimination must become a corporate objective”.

However the most recent IPCC Assessment Report did not consider the issue. Whilst the term “risk management” appears in the 2014 IPCC Synthesis Report fourteen times, the terms “existential” and “catastrophic” do not appear...

5.31 The 2018 IPCC report

Excerpts from an article summarizing the report

Here are excerpts from an article entitled *UN Experts Warn of ‘Climate Catastrophe’ by 2040* by Jessica Corbett. The article was published in *Common Dreams* on Monday, October 8, 2018.³³:

“The climate crisis is here and already impacting the most vulnerable,” notes 350.org’s program director. “Staying under 1.5°C is now a matter of political will.”

Underscoring the need for “rapid, far-reaching, and unprecedented” changes to life as we know it to combat the global climate crisis, a new report from

³³<https://www.commondreams.org/news/2018/10/08/un-experts-warn-climate-catastrophe-2040-without-rapid-and-unprecedented-global>

the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) - the United Nations' leading body for climate science - details what the world could look like if the global temperature rises to 1.5°C versus 2°C (2.7°F versus 3.6°F) above pre-industrial levels, and outlines pathways to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty.

“Climate change represents an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies and the planet,” the report reads. “Human-induced warming has already reached about 1°C (1.8°F) above pre-industrial levels at the time of writing of this Special Report... If the current warming rate continues, the world would reach human-induced global warming of 1.5°C around 2040.”

Approved by the IPCC in South Korea on Saturday ahead of COP24 in Poland in December, *Global Warming of 1.5°C* was produced by 91 authors and reviewers from 40 countries. Its release has elicited calls to action from climate campaigners and policymakers the world over.

“This is a climate emergency. The IPCC 1.5 report starkly illustrates the difference between temperature rises of 1.5°C and 2°C - for many around the world this is a matter of life and death,” declared Karin Nansen, chair of Friends of the Earth International (FOEI). “It is crucial to keep temperature rise well below 1.5 degrees ... but the evidence presented by the IPCC shows that there is a narrow and shrinking window in which to do so.”

The report was requested when the international community came together in December of 2015 for the Paris agreement, which aims to keep global warming within this century “well below” 2°C, with an ultimate target of 1.5°C. President Donald Trump's predecessor supported the accord, but Trump has vowed to withdraw the United States, even as every other nation on the planet has pledged their support for it. In many cases, however, sworn support hasn't led to effective policy.

“It's a fresh reminder, if one was needed, that current emissions reduction pledges are not enough to meet the long-term goals of the Paris agreement. Indeed, they are not enough for any appropriately ambitious temperature target, given what we know about dangerous climate impacts already unfolding even at lower temperature thresholds,” Rachel Cleetus, lead economist and climate policy manager for the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), wrote ahead of its release.

“The policy implications of the report are obvious: We need to implement a suite of policies to sharply limit carbon emissions and build climate resilience, and we must do all this in a way that prioritizes equitable outcomes particularly for the world's poor and marginalized communities,” Cleetus added.

“We want a just transition to a clean energy system that benefits people not corporations,” Nansen emphasized. “Only with a radical transformation of our energy, food and economic systems, embracing environmental, social, gender and economic justice, can we prevent climate catastrophe and temperature rises exceeding 1.5°C.”

Only immediate climate action can save the future

Immediate action to halt the extraction of fossil fuels and greatly reduce the emission of CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses is needed to save the long-term future of human civilization and the biosphere.

At the opening ceremony of United Nations-sponsored climate talks in Katowice, Poland, Sir David Attenborough said “Right now, we are facing a man-made disaster of global scale. Our greatest threat in thousands of years. Climate change. If we don’t take action, the collapse of our civilizations and the extinction of much of the natural world is on the horizon. The world’s people have spoken. Their message is clear. Time is running out. They want you, the decision-makers, to act now.”

Antonio Guterres, UN Secretary-General, said climate change was already “a matter of life and death” for many countries. He added that the world is “nowhere near where it needs to be” on the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Swedish student Greta Thunberg, is a 16-year-old who has launched a climate protest movement in her country. She said, in a short but very clear speech after that of UN leader Antonio Guterres: “Some people say that I should be in school instead. Some people say that I should study to become a climate scientist so that I can ‘solve the climate crisis’. But the climate crisis has already been solved. We already have all the facts and solutions.”

She added: “Why should I be studying for a future that soon may be no more, when no one is doing anything to save that future? And what is the point of learning facts when the most important facts clearly mean nothing to our society?”

Thunberg continued: “Today we use 100 million barrels of oil every single day. There are no politics to change that. There are no rules to keep that oil in the ground. So we can’t save the world by playing by the rules. Because the rules have to be changed.”

She concluded by saying that “since our leaders are behaving like children, we will have to take the responsibility they should have taken long ago.”

Institutional inertia

Our collective failure to respond adequately to the current crisis is very largely due to institutional inertia. Our financial system is deeply embedded and resistant to change. Our entire industrial infrastructure is based on fossil fuels; but if the future is to be saved, the use of fossil fuels must stop. International relations are still based based on the concept of absolutely sovereign nation states, even though this concept has become a dangerous anachronism in an era of instantaneous global communication and economic interdependence. Within nations, systems of law and education change very slowly, although present dangers demand rapid revolutions in outlook and lifestyle.

The failure of the recent climate conferences to produce strong final documents can be attributed to the fact that the nations attending the conferences felt themselves to be in competition with each other, when in fact they ought to have cooperated in response to a common danger. The heavy hand of the fossil fuel industry also made itself felt at the conferences.

Until the development of coal-driven steam engines in the 19th century humans lived more or less in harmony with their environment. Then, fossil fuels, representing many millions of years of stored sunlight, were extracted and burned in two centuries, driving a frenzy of growth of population and industry that has lasted until the present. But today, the party is over. Coal, oil and gas are nearly exhausted, and what remains of them must be left in the ground to avoid existential threats to humans and the biosphere. Big coal and oil corporations base the value of their stocks on ownership of the remaining resources that are still buried, and they can be counted on to use every trick, fair or unfair, to turn those resources into money.

In general corporations represent a strong force resisting change. By law, the directors of corporations are obliged to put the profits of stockholders above every other consideration. No room whatever is left for an ecological or social conscience. Increasingly, corporations have taken control of our mass media and our political system. They intervene in such a way as to make themselves richer, and thus to increase their control of the system.

Polite conversation and cultural inertia

Each day, the conventions of polite conversation contribute to our sense that everything is as it always was. Politeness requires that we do not talk about issues that might be contrary to another person's beliefs. Thus polite conversation is dominated by trivia, entertainment, sports, the weather, gossip, food, and so on. Worries about the distant future, the danger of nuclear war, the danger of uncontrollable climate change, or the danger of widespread famine seldom appear in conversations at the dinner table, over coffee or at the pub. In conversations between polite people, we obtain the false impression that all is well with the world. But in fact, all is not well. We have to act promptly and adequately to save the future.

The situation is exactly the same in the mass media. The programs and articles are dominated by trivia and entertainment. Serious discussions of the sudden crisis which civilization now faces are almost entirely absent, because the focus is on popularity and ratings. As Neil Postman remarked, we are entertaining ourselves to death.

Further growth implies future collapse

We have to face the fact that endless economic growth on a finite planet is a logical impossibility, and that we have reached or passed the sustainable limits to growth.

In today's world, we are pressing against the absolute limits of the earth's carrying capacity, and further growth carries with it the danger of future collapse. In the long run, neither the growth of industry nor that of population is sustainable; and we have now reached or exceeded the sustainable limits.

Our responsibility to future generations and to the biosphere

All of the technology needed for the replacement of fossil fuels by renewable energy is already in place. Although renewable sources currently supply only 19 percent of the world's energy requirements, they are growing rapidly. For example, wind energy is growing at the rate of 30 percent per year. Because of the remarkable properties of exponential growth, this will mean that wind will soon become a major supplier of the world's energy requirements, despite bitter opposition from the fossil fuel industry.

Both wind and solar energy can now compete economically with fossil fuels, and this situation will become even more pronounced if more countries put a tax on carbon emissions, as Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Costa Rica, the United Kingdom and Ireland already have done.³⁴

Much research and thought have also been devoted to the concept of a steady-state economy. The only thing that is lacking is political will. It is up to the people of the world to make their collective will felt.³⁵

History has given to our generation an enormous responsibility towards future generations. We must achieve a new kind of economy, a steady-state economy. We must stabilize global population. We must replace fossil fuels by renewable energy. We must abolish nuclear weapons. We must end the institution of war. We must reclaim democracy in our own countries when it has been lost. We must replace nationalism by a just system of international law. We must prevent degradation of the earth's environment. We must act with dedication and fearlessness to save the future of the earth for human civilization and for the plants and animals with which we share the gift of life.

“And yes, we do need hope. Of course, we do. But the one thing we need more than hope is action. Once we start to act, hope is everywhere. So instead of looking for hope, look for action. Then and only then, hope will come today.”
Greta Thunberg

³⁴<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-5/article/urgent-need-renewable-energy>

³⁵<http://steadystate.org/category/herman-daly/>





Figure 5.29: Our carbon budget. If global warming is to be limited to 1.5°C, CO₂ emissions must fall extremely rapidly. This means radical and fundamental changes for economies and lifestyles.

Effect of current pledges and policies

Global greenhouse gas emissions



Source: Climate Action Tracker

Vox

Figure 5.30: Predicted gigatons of carbon emitted during the present century under various policies. Under current policies, temperatures at the end of the century are predicted to be 3.1-3.7°C higher than normal, which would be disastrous. This implies that quick action must be taken to change current policies.

Suggestions for further reading

1. A. Gore, *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It*, Rodale Books, New York, (2006).
2. A. Gore, *Earth in the Balance: Forging a New Common Purpose*, Earthscan, (1992).
3. A.H. Ehrlich and P.R. Ehrlich, *Earth*, Thames and Methuen, (1987).
4. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *The Population Explosion*, Simon and Schuster, (1990).
5. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Healing the Planet: Strategies for Resolving the Environmental Crisis*, Addison-Wesley, (1991).
6. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environmental Rhetoric Threatens our Future*, Island Press, (1998).
7. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *One With Nineveh: Politics, Consumption and the Human Future*, Island Press, (2004).
8. D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W.W. Behrens III, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, Universe Books, New York, (1972).
9. D.H. Meadows et al., *Beyond the Limits. Confronting Global Collapse and Envisioning a Sustainable Future*, Chelsea Green Publishing, Post Mills, Vermont, (1992).
10. D.H. Meadows, J. Randers and D.L. Meadows, *Limits to Growth: the 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Jct., VT 05001, (2004).
11. A. Peccei and D. Ikeda, *Before it is Too Late*, Kodansha International, Tokyo, (1984).
12. V.K. Smith, ed., *Scarcity and Growth Reconsidered*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1979).
13. British Petroleum, *BP Statistical Review of World Energy*, (published yearly).
14. R. Costanza, ed., *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1991).
15. J. Darmstadter, *A Global Energy Perspective*, Sustainable Development Issue Backgrounder, Resources for the Future, (2002).
16. D.C. Hall and J.V. Hall, *Concepts and Measures of Natural Resource Scarcity*, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, **11**, 363-379, (1984).
17. M.K. Hubbert, *Energy Resources*, in *Resources and Man: A Study and Recommendations*, Committee on Resources and Man, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1969).
18. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis*, IPCC, (2001).
19. J.A. Krautkraemer, *Nonrenewable Resource Scarcity*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **36**, 2065-2107, (1998).
20. N. Stern et al., *The Stern Review*, www.sternreview.org.uk, (2006).
21. T.M. Swanson, ed., *The Economics and Ecology of Biodiversity Decline: The Forces Driving Global Change*, Cambridge University Press, (1995).
22. P.M. Vitousek, H.A. Mooney, J. Lubchenco and J.M. Melillo, *Human Domination of Earth's Ecosystems*, *Science*, **277**, 494-499, (1997).

23. World Resources Institute, *World Resources 200-2001: People and Ecosystems: The Fraying Web of Life*, WRI, Washington D.C., (2000).
24. A. Sampson, *The Seven Sisters: The Great Oil Companies of the World and How They Were Made*, Hodder and Staughton, London, (1988).
25. D. Yergin, *The Prize*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1991).
26. M.B. Stoff, *Oil, War and American Security: The Search for a National Policy on Oil, 1941-1947*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1980).
27. J. Stork, *Middle East Oil and the Energy Crisis*, Monthly Review, New York, (1976).
28. F. Benn, *Oil Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1986).
29. K. Roosevelt, *Countercoup: The Struggle for the Control of Iran*, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1979).
30. E. Abrahamian, *Iran Between Two Revolutions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (1982).
31. J.M. Blair, *The Control of Oil*, Random House, New York, (1976).
32. M.T. Klare, *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*, Owl Books reprint edition, New York, (2002).
33. H. Mejcher, *Imperial Quest for Oil: Iraq, 1910-1928*, Ithaca Books, London, (1976).
34. P. Sluglett, *Britain in Iraq, 1914-1932*, Ithaca Press, London, (1976).
35. D.E. Omissi, *British Air Power and Colonial Control in Iraq, 1920-1925*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, (1990).
36. V.G. Kiernan, *Colonial Empires and Armies, 1815-1960*, Sutton, Stroud, (1998).
37. R. Solh, *Britain's 2 Wars With Iraq*, Ithaca Press, Reading, (1996).
38. D. Morgan and D.B. Ottaway, *In Iraqi War Scenario, Oil is Key Issue as U.S. Drillers Eye Huge petroleum Pool*, Washington Post, September 15, (2002).
39. C.J. Cleveland, *Physical and Economic Aspects of Natural Resource Scarcity: The Cost of Oil Supply in the Lower 48 United States 1936-1987*, Resources and Energy **13**, 163-188, (1991).
40. C.J. Cleveland, *Yield Per Effort for Additions to Crude Oil Reserves in the Lower 48 States, 1946-1989*, American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, **76**, 948-958, (1992).
41. M.K. Hubbert, *Technique of Prediction as Applied to the Production of Oil and Gas*, in *NBS Special Publication 631*, US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, (1982).
42. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Oil Discovery Indices and Projected Discoveries*, Oil and Gas Journal, **11**, 19, (1984).
43. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Future Crude Oil Supplies and Prices*, Oil and Gas Journal, July 25, 111-112, (1988).
44. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Updated Hubbert Curves Analyze World Oil Supply*, World Oil, November, 91-94, (1996).
45. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Get Ready for Another Oil Shock!*, The Futurist, January-February, 20-23, (1997).

46. Energy Information Administration, *International Energy Outlook, 2001*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
47. Energy Information Administration, *Caspian Sea Region*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
48. National Energy Policy Development Group, *National Energy Policy*, The White House, (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/energy/>), (2004).
49. M. Klare, *Bush-Cheney Energy Strategy: Procuring the Rest of the World's Oil*, Foreign Policy in Focus, (Interhemispheric Resource Center/Institute for Policy Studies/SEEN), Washington DC and Silver City NM, January, (2004).
50. IEA, *CO2 from Fuel Combustion Fact-Sheet*, International Energy Agency, (2005).
51. H. Youguo, *China's Coal Demand Outlook for 2020 and Analysis of Coal Supply Capacity*, International Energy Agency, (2003).
52. R.H. Williams, *Advanced Energy Supply Technologies*, in **World Energy Assessment: Energy and the Challenge of Sustainability**, UNDP, (2000).
53. H. Lehmann, *Energy Rich Japan*, Institute for Sustainable Solutions and Innovations, Aachen, (2003).
54. D. King, *Climate Change Science: Adapt, Mitigate or Ignore*, Science, **303** (5655), pp. 176-177, (2004).
55. S. Connor, *Global Warming Past Point of No Return*, The Independent, (116 September, 2005).
56. D. Rind, *Drying Out the Tropics*, New Scientist (6 May, 1995).
57. J. Patz et al., *Impact of Regional Climate Change on Human Health*, Nature, (17 November, 2005).
58. M. McCarthy, *China Crisis: Threat to the Global Environment*, The Independent, (19 October, 2005).
59. L.R. Brown, *The Twenty-Ninth Day*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
60. W.V. Chandler, *Materials Recycling: The Virtue of Necessity*, Worldwatch Paper 56, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C, (1983).
61. W.C. Clark and others, *Managing Planet Earth*, Special Issue, *Scientific American*, September, (1989).
62. B. Commoner, *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*, Bantam Books, New York, (1972).
63. C. Flavin, *Slowing Global Warming: A Worldwide Strategy*, Worldwatch Paper 91, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1989).
64. J.R. Frisch, *Energy 2000-2020: World Prospects and Regional Stresses*, World Energy Conference, Graham and Trotman, (1983).
65. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
66. J. Holdren and P. Herrera, *Energy*, Sierra Club Books, New York, (1971).
67. N. Myers, *The Sinking Ark*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).
68. National Academy of Sciences, *Energy and Climate*, NAS, Washington D.C., (1977).
69. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).

70. A. Peccei, *The Human Quality*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, (1977).
71. A. Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1977).
72. E. Pestel, *Beyond the Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York, (1989).
73. C. Pollock, *Mining Urban Wastes: The Potential for Recycling*, Worldwatch Paper 76, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
74. S.H. Schneider, *The Genesis Strategy: Climate and Global Survival*, Plenum Press, (1976).
75. P.B. Smith, J.D. Schilling and A.P. Haines, *Introduction and Summary*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
76. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
77. J.E. Young, John E., *Mining the Earth*, Worldwatch Paper 109, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
78. J.R. Craig, D.J. Vaughan and B.J. Skinner, *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, (2001).
79. W. Youngquist, *Geodesinies: The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources Over Nations and Individuals*, National Book Company, Portland Oregon, (1997).
80. M. Tanzer, *The Race for Resources. Continuing Struggles Over Minerals and Fuels*, Monthly Review Press, New York, (1980).
81. C.B. Reed, *Fuels, Minerals and Human Survival*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers Inc., Ann Arbor Michigan, (1975).
82. A.A. Bartlett, *Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis*, American Journal of Physics, **46**, 876-888, (1978).
83. N. Gall, *We are Living Off Our Capital*, Forbes, September, (1986).
84. M. Anklin et al., *Climate instability during the last interglacial period recorded in the GRIP ice core*. Nature **364**, 15 July: 203-207, (1993).
85. O. J. Blanchard and S. Fischer, *Lectures on Macroeconomics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. (1989).
86. Ehrlich P-R (1995) *The scale of the human enterprise and biodiversity loss*, in *Extinction Rates*, eds Lawton JH, May RM (Oxford Univ Press, Oxford, UK), pp 214-226.
87. Dirzo R, et al. (2014) *Defaunation in the Anthropocene*. Science **345**:401-406.
88. Young HS, McCauley DJ, Galletti M, Dirzo R (2016) *Patterns, causes, and consequences of Anthropocene defaunation*. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst **47**:433-458.
89. World Wide Fund for Nature (2016) *Living Planet Report 2016. Risk and resilience in a new era*. (WWF International, Gland, Switzerland), 2017.
90. Maxwell SL, Fuller RA, Brooks TM, Watson JEM (2016) *Biodiversity: The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers*. Nature **536**:143-145.
91. Laliberte AS, Ripple WJ (2004) *Range contractions of North American carnivores and ungulates*. BioScience **54**:123-138.
92. Worm B, Tittensor DP (2011) *Range contraction in large pelagic predators*. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **108**:11942-11947.
93. Ripple WJ, et al. (2014) *Status and ecological effects of the world's largest carnivores*. Science **343**:1241-1248.

94. Barnosky AD, et al. (2011) *Has the Earth's sixth mass extinction already arrived?* Nature **471**:51-57.
95. Ceballos G, Garcia A, Ehrlich PR (2010) *The sixth extinction crisis: Loss of animal populations and species.* J. Cosmology **8**:1821-1831.
96. Ceballos G, et al. (2015) *Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction.* Sci Adv **1**:e1400253.
97. Wake DB, Vredenburg VT (2008) *Colloquium paper: Are we in the midst of the sixth mass extinction? A view from the world of amphibians.* Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **105**:11466-11473.
98. McCallum ML (2015) *Vertebrate biodiversity losses point to a sixth mass extinction.* Biol Conserv **24**:2497-2519.
99. Pimm SL, et al. (2014) *The biodiversity of species and their rates of extinction, distribution, and protection.* Science **344**:1246752.
100. McCauley DJ, et al. (2015) *Marine defaunation: Animal loss in the global ocean.* Science **347**:1255641.
101. Collen B, Böhm M, Kemp R, Baillie J (2012) *Spineless: Status and Trends of the World's Invertebrates* (Zoological Society of London, London). Red List
102. Daily G (1997) *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems.* (Island Press, Covello, CA).
103. Naeem S, Duffy JE, Zavaleta E (2012) *The functions of biological diversity in an age of extinction.* Science **336**:1401-1406.
104. Estes JA, et al. (2011) *Trophic downgrading of planet Earth.* Science **333**:301-306.
105. Brosi BJ, Briggs HM (2013) *Single pollinator species losses reduce floral fidelity and plant reproductive function.* Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **110**:13044-13048.
106. Briggs JC (2014) *Global biodiversity gain is concurrent with decreasing population sizes.* Biodiver J **5**:447-452.
107. Hooper DU, et al. (2012) *A global synthesis reveals biRed Listodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change.* Nature **486**:105-108. Red List
108. Ehrlich PR (2014) *The case against de-extinction: It's a fascinating but dumb idea.* Yale Environment 360 (Yale University, New Haven, CT). Available at bit.ly/1gAIuJF. Accessed JunStudiese 10, 2017.
109. Hobbs RJ, Mooney HA (1998) *Broadening the extinction debate: Population deletions and additions in California and Western Australia.* Conserv Biol **12**:271-283. Studies
110. Hughes JB, Daily GC, Ehrlich PR (1997) *Population diversity: Its extent and extinction.* Science **278**:689-692.
111. Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR (2002) *Mammal population losses and the extinction crisis.* Science **296**:904-907.
112. Gaston KJ, Fuller RA (2008) *Commonness, population depletion and conservation biology.* Trends Ecol Evol **23**:14-19.
113. International Union of Conservation of Nature (2015) *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2015.2* (IUCN, 2015). Available at www.iucnredlist.org. Accessed February 10, 2016. Revised January 10, 2017.

114. Durant SM, et al. (2017) *The global decline of cheetah *Acinonyx jubatus* and what it means for conservation*. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **114**:528-533.
115. Henschel P, et al. (2014) *The lion in West Africa is critically endangered*. PLoS One **9**:e83500.
116. Challender D, et al. (2016) *On scaling up pangolin conservation*. Traffic Bulletin **28**: 19-21.
117. Fennessy J, et al. (2016) *Multi-locus analyses reveal four giraffe species instead of one*. Curr Biol **26**:2543-2549.
118. Butchart S, Dunn E (2003) *Using the IUCN Red List criteria to assess species with declining populations*. Conserv Biol **17**:1200-1202.
119. Gaston K, Blackburn T (2008) *Pattern and Process in Macroecology* (Blackwell Publishing, Hoboken, NJ). Red List
120. Thomas JA (2016) *ECOLOGY. Butterfly communities under threat*. Science **353**:216-218.
121. Régnier C, et al. (2015) *Mass extinction in poorly known taxa*. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **112**:7761-7766.25.
122. Hughes JB, Daily GC, Ehrlich PR (1997) *Population diversity: Its extent and extinction*. Science **278**:689-692.
123. Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR (2002) *Mammal population losses and the extinction crisis*. Science **296**:904-907.
124. Cardinale BJ, et al. (2012) *Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity*. Nature **486**: 59-67.
125. Hurlbert AH, Jetz W (2007) *Species richness, hotspots, and the scale dependence of range maps in ecology and conservation*. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **104**:13384-13389.
126. Peterson AT, Navarro-Sigüenza AG, Gordillo A (2016) *Assumption- versus data-based approaches to summarizing species' ranges*. Conserv Biol, 10.1111/cobi.12801.
127. Martínez-Ramos M, Ortiz-Rodríguez I, Pinero D, Dirzo R, Sarukhán J (2016) *Humans disrupt ecological processes within tropical rainforest reserves*. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **113**:5323-5328.
128. Camargo-Sanabria AA, Mendoza E, Guevara R, Martínez-Ramos M, Dirzo R (2015) *Experimental defaunation of terrestrial mammalian herbivores alters tropical rainforest understorey diversity*. Proc Biol Sci **282**:20142580.
129. Petipas RH, Brody AK (2014) *Termites and ungulates affect arbuscular mycorrhizal richness and infectivity in a semiarid savanna*. Botany **92**:233-240.
130. Wardle DA, et al. (2004) *Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota*. Science **304**:1629-1633.
131. Ceballos G, Ehrlich AH, Ehrlich PR (2015) **The Annihilation of Nature: Human Extinction of Birds and Mammals**, (Johns Hopkins Univ Press, Baltimore).
132. Knoll AH (2015) *Life on a Young Planet: The First Three Billion Years of Evolution on Earth*, (Princeton Univ Press, Princeton, NJ).
133. Barnosky AD, et al. (2014) *Introducing the scientific consensus on maintaining humanity's life support systems in the 21st century: Information for policy makers*. The Anthropocene Review **1**:78-109.

134. Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Soberón J, Salazar I, Fay JP (2005) *Global mammal conservation: What must we manage?* Science **309**:603-607.
135. Brown IL, Ehrlich PR (1980) *Population biology of the checkerspot butterfly, Euphydryas chalcedona structure of the Jasper Ridge colony.* Oecologia **47**:239-251.
136. Environmental Systems Research Institute (2011) *Release 10. Documentation Manual*, (Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, CA).
137. Balling, R. C. 1988. *The climate impact of Sonoran vegetation discontinuity.* Climate Change **13**: 99-109.
138. Balling, R. C. 1991. *Impact of desertification on regional and global warming.* Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society **72**: 232-234.
139. Barigozzi, C. (ed.). 1986. *The Origin and Domestication of Cultivated Plants.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.
140. Botkin, D. B. 1989. *Science and the global environment.* In: D. B. Botkin et al., *Global Change.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 1-14.
141. Bryson, R. 1972. *Climate modification by air pollution.* In: N. Polunin (ed.), *The Environmental Future.* London: Macmillan, pp. 133-174.
142. Dregne, H. E., M. Kassas, and B. Rozanov. 1991. *A new assessment of the world status of desertification.* Desertification Control Bulletin, **no. 20**: 6-18.
143. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). 1991. *Protection of land resources: Deforestation* UNCED Prepcomm., 2nd session, Doc. A/CONF. 15/PC/27.
144. Hare, F. K. and L. A. J. Ogallo. 1993. *Climate Variation, Drought and Desertification.* WMO-No. 653. Geneva: WMO.
145. Houghton, J. T., B. A. Callander, and S. K. Varney (eds.). 1992. *Climate Change 1992. The Supplementary Report to the IPCC Scientific Assessment.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
146. Hulme, M. and M. Kelly. 1993. *Exploring the links between desertification and climate change.* Environment **35(6)**: 5-11, 39-45.
147. Jackson, R. D. and S. B. Idso. 1975. *Surface albedo and desertification.* Science **189**: 1012-1013.
148. Matthews, E. 1983. *Global vegetation and land use: New high-resolution databases for climatic studies.* Journal of Climate and Meteorology **22**: 474-487.
149. Schlesinger, W. H., et al. 1990. *Biological feedback in global desertification.* Science **247**: 1043-1048.
150. Turner, B. L., et al. 1990. "Two types of global environmental changes: Definitional and special-scale issues in their human dimensions." Global Environmental Change **1**: 14-22.
151. UNESCO. 1960. *Medicinal plants of arid zones.* Arid Zone Research **13**.
152. Vavilov, N. I. 1949. *The Origin, Variation, Immunity and Breeding of Cultivated Plants.* Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica

Chapter 6

THE GLOBAL HUMAN FOOTPRINT

6.1 How many earths does it take to support us?

The total ecological footprint of humanity is a concept used to measure the relationship between the resources that humans demand from their environment, compared with the ability of nature to provide those resources. In recent years humans have been asking the earth to provide the with much more than the earth can regenerate. Our collective footprint on the face of nature has become too large.

Here are some quotations from the homepage of the Footprint Network organization:¹

“If a population’s Ecological Footprint exceeds the region’s biocapacity, that region runs an ecological deficit. Its demand for the goods and services that its land and seas can provide - fruits and vegetables, meat, fish, wood, cotton for clothing, and carbon dioxide absorption - exceeds what the region’s ecosystems can renew. A region in ecological deficit meets demand by importing, liquidating its own ecological assets (such as overfishing), and/or emitting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. If a region’s biocapacity exceeds its Ecological Footprint, it has an ecological reserve.

“Conceived in 1990 by Mathis Wackernagel and William Rees at the University of British Columbia, the Ecological Footprint launched the broader Footprint movement, including the carbon Footprint, and is now widely used by scientists, businesses, governments, individuals, and institutions working to monitor ecological resource use and advance sustainable development.

“A rich introduction to the theory and practice of the approach is available in the book Ecological Footprint: Managing Our Biocapacity Budget (2019).”

¹<https://www.footprintnetwork.org/our-work/ecological-footprint/>

How many Earths does it take to support humanity?




Figure 6.1: The business as usual course would lead us to disaster.




Figure 6.2: Both the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity are expressed in global hectares - globally comparable, standardized hectares with world average productivity.

6.2 Overuse of pesticides and the insect apocalypse

Loss of flying insects, especially bees

Studies have shown an annual decline of 5.2% in flying insect biomass found in nature reserves in Germany - about 75% loss in 26 years.

In the United States the managed bee populations have declined dramatically. According to one study, for the single year, from April 1, 2018, to April 1, 2019, the managed bee population decreased by 40.7%.

Overuse of pesticides degrades topsoil

It is not only the loss of bees and other pollinator insects that is dangerous to agriculture. The excessive use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals also degrades topsoil. Normally, topsoil contains richly numerous and diverse populations of tiny worms and bacteria, that aid the recycling of crop residue from previous years into nutrients for plant growth. However, the overuse of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals kills these vitally important populations. Carbon from the dead topsoil is released into the atmosphere, thus increasing the concentrations of dangerous greenhouse gases. Having killed the living topsoil, farmers then find that they need increased quantities of petroleum-derived fertilizers to make their crops grow.

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

An environmental treaty, signed in 2001 and effective since May, 2004, aims at restricting the production and use of persistent organic pollutants (POPs). These are defined by the United Nations Environmental Institute as “chemical substances that persist in the environment, bio-accumulate through the food web, and pose a risk of causing adverse effects to human health and the environment”. Besides DDT, the Stockholm Treaty also lists Aldrin, α -Hexachlorocyclohexane, β -Hexachlorocyclohexane, Chlordane, Chlordecone, Decabromodiphenyl ether, Dicofol, Dieldrin, Endosulfan, Endrin, Heptachlor, Hexabromobiphenyl, Hexabromocyclododecane, Hexabromodiphenylether, Hexachlorobenzene, Hexachlorobutadiene, Lindane, Mirex, Pentachlorobenzene, Pentachlorophenol, Perfluorooctanoic acid, Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, Polychlorinated biphenyls, Polychlorinated dibenzodioxins, Polychlorinated naphthalenes, Tetrabromodiphenyl ether, Short-chain chlorinated paraffins, and Toxaphene.

Although some critics have claimed that the treaty is responsible for the continuing death toll from malaria, in reality it specifically permits the public health use of DDT for the control of malaria-carrying mosquitoes. In 2016, there were 216 million cases of malaria worldwide, resulting in an estimated 445,000 to 731,000 deaths.



Figure 6.3: 20 May 2019, Rome - The global decline in bee populations poses a serious threat to a wide variety of plants critical to human well-being and livelihoods, and countries should do more to safeguard our key allies in the fight against hunger and malnutrition, FAO stressed today as it marked UN World Bee Day. Bees and other pollinator are declining in abundance in many parts of the world largely due to intensive farming practices, mono-cropping, excessive use of agricultural chemicals and higher temperatures associated with climate change, affecting not only crop yields but also nutrition. If this trend continues, nutritious crops such as fruits, nuts, and many vegetables will be substituted increasingly by staple crops like rice, corn, and potatoes, eventually resulting in an imbalanced diet.

6.3 The Silent Spring

Dangers from pesticide pollution

Rachel Carson's most influential book, *The Silent Spring*, was published in 1962, when she was already suffering from breast cancer. Eventually it sold over two million copies. The book expresses Carson's worries about the environmental consequences of overuse of pesticides, such as DDT, which were killing not only their targeted pests, but also many vitally important insects, as well as causing health problems in humans. Part of the anger that Carson expressed in the book may have come because the cancer from which she was suffering could have been caused by mutagenic pesticides.

The town was fictitious, but the problems were real

The Silent Spring begins by describing a fictitious Midwestern American town, where people are mysteriously suffering and dying from a variety of unexplained illnesses previously unseen by doctors. Sheep and cattle, fish in the river, and birds, all sicken and die. Orchards bear no fruit and vegetation withers. It gradually becomes clear that the people of the town are themselves to blame. That have been poisoning themselves and their environment by overuse of pesticides.

Some quotations from *The Silent Spring*

Here are two quotations from the book:

As crude a weapon as the cave man's club, the chemical barrage has been hurled against the fabric of life - a fabric on the one hand delicate and destructible, on the other miraculously tough and resilient, and capable of striking back in unexpected ways... It is our alarming misfortune that so primitive a science has armed itself with the most modern and terrible weapons, and that in turning them against the insects it has also turned them against the earth...

Among the herbicides are some that are classified as 'mutagens,' or agents capable of modifying the genes, the materials of heredity. We are rightly appalled by the genetic effects of radiation; how then, can we be indifferent to the same effect in chemicals that we disseminate widely in our environment?

Although extremely ill with cancer and in constant pain, Carson gave newspaper interviews and appeared on television to make her case. In July, 1962, the US Department of agriculture issued the following statement: **"Miss Carson provides a lucid description of the real and potential dangers of misusing chemical pesticides... She expresses the concern of many people about the effect of chemical pesticides on birds, animals and people. We are fully aware of and share this concern."**

'Silent Spring' Is Now Noisy Summer

*Pesticides Industry
Up in Arms Over
a New Book*

By JOHN M. LEE

The \$200,000,000 pesticides industry has been highly irritated by a quiet woman author whose previous works on science have been praised for the beauty and precision of the writing.

The author is Rachel Carson, whose "The Sea Around Us" and "The Edge of the Sea" were best sellers in 1951 and 1955. Miss Carson, trained as a marine biologist, wrote gracefully of sea and shore life.

In her latest work, however, Miss Carson is not so gentle,



*Rachel Carson Stirs
Conflict—Producers
Are Crying 'Foul'*

feeding the use of their products. Meetings have been held in Washington and New York. Statements are being drafted and counter-attacks plotted.

A drowsy midsummer has suddenly been enlivened by the greatest uproar in the pesticides industry since the cranberry scare of 1959.

Miss Carson's new book is entitled "Silent Spring." The title is derived from an idealized situation in which Miss Carson envisions an imaginary town where chemical pollution has silenced "the voices of spring."

Figure 6.4: Rachel Carson's book, *The Silent Spring*, was controversial, to say the least, but it focused public attention on problems of ecology.




Figure 6.5: *The Silent Spring* was an international best-seller, and it ignited the environmental movement.




Figure 6.6: An audio version of *The Silent Spring*.



Figure 6.7: As Rachel Carson's influence increased, she began speaking to large audiences.



Figure 6.8: Statue of Carson at the Museo Rocsen, Nono, Argentina.

6.4 Biodiversity loss

According to Wikipedia's article on *Biodiversity Loss*,

“The current rate of global diversity loss is estimated to be 100 to 1000 times higher than the (naturally occurring) background extinction rate and expected to still grow in the upcoming years...

“According to the UN's Global Biodiversity Outlook 2014 estimates that 70 percent of the projected loss of terrestrial biodiversity are caused by agriculture use. Moreover, more than 1/3 of the planet's land surface is utilised for crops and grazing of livestock. Agriculture destroys biodiversity by converting natural habitats to intensely managed systems and by releasing pollutants, including greenhouses gases. Food value chains further amplify impacts including through energy use, transport and waste. The direct effects of urban growth on habitat loss are well understood: Building construction often results in habitat destruction and fragmentation. The rise of urbanization greatly reduced biodiversity when large areas of natural habitat are fragmented. Small habitat patches are unable to support the same level of genetic or taxonomic diversity as they formerly could while some of the more sensitive species may become locally extinct.

“Pollution from burning fossil fuels such as oil, coal and gas can remain in the air as particle pollutants or fall to the ground as acid rain. Acid rain, which is primarily composed of sulfuric and nitric acid, causes acidification of lakes, streams and sensitive forest soils, and contributes to slower forest growth and tree damage at high elevations. Moreover, Carbon dioxide released from burning fossil fuels and biomass, deforestation, and agricultural practices contributes to greenhouse gases, which prevent heat from escaping the earth's surface. With the increase in temperature expected from increasing greenhouse gases, there will be higher levels of air pollution, greater variability in weather patterns, and changes in the distribution of vegetation in the landscape. These two factors play a huge role towards biodiversity loss and entirely depended on human-driven factors.”

6.5 Illegal burning for palm oil plantations

According to a recent article published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, “One huge source of global warming emissions associated with palm oil is the draining and burning of the carbon-rich swamps known as peatlands. Peatlands can hold up to 18 to 28 times as much carbon as the forests above them; when they are drained and burned, both carbon and methane are released into the atmosphere - and unless the water table is restored, peatlands continue to decay and release global warming emissions for decades.

“As if that wasn't bad enough, the burning of peatlands releases a dangerous haze into




Figure 6.9: **The growth of palm oil cultivation between 1993 and 2013. The dark area at the top of the graph indicates the dramatic growth of palm oil production in Southeast Asia, especially Indonesia.**

the air, resulting in severe health impacts and significant economic losses. Each year, more than 100,000 deaths in Southeast Asia can be attributed to particulate matter exposure from landscape fires, many of which are peat fires.

“Beyond its global warming and human health impacts, palm oil production also takes a toll on biodiversity and human rights. Only about 15 percent of native animal species can survive the transition from primary forest to plantation. Among the species vulnerable to palm oil expansion are orangutans, tigers, rhinoceros, and elephants. Furthermore, palm oil growers have also been accused of using forced labor, seizing land from local populations, and other human rights abuses.”

Licences to burn forests for palm oil plantations are often granted by corrupt government officials. Fortunately, through the efforts of NGO’s the public has become increasingly aware of the problem, and supermarkets are being urged to purchase products containing deforestation-free palm oil.

Another recent article² states that “Indonesia is being deforested faster than any other country in the world, and it has everything to do with one product: palm oil.

“According to a new study in the journal *Nature Climate Change*, deforestation in the Southeast Asian archipelago is nearly double the rate in the Amazon. Indonesia is said to have lost 840,000 hectares (3,250 square miles) of forest in 2012 while Brazil - which has four times Indonesia’s rainforest - lost a still-massive 460,000 hectares.

“The report’s authors found that government figures underestimated the true toll of forest clearing by as much as half. In the last 12 years, it’s possible that the destruction of one million hectares of ‘primary forest’ went unreported.

“The tree-killing spree is largely due to slashing and burning vegetation for the expansion of palm oil plantations to feed growing demand in countries like China and India.

²<https://news.vice.com/article/indonesia-is-killing-the-planet-for-palm-oil>

Americans and Europeans are still far and away the top consumers per capita - it's estimated that palm oil can be found in roughly half the manufactured goods in any supermarket or drug store. Everything from peanut butter to soap to cosmetics contains the oil in its various forms.

"In Indonesia, where much of the land consists of carbon-rich soil known as peat, the problem is acute. Water-logged peat is commonly found in the jungles of Sumatra and Borneo, and merely exposing it to the air releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere."

6.6 Jair Bolsonaro's attack on the Amazon rainforest

Beef is killing the rainforest

Beef Production is Killing the Amazon Rainforest. That is the title of an article published by onegreenplanet.org³. Here are some excerpts from the article

"The Amazon rainforest has been facing severe deforestation problems for several decades - it has lost about a fifth of its forest in the past three. While there are many causes, one of the main causes is cattle ranching, particularly in Brazil. Trees are cut and the land is converted into a pasture for cattle grazing. According to one report, an estimated 70 percent of deforestation in the Amazon basin can be attributed to cattle ranching. Using these numbers, cattle ranching in the Amazon has resulted in the loss of an area larger than the state of Washington.

"The government of Brazil offers loans of billions of dollars to support the expansion of its beef industry. Approximately 200 million pounds of beef is imported by the United States from Central America every year. While the chief importers of Brazilian beef were previously Europe and North America, nowadays Asian countries such as China and Russia consume more Brazilian beef than the European market. So, the demand is increasing day by day.

"With increasing population and increased per capita meat consumption, the rate of deforestation is increasing every day as well. It is expected that by 2018, the beef export will increase 93 percent, thereby increasing Brazil's beef market share of world exports to 61 percent. Beef is the most carbon-intensive form of meat production on the planet. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization finds that beef production gives rise to more greenhouse gases than the transportation industry."

Beef production and methane

A cow (or a bull) releases between 70 and 120 kg of methane per year. Methane is a greenhouse gas like carbon dioxide, but the negative effect on the climate of methane (CH₄) is 23 times higher than the effect of CO₂. Therefore the release of about 100 kg methane per year for each cow is equivalent to about 2,300 kg CO₂ per year.

³<http://www.onegreenplanet.org/animalsandnature/beef-production-is-killing-the-amazon-rainforest/>




Figure 6.10: Total cattle herds and total deforestation in Amazonia between 1988 and 2104. Deforestation is measured in thousands of square kilometers, while herd size is measured in millions.




Figure 6.11: Population density and forest size.




Figure 6.12: This figure shows the causes of Amazonian deforestation. The largest is beef production.

World-wide, there are about 1.5 billion cows and bulls. All ruminants (animals which regurgitates food and re-chews it) on the world emit about two billion metric tons of CO₂, equivalents per year. In addition, clearing of tropical forests and rain forests to get more grazing land and farm land is responsible for an extra 2.8 billion metric tons of CO₂ emission per year!

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) agriculture is responsible for 18% of the total release of greenhouse gases world-wide (this is more than the whole transportation sector). Cattle-breeding is taking a major factor for these greenhouse gas emissions according to FAO. Says Henning Steinfeld, Chief of FAO's Livestock Information and Policy Branch and senior author of the report: "Livestock are one of the most significant contributors to today's most serious environmental problems. Urgent action is required to remedy the situation."

Livestock now use 30 percent of the earth's entire land surface, mostly permanent pasture but also including 33 percent of the global arable land used to producing feed for livestock, the report notes. As forests are cleared to create new pastures, it is a major driver of deforestation, especially in Latin America where, for example, some 70 percent of former forests in the Amazon have been turned over to grazing.

Dietary changes can help

You and I can help to save our common future by changing our diets, especially by cutting out beef. Not only does beef production produce methane and destroy rainforests, it also requires much more land per calorie than other forms of agriculture. By switching from beef to other protein-rich foods, we not only substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but we also shorten the food chain, so that more grain will be available to feed the world's growing population. Furthermore a changed diet with less meat would improve our health, since animal fats have been linked with heart disease, circulatory problems and strokes.

6.7 Growing populations and forest loss

Deforestation is occurring at alarming rates, especially in countries that have high levels of population growth.⁴ The following table shows the forest loss in some countries where it is particularly high, together with their present and projected populations⁵. In the table, the annual rate of forest loss in the period 2000-2010. measured both in thousands of hectares and in percent. Populations in millions in 2010 are shown, together with projected populations in 2050.

⁴<http://www.prb.org/Publications/Articles/2004/PopulationGrowthandDeforestationACriticalandComplexRelationship.aspx>
⁵Population Action International, *Why Population Matters to Forests*

country	forest loss	percent	pop. 2010	pop. 2050
Brazil	-2642	-0.49	194.9	222.8
Australia	-562	-0.37	22.3	31.4
Indonesia	-498	-0.51	239.9	293.5
Nigeria	-410	-3.67	158.4	389.6
Tanzania	-403	-1.13	44.8	138.3
Zimbabwe	-327	-1.88	12.6	20.6
Dem. Rep. Congo	.311	-0.20	66.0	148.5
Myanmar	-310	-0.93	47.9	55.3
Bolivia	-290	-0.49	9.9	16.8
Venezuela	-288	-0.60	28.0	41.8

The main mechanism through which rapid population growth is linked to forest loss is felling forests for the sake of agriculture.

Notice that Nigeria is losing 3.67% of its forests each year. The population of Nigeria is projected to more than double by 2050, but rising death rates from heat, famine and conflicts may prevent this. In general, rising death rates from these causes may ultimately lead populations in the tropics to decrease rather than increase.

Population Action International points out that “Deforestation threatens the well-being and livelihoods of millions of people who heavily depend on forest resources. It is particularly devastating for women and children in poor rural communities.” The organization recommends that information and materials for family planning be made available to all through universal provision of primary health care.

6.8 Desertification and soil erosion

The Princeton University Dictionary defines *desertification* as “the process of fertile land transforming into desert typically as a result of deforestation, drought or improper/inappropriate agriculture”. It is estimated that approximately a billion people are under threat from further expansions of deserts.

Southward expansion of the Gobi desert

The Gobi desert is the fastest moving desert on earth. The rapid southward expansion of the Gobi is mainly due to human activities, such as overgrazing, deforestation and overuse of water. Dust storms from the Gobi desert are becoming more and more frequent. Sand dunes are reportedly forming only 70 km north of Beijing.

The Sahel

Another region in which the threat of desertification is extremely acute is the Sahel, which is the boundary between Africa's Sahara desert to the north and a region of savanna to the south. The Sahel stretches between the Atlantic Ocean and the Red Sea. During the last 50 years, the Sahel has lost approximately 650,000 km² of fertile land to the desert, and the boundary of the Sahara has moved 250 km southward.

The southward expansion of the Sahara has been caused partly by climate change, and partly by human activities. Growing human populations have put pressure on the fragile arid environment by overgrazing, tree-cutting for firewood and inappropriate agriculture.

6.9 Forest drying and wildfires: a feedback loop

When climate change produces aridity in a forested region, wildfires produced by lightning, stray sparks from falling stones, or human carelessness become increasingly likely. Forest fires contribute to global warming by releasing CO₂ into the atmosphere and by destroying climate-friendly tree-covered areas. Thus a dangerous feedback loop can be formed, and as was discussed in Chapter 4, with every feedback loop there is an associated tipping point. In the case of forest drying and wildfires, passing the tipping point means that forest cover will be lost irrevocably. We must avoid passing wildfire tipping points through human activities, such as the deliberate burning of rainforests for the sake of oil palm plantations.

6.10 Degraded forests are carbon emitters

According to an article published in the journal *Science* on 28 September, 2017⁶, degraded tropical forest throughout the world have stopped being carbon absorbers, and are now carbon emitters.

Reporting on the study, *The Guardian*,⁷ noted that "Researchers found that forest areas in South America, Africa and Asia - which have until recently played a key role in absorbing greenhouse gases - are now releasing 425 teragrams of carbon annually, which is more than all the traffic in the United States.

"The study went further than any of its predecessors in measuring the impact of disturbance and degradation - the thinning of tree density and the culling of biodiversity below an apparently protected canopy - usually as a result of selective logging, fire, drought and hunting.

"Overall, more carbon was lost to degradation and disturbance than deforestation. The researchers stressed this was an opportunity as well as a concern because it was now possible

⁶A. Baccini et al., *Tropical forests are a net carbon source based on aboveground measurements of gain and loss*, DOI: 10.1126/science.aam5962

⁷<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/sep/28/alarm-as-study-reveals-worlds-tropical-forests-are-huge-carbon-emission-source>

to identify which areas are being affected and to restore forests before they disappeared completely.”

6.11 Replanting forests

Around the world, people interested in replanting forests can take inspiration from the Green Belt Movement, which was founded in 1977 by Wangari Maathai.

The Green Belt Movement organizes women in rural Africa to combat deforestation by planting trees. In this way they restore their main source of fuel for cooking, generate income and stop soil erosion. Since its foundation in 1977, the movement has planted 51 million trees. Over 30,000 women have been trained in forestry, food processing, bee-keeping, and other trades. The movement emphasizes economic justice and empowerment of women. This work is particularly valuable in regions of water scarcity, because besides preventing soil erosion, forests prevent the rapid run-off of water.

In order to combat climate change and to prevent southward expansion of the Sahara, the African Union has initiated a project called the Great Green Wall. The project aims at creating a mosaic of green and productive landscapes stretching across Africa, the Sahel region to the Horn of Africa, a strip of forested land 15 km wide and 7,500 km long, stretching from Dakar to Djibouti.

In China, the Green Great Wall project aims at preventing the expansion of the Gobi desert by planting a 4,500-kilometer-long windbreaking line of forests. The project is expected to be completed by 2050.

Reforestation initiatives also exist in other countries, for example in India, Lebanon, Philippines, Japan, Germany, Canada and the United States.



Figure 6.13: Nobel Laureate Wangari Maathai (1940-2011).



Figure 6.14: Wangari Maathai speaks about deforestation.

6.12 Human ecology

By definition, “Human Ecology is the study of the interactions between man and nature in different cultures. Human Ecology combines the ideas and methods from several disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, biology, economic history and archeology.”

6.13 Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne H. Ehrlich

Education

Paul R. Ehrlich was born in 1932 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He studied zoology at the University of Pennsylvania, and later received a Ph.D. from the University of Kansas, where he specialized in the study of insects. In 1959, Ehrlich joined the staff of Stanford University, where he was appointed to the Bing Professorship in Zoology in 1977.

Involvement in the population debate

In 1967, a lecture on population that Ehrlich gave at the Commonwealth Club of California was broadcast on the radio. Because of the publicity that followed the radio broadcast, Ehrlich was invited by the Sierra Club and Ballantine Books to write a book on the dangers of a human population explosion. Paul R. Ehrlich and his wife, Anne H. Ehrlich together wrote a book entitled *The Population Bomb*, which was published in 1968. Although the book was a joint husband and wife production, the publisher insisted that only Paul’s name should appear as author. Although others had written about the dangers of overpopulation, it was this book that brought the problem to a wide audience.

Books by Paul R. Ehrlich

- *How to Know the Butterflies* (1960)
- *Process of Evolution* (1963)
- *Butterflies and Plants: A Study in Coevolution* (1964)
- *The Population Bomb* (1968, revised 1971, updated 1978, re-issued 1988, 1998, 2008 and 2018)
- *Population, Resources, Environments: Issues in Human Ecology* (1970)
- *How to Be a Survivor* (1971)
- *Man and the Ecosphere: Readings from Scientific American* (1971)
- *Population, Resources, Environments: Issues in Human Ecology* Second Edition (1972)
- *Human Ecology: Problems and Solutions* (1973)
- *Introductory Biology* (1973)
- *The End of Affluence* (1975)
- *Biology and Society* (1976)

- *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment* (1978)
- *The Race Bomb* (1978)
- *Extinction* (1981)
- *The Golden Door: International Migration, Mexico, and the United States* (1981)
- *The Cold and the Dark: The World after Nuclear War* (1984, with Carl Sagan, Donald Kennedy, and Walter Orr Roberts)
- *The Machinery of Nature: The Living World Around Us and How it Works* (1986)
- *Earth* (1987, co-authored with Anne Ehrlich)
- *Science of Ecology* (1987, with Joan Roughgarden)
- *The Cassandra Conference: Resources and the Human Predicament* (1988)
- *The Birder's Handbook: A field Guide to the Natural History of North American Birds* (1988, with David S. Dobkin and Darryl Wheye)
- *New World, New Mind: Moving Towards Conscious Evolution* (1988, co-authored with Robert E. Ornstein)
- *The Population Explosion* (1990, with Anne Ehrlich)
- *Healing the Planet: Strategies for Resolving the Environmental Crisis* (1991, co-authored with Anne Ehrlich)
- *Birds in Jeopardy: The Imperiled and Extinct Birds of the United States and Canada, Including Hawaii and Puerto Rico* (1992, with David S. Dobkin and Darryl Wheye)
- *The Stork and the Plow : The Equity Answer to the Human Dilemma* (1995, with Anne Ehrlich and Gretchen C. Daily)
- *A World of Wounds: Ecologists and the Human Dilemma* (1997)
- *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environment Rhetoric Threatens Our Future* (1998, with Anne Ehrlich)
- *Wild Solutions: How Biodiversity is Money in the Bank* (2001, with Andrew Beattie)
- *Human Natures: Genes, Cultures, and the Human Prospect* (2002)
- *One With Nineveh: Politics, Consumption, and the Human Future* (2004, with Anne Ehrlich)
- *On the Wings of Checkerspots: A Model System for Population Biology* (2004, edited volume, co-edited with Ilkka Hanski)
- *The Dominant Animal: Human Evolution and the Environment* (2008, with Anne Ehrlich)
- *Humanity on a Tightrope: Thoughts on Empathy, Family, and Big Changes for a Viable Future* (2010, with Robert E. Ornstein)
- *Conservation Biology for All* (2010, edited volume, co-edited with Navjot S. Sodhi)
- *Hope on Earth: A Conversation* (2014, co-authored with Michael Charles Tobias)
- *Killing the Koala and Poisoning the Prairie: Australia, America and the Environment* (2015, co-authored with Corey J. A. Bradshaw)
- *The Annihilation of Nature: Human Extinction of Birds and Mammals* (2015, with Anne Ehrlich and Gerardo Ceballos)



Figure 6.15: Paul R. Ehrlich in 1974.



Figure 6.16: Ehrlich speaking in 2008.



Figure 6.17: Anne H. Ehrlich, Paul Ehrlich's wife, is the co-author of many of his books. I know her personally because of the many Pugwash Conferences that we both have attended. I also know John P. Holdren for the same reason,

6.14 John P. Holdren

Education

John P. Holdren was born in Pennsylvania in 1944, but grew to in California. He graduated from MIT with a B.Sc. degree in 1965, and was awarded a Ph.D. by Stanford University in 1970, having studied aeronautics, astronautics and plasma physics.

Professor of environmental science

Holdren taught for 13 years at Harvard, and later for more than 20 years at the University of California, Berkeley. His research interests centered on environmental questions. These included global environmental change, population stabilization, energy technologies and policies, ways to reduce the dangers from nuclear weapons and materials, and science and technology policy.

Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs

John P. Holdren served as the Chairman of the Executive Committee of Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs. The Russell-Einstein Manifesto of 1955 called for a meeting of scientists from both sides of the Cold War to try to minimize the danger of a thermonuclear conflict. The first meeting took place at the summer home of the Canadian philanthropist Cyrus Eaton at the small village of Pugwash, Nova Scotia.

From this small beginning, a series of conferences developed, in which scientists, especially physicists, attempted to work for peace, and tried to address urgent global problems related to science, and especially to reduce the danger of a thermonuclear war. In 1995, Pugwash Conferences, and its president, Sir Joseph Rotblat, shared the Nobel Peace Prize. John P. Holdren delivered the acceptance speech on behalf of the organization.

Some books and articles by John P. Holdren

Holdren has authored over 200 articles and papers and has co-authored and co-edited some 20 books and book-length reports including

- *Ecoscience : Population, Resources, Environment* by John P. Holdren, Paul R. Ehrlich, Ann H. Ehrlich
- *Global Ecology* by John P. Holdren and Paul R. Ehrlich
- *The Cassandra Conference : Resources and the Human Predicament* by John P. Holdren and Paul R. Ehrlich
- *Strategic Defense and the Future of the Arms Race : A Pugwash Symposium* by John P. Holdren
- *Energy* by John P. Holdren
- *Science in the White House*. *Science*, May 2009, 567.[
- *Policy for Energy Technology Innovation. Acting in Time on Energy Policy*, (with Laura Diaz Anadon, Max H. Bazerman, David T. Ellwood, Kelly Sims Gallagher, William H. Hogan, Henry Lee, and Daniel Schrag), Brookings Institution Press, 2009.
- *The Future of Climate Change Policy: The U.S.'s Last Chance to Lead*. *Scientific American* 2008 Earth 3.0 Supplement. October 13, 2008, 20-21.
- *Convincing the Climate Change Skeptics*. *The Boston Globe*, August 4, 2008.[
- *Ending the Energy Stalemate: A Bipartisan Strategy To Meet America's Energy Challenges*. Presentation at the National Academies 2008 Energy Summit, Washington, D.C., March 14, 2008.
- *Global Climatic Disruption: Risks and Opportunities*. Presentation at Investor Summit on Climate Risk, New York, February 14, 2008.
- *Meeting the Climate-Change Challenge*. The John H. Chafee Memorial Lecture, National Council for Science and the Environment, Washington, D.C., January 17, 2008.



Figure 6.18: John P. Holdren held the position of Assistant to the President for Science and Technology between 2009 and 2017.



Figure 6.19: John P. Holdren with Barack Obama.



Figure 6.20: John P. Holdren: “Trump has no science policy to speak of”.

6.15 Barry Commoner

Early life and education

Barry Commoner (1917-2012) was born in Brooklyn, New York, the son of Jewish immigrants from Russia. After a B.Sc. from Columbia University, he received a doctoral degree in cell biology from Harvard. In 1947, he became a professor of plant physiology at Washington University, Sr. Louis. and he taught there for the next 34 years.

A pioneer of ecology

While teaching at Washington University, Barry Commoner established the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems to study “the science of the total environment”. During the late 1950’s, Commoner’s attention was drawn to health and environmental consequences of nuclear testing. His Baby Tooth Survey demonstrated that radioactive substances, such as Strontium 90, were being incorporated in the teeth of infants as a result of the testing of nuclear weapons. Commoner wrote: “The greatest single cause of environmental contamination of this planet is radioactivity from test explosions of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere.”

Barry Commoner’s US presidential campaign

In 1980, Barry Commoner founded the Citizens Party, and he ran as the party’s candidate for the US presidency. Although he received only a very small percentage of the votes in the election, the campaign nevertheless made a wide public aware of the seriousness of ecological problems. During the last phase of his career, Commoner returned to New York as a professor at Queens College, part of the City University of New York. Although he stepped down from his professorship in 2000, he remained a senior scientist at Queens College until his death in 2012 at the age of 95.

Books and reports by Barry Commoner

- *Science and Survival* (1966), New York: Viking OCLC 225105 - on “the uses of science and technology in relation to environmental hazards”.
- *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man, and Technology* (1971), New York: Knopf.
- *The Poverty of Power: Energy and the Economic Crisis* (1976), New York: Random House.
- *The Politics of Energy* (1979), New York: Knopf.
- *Making Peace With the Planet* (1990), New York: Pantheon.
- *Long-range Air Transport of Dioxin from North American Sources to Ecologically Vulnerable Receptors in Nunavut, Arctic Canada*, (2000), Commoner, Barry; Bartlett, Paul Woods; Eisl, Holger; Couchot, Kim; Center for the Biology of Natural Systems, Queens College, City University of New York, published by the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

A few things that Barry Commoner said or wrote

The proper use of science is not to conquer nature but to live in it.

Everything is connected to everything else. Everything must go somewhere. Nature knows best. There is no such thing as a free lunch.

If you ask what you are going to do about global warming, the only rational answer is to change the way in which we do transportation, energy production, agriculture and a good deal of manufacturing. The problem originates in human activity in the form of the production of goods.

The environmental crisis is somber evidence of an insidious fraud hidden in the vaunted productivity and wealth of modern, technology-based society. This wealth has been gained by rapid short-term exploitation of the environmental system, but it has blindly accumulated a debt to nature - a debt so large and so pervasive that in the next generation it may, if unpaid, wipe out most of the wealth it has gained us.

Our assaults on the ecosystem are so powerful, so numerous, so finely interconnected, that although the damage they do is clear, it is very difficult to discover how it was done. By which weapon? In whose hand? Are we driving the ecosphere to destruction simply by our growing numbers? By our greedy accumulation of wealth? Or are the machines which we have built to gain this wealth - the magnificent technology that now feeds us out of neat packages, that clothes us in man-made fibers, that surrounds us with new chemical creations - at fault?

The environmental crisis arises from a fundamental fault: our systems of production - in industry, agriculture, energy and transportation - essential as they are, make people sick and die.

Sooner or later, wittingly or unwittingly, we must pay for every intrusion on the natural environment.

Air pollution is not merely a nuisance and a threat to health. It is a reminder that our most celebrated technological achievements - the automobile, the jet plane, the power plant, industry in general, and indeed the modern city itself - are, in the environment, failures.

All of the clean technologies are known, it's a question of simply applying them.






Figure 6.21: Time reported in its February 1970 issue that "the national concern over the environment has reached an unprecedented level of intensity." On the cover, the visage of Barry Commoner projected a powerful image of ecology, which took the stage for the first time in the public eye.



Figure 6.22: Barry Commoner died at the age of 95 in 2012.





The favorite statistic is that the U.S. contains 6 to 7% of the world population but consumes more than half the world's resources and is responsible for that fraction of the total environmental pollution. But this statistic hides another vital fact: that not everyone in the U.S. is so affluent.

Perhaps the simplest example is a synthetic plastic, which unlike natural materials, is not degraded by biological decay. It therefore persists as rubbish or is burned - in both cases causing pollution. In the same way, a substance such as DDT or lead, which plays no role in the chemistry of life and interferes with the actions of substances that do, is bound to cause ecological damage if sufficiently concentrated.

Because the global ecosystem is a connected whole, in which nothing can be gained or lost and which is not subject to over-all improvement, anything extracted from it by human effort must be replaced. Payment of this price cannot be avoided; it can only be delayed. The present environmental crisis is a warning that we have delayed nearly too long.

Despite the dazzling successes of modern technology and the unprecedented power of modern military systems, they suffer from a common and catastrophic fault. While providing us with a bountiful supply of food, with great industrial plants, with high-speed transportation, and with military weapons of unprecedented power, they threaten our very survival.

6.16 The earth is our mother

The World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth

This conference took place in Tiquipaya, just outside the city of Cochabamba, Bolivia, from April 19-22, 2010. The event was attended by around 30,000 people from over 100 countries. It was hosted by the Bolivian government, and the proceedings were transmitted online by the organizations OneClimate and Global Campaign for Climate Action.

One of the outstanding results of the conference was the drafting of a Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth, modeled on the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Both Declarations might be criticized for being unrealistic,⁸ but both have great normative value. They define the goals towards which we ought to be striving.

⁸<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2012/12/human-rights-a-letter-to-santa-claus/>

Proposed Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth⁹

Preamble

We, the peoples and nations of Earth:

- *considering that we are all part of Mother Earth, an indivisible, living community of interrelated and interdependent beings with a common destiny;*
- *gratefully acknowledging that Mother Earth is the source of life, nourishment and learning and provides everything we need to live well;*
- *recognizing that the capitalist system and all forms of depredation, exploitation, abuse and contamination have caused great destruction, degradation and disruption of Mother Earth, putting life as we know it today at risk through phenomena such as climate change;*
- *convinced that in an interdependent living community it is not possible to recognize the rights of only human beings without causing an imbalance within Mother Earth;*
- *affirming that to guarantee human rights it is necessary to recognize and defend the rights of Mother Earth and all beings in her and that there are existing cultures, practices and laws that do so;*
- *conscious of the urgency of taking decisive, collective action to transform structures and systems that cause climate change and other threats to Mother Earth;*
- *proclaim this Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth, and call on the General Assembly of the United Nation to adopt it, as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations of the world, and to the end that every individual and institution takes responsibility for promoting through teaching, education, and consciousness raising, respect for the rights recognized in this Declaration and ensure through prompt and progressive measures and mechanisms, national and international, their universal and effective recognition and observance among all peoples and States in the world.*

Article 1: Mother Earth

1. *Mother Earth is a living being.*
2. *Mother Earth is a unique, indivisible, self-regulating community of interrelated beings that sustains, contains and reproduces all beings.*
3. *Each being is defined by its relationships as an integral part of Mother Earth.*

⁹<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/apr/10/bolivia-enshrines-natural-worlds-rights>
<https://pwccc.wordpress.com>

4. *The inherent rights of Mother Earth are inalienable in that they arise from the same source as existence.*
5. *Mother Earth and all beings are entitled to all the inherent rights recognized in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as may be made between organic and inorganic beings, species, origin, use to human beings, or any other status.*
6. *Just as human beings have human rights, all other beings also have rights which are specific to their species or kind and appropriate for their role and function within the communities within which they exist.*
7. *The rights of each being are limited by the rights of other beings and any conflict between their rights must be resolved in a way that maintains the integrity, balance and health of Mother Earth.*

Article 2. Inherent Rights of Mother Earth

1. *Mother Earth and all beings of which she is composed have the following inherent rights:*
 - (a) *the right to life and to exist;*
 - (b) *the right to be respected;*
 - (c) *the right to regenerate its bio-capacity and to continue its vital cycles and processes free from human disruptions;*
 - (d) *the right to maintain its identity and integrity as a distinct, self-regulating and interrelated being;*
 - (e) *the right to water as a source of life;*
 - (f) *the right to clean air;*
 - (g) *the right to integral health;*
 - (h) *the right to be free from contamination, pollution and toxic or radioactive waste;*
 - (i) *the right to not have its genetic structure modified or disrupted in a manner that threatens its integrity or vital and healthy functioning;*
 - (j) *the right to full and prompt restoration the violation of the rights recognized in this Declaration caused by human activities;*
2. *Each being has the right to a place and to play its role in Mother Earth for her harmonious functioning.*
3. *Every being has the right to wellbeing and to live free from torture or cruel treatment by human beings.*



Figure 6.23: **The earth is our mother.**

Article 3. Obligations of human beings to Mother Earth

1. *Every human being is responsible for respecting and living in harmony with Mother Earth.*
2. *Human beings, and all States guarantee peace and eliminate nuclear, chemical and biological weapons;*
 - (a) *act in accordance with the rights and obligations recognized in this Declaration;*
 - (b) *recognize and promote the full implementation and enforcement of the rights and obligations recognized in this Declaration;*
 - (c) *promote and participate in learning, analysis, interpretation and communication about how to live in harmony with Mother Earth in accordance with this Declaration;*
 - (d) *ensure that the pursuit of human wellbeing contributes to the wellbeing of Mother Earth, now and in the future;*
 - (e) *establish and apply effective norms and laws for the defense, protection and conservation of the rights of Mother Earth;*
 - (f) *respect, protect, conserve and where necessary, restore the integrity, of the vital ecological cycles, processes and balances of Mother Earth;*
 - (g) *guarantee that the damages caused by human violations of the inherent rights recognized in this Declaration are rectified and that those responsible are held accountable for restoring the integrity and health of Mother Earth;*
 - (h) *empower human beings and institutions to defend the rights of Mother Earth and of all beings;*
 - (i) *establish precautionary and restrictive measures to prevent human activities from causing species extinction, the destruction of ecosystems or the disruption of ecological cycles;*
 - (j) *guarantee peace and eliminate nuclear, chemical and biological weapons;*
 - (k) *promote and support practices of respect for Mother Earth and all beings, in accordance with their own cultures, traditions and customs;*
 - (l) *promote economic systems that are in harmony with Mother Earth and in accordance with the rights recognized in this Declaration.*

Article 4: Definitions

1. *The term “being” includes ecosystems, natural communities, species and all other natural entities which exist as part of Mother Earth.*
2. *Nothing in this Declaration restricts the recognition of other inherent rights of all beings or specified beings.*



Figure 6.24: Love and respect Mother Earth.



Figure 6.25: We need reverence for all life, and even reverence for inanimate nature. We need respect and love for Mother Earth. She will return out love.

Suggestions for further reading

1. Rachel L. Carson *Under the Sea-Wind* Oxford University Press, 1952
2. Rachel L. Carson *The Sea Around Us* Oxford University Press, 1953
3. Rachel Carson *The Edge of the Sea* Houghton Mifflin, 1955
4. Rachel Carson *Silent Spring* Houghton Mifflin, 1962
5. Linda Lear *Rachel Carson: The Life of the Author of Silent Spring* Penguin Group, 1997
6. William Souder *On a Farther Shore: The Life and Legacy of Rachel Carson* Crown Publishers, 2012
7. C.H. Wood and David L. Skole, *Linking satellite, census, and survey data to study deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon*, in **People and Pixels**, ed. D. Liverman et al. (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 1998).
8. Suzi Kerr, Alexander S. Pfaff, and Arturo Sanchez, *Development and Deforestation: Evidence From Costa Rica* (unpublished paper, 2003).
9. Frederick A.B. Meyerson, *Population, Biodiversity and Changing Climate*, *Advances in Applied Biodiversity Science* **4** (2003), Chapter 11 (2003): 83-90
10. Andrew D. Foster and Mark R. Rosenzweig, *Economic Growth and the Rise of Forests*,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (May 2003): 601-637.
11. A. Balmford et al., *Conservation Conflicts Across Africa*, *Science* **291** (2001): 2616-19.
12. Richard P. Cincotta, Jennifer Wisniewski, and Robert Engelman, *Human Population in the Biodiversity Hotspots*, *Nature* **404** (2000): 990-92.
13. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010*. Rome: FAO.
14. World Bank. 2004. *Sustaining Forests: A Development Strategy*. Washington DC: World Bank.
15. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2006. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2005: Progress Towards Sustainable Forest Management*. Rome: FAO.
16. United Nations Population Division. 2009. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision*. New York: UN Population Division.
17. Pan, W, D Carr, A Barbierri, R Bilsborrow and C Suchindran. 2007. *Forest Clearing in the Ecuadorian Amazon: A Study of Patterns Over Space and Time*. *Population Research and Policy Review* **26**:635-659.
18. Geist, H J and E F Lambin. 2002. *Proximate Causes and Underlying Driving Forces of Tropical Deforestation*. *Bioscience* **52(2)**: 143-150.
19. Rosero-Bixby, L and A Palloni. 1996. *Population and Deforestation in Costa Rica*. CDE Working Paper No. 96-19. Madison: 1996.
20. Carr, D, L Sutter and A Barbieri. 2006. *Population Dynamics and Tropical Deforestation: State of the Debate and Conceptual Challenges*. *Population and Environment* **27**:89-113.

21. Barreto, P, C Souza, R Nogueron, A Anderson, R Salamao and J Wiles. 2006. *Human Pressure on the Brazilian Amazon Forests*. Washington DC: World Resources Institute (WRI).
22. Ramankutty, N, JA Foley and NJ Olejniczak. 2002. *People on the Land: Changes in Global Population and Croplands during the 20th Century*. *Ambio* **31(3)**: 251-257.
23. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2008. *Forests and Energy: Key Issues*. Rome: FAO.
24. P. Dasgupta, *Population, Resources and Poverty*, *Ambio*, **21**, 95-101, (1992).
25. L.R. Brown, *Who Will Feed China?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
26. L.R. Brown, et al., *Saving the Planet. How to Shape and Environmentally Sustainable Global Economy*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
27. L.R. Brown, *Postmodern Malthus: Are There Too Many of Us to Survive?*, *The Washington Post*, July 18, (1993).
28. L.R. Brown and H. Kane, *Full House. Reassessing the Earth's Population Carrying Capacity*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
29. L.R. Brown, *Seeds of Change*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1970).
30. L.R. Brown, *The Worldwide Loss of Cropland*, Worldwatch Paper 24, Worldwatch Institute, Washington, D.C., (1978).
31. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *Our Demographically Divided World*, Worldwatch Paper 74, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1986).
32. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *The Future of Urbanization: Facing the Ecological and Economic Constraints*, Worldwatch Paper 77, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
33. L.R. Brown, and others, *State of the World*, W.W. Norton, New York, (published annually).
34. H. Brown, *The Human Future Revisited. The World Predicament and Possible Solutions*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
35. H. Hanson, N.E. Borlaug and N.E. Anderson, *Wheat in the Third World*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1982).
36. A. Dil, ed., *Norman Borlaug and World Hunger*, Bookservice International, San Diego/Islamabad/Lahore, (1997).
37. N.E. Borlaug, *The Green Revolution Revisited and the Road Ahead*, Norwegian Nobel Institute, Oslo, Norway, (2000).
38. N.E. Borlaug, *Ending World Hunger. The Promise of Biotechnology and the Threat of Antiscience Zealotry*, *Plant Physiology*, **124**, 487-490, (2000).
39. M. Giampietro and D. Pimental, *The Tightening Conflict: Population, Energy Use and the Ecology of Agriculture*, in *Negative Population Forum*, L. Grant ed., Negative Population Growth, Inc., Teaneck, N.J., (1993).
40. H.W. Kendall and D. Pimental, *Constraints on the Expansion of the Global Food Supply*, *Ambio*, **23**, 198-2005, (1994).
41. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).

42. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, Science, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
43. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, Population and Environment, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
44. D. Pimental and M. Pimental, *Food Energy and Society*, University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado, (1996).
45. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, Science, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
46. RS and NAS, *The Royal Society and the National Academy of Sciences on Population Growth and Sustainability*, Population and Development Review, **18**, 375-378, (1992).
47. A.M. Altieri, *Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1995).
48. G. Conway, *The Doubly Green Revolution*, Cornell University Press, (1997).
49. J. Dreze and A. Sen, *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford University Press, (1991).
50. G. Bridger, and M. de Soissons, *Famine in Retreat?*, Dent, London, (1970).
51. W. Brandt, *World Armament and World Hunger: A Call for Action*, Victor Gollanz Ltd., London, (1982).
52. A.K.M.A. Chowdhury and L.C. Chen, *The Dynamics of Contemporary Famine*, Ford Foundation, Dacca, Pakistan, (1977)
53. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
54. M.E. Clark, *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1989).
55. J.-C. Chesnais, *The Demographic Transition*, Oxford, (1992).
56. C.M. Cipola, *The Economic History of World Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1974).
57. E. Draper, *Birth Control in the Modern World*, Penguin Books, Ltd., (1972).
58. Draper Fund Report No. 15, *Towards Smaller Families: The Crucial Role of the Private Sector*, Population Crisis Committee, 1120 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (1986).
59. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
60. E. Havemann, *Birth Control*, Time-Life Books, (1967).
61. J. Jacobsen, *Promoting Population Stabilization: Incentives for Small Families*, Worldwatch Paper 54, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1983).
62. N. Keyfitz, *Applied Mathematical Demography*, Wiley, New York, (1977).
63. W. Latz (ed.), *Future Demographic Trends*, Academic Press, New York, (1979).
64. World Bank, *Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, Washington D.C., (1986).
65. J.E. Cohen, *How Many People Can the Earth Support?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
66. J. Amos, *Climate Food Crisis to Deepen*, BBC News (5 September, 2005).

67. J. Vidal and T. Ratford, *One in Six Countries Facing Food Shortage*, The Guardian, (30 June, 2005).
68. J. Mann, *Biting the Environment that Feeds Us*, The Washington Post, July 29, 1994.
69. G.R. Lucas, Jr., and T.W. Ogletree, (editors), *Lifeboat Ethics. The Moral Dilemmas of World Hunger*, Harper and Row, New York.
70. J.L. Jacobson, *Gender Bias: Roadblock to Sustainable Development*, Worldwatch Paper 110, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
71. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
72. M. ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain: Choices for the Third World*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1976).
73. H. Le Bras, *La Planète au Village*, Datar, Paris, (1993).
74. E. Mayr, *Population, Species and Evolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, (1970).
75. D.C. Pirages and P.R. Ehrlich, *Ark II: Social Responses to Environmental Imperatives*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1974).
76. Population Reference Bureau, *World Population Data Sheet*, PRM, 777 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington D.C. 20007, (published annually).
77. R. Pressat, *Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1970).
78. M. Rechigl (ed.), *Man/Food Equation*, Academic Press, New York, (1975).
79. J.C. Ryan, *Life Support: Conserving Biological Diversity*, Worldwatch Paper 108, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
80. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
81. P.B. Smith, J.D. Schilling and A.P. Haines, *Introduction and Summary*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
82. B. Stokes, *Local Responses to Global Problems: A Key to Meeting Basic Human Needs*, Worldwatch Paper 17, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1978).
83. L. Timberlake, *Only One Earth: Living for the Future*, BBC/ Earthscan, London, (1987).
84. UNEP, *Environmental Data Report*, Blackwell, Oxford, (published annually).
85. UNESCO, *International Coordinating Council of Man and the Biosphere*, MAB Report Series No. 58, Paris, (1985).
86. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *A Bibliography of United Nations Publications on Population*, United Nations, New York, (1977).
87. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *The State of World Population*, UNPF, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, 10017, (published annually).
88. United Nations Secretariat, *World Population Prospects Beyond the Year 2000*, U.N., New York, (1973).
89. J. van Klinken, *Het Dierde Punte*, Uitgiversmaatschappij J.H. Kok-Kampen, Netherlands (1989).
90. P.M. Vitousek, P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and P.A. Matson, *Human Appropriation of the Products of Photosynthesis*, *Bioscience*, 34, 368-373, (1986).

91. B. Ward and R. Dubos, *Only One Earth*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1973).
92. WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF, *The Reproductive Health of Adolescents: A Strategy for Action*, World Health Organization, Geneva, (1989).
93. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press, (1975).
94. E.O. Wilson (ed.), *Biodiversity*, National Academy Press, Washington D.C., (1988).
95. E.O. Wilson, *The Diversity of Life*, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, London, (1992).
96. G. Woodwell (ed.), *The Earth in Transition: Patterns and Processes of Biotic Impoverishment*, Cambridge University Press, (1990).
97. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
98. World Bank, *Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, Washington D.C., (1986).
99. World Resources Institute (WRI), *Global Biodiversity Strategy*, The World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), (1992).
100. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
101. J.E. Cohen, *How Many People Can the Earth Support?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
102. D.W. Pearce and R.K. Turner, *Economics of Natural Resources and the Environment*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1990).
103. P. Bartelmus, *Environment, Growth and Development: The Concepts and Strategies of Sustainability*, Routledge, New York, (1994).
104. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, Population and Environment, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
105. D. Pimentel and M. Pimentel, *Food Energy and Society*, University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado, (1996).
106. H. Brown, *The Human Future Revisited. The World Predicament and Possible Solutions*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
107. W. Jackson, *Man and the Environment*, Wm. C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, (1971).
108. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), *The Global Forest Assessment 2000* (Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization, Committee on Forestry, 2000).
109. Thomas K. Rudel, Kevin Flesher, Diana Bates, Sandra Baptista, and Peter Holmgren, *Tropical Deforestation Literature: Geographical and Historical Patterns*, *Unasylva* **203**, Vol. 51 (2000): 11-18;
110. Alexander S. Pfaff, *What drives deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon?* *Journal of Economics and Management* **37** (1999): 26-43.
111. Phillip M. Fearnside, *Human Carrying Capacity Estimation in Brazilian Amazonia as the Basis for Sustainable Development*, *Environmental Conservation* **24** (1997): 271-82;
112. Frederick A.B. Meyerson, *Human Population Density, Deforestation and Protected Areas Management: A Multi-scale Analysis of Central America, Guatemala,*

113. The Maya Biosphere Reserve, *Proceedings of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population*, XXIV General Population Conference (Salvador, Brazil, 2001).
114. Millenium Ecosystem Assessment. 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being Biodiversity Synthesis*. Washington DC: World Resources Institute (WRI).
115. Sherbinin, A, D Carr, S Cassels and L Jiang. 2007. *Population and Environment*. The Annual Review of Environment and Resources **32**: 345-373.
116. Leahy, E, R Englelman, C Vogel, S Haddock and T Preston. 2007. *The Shape of Things to Come*. Washington, DC: PAI.
117. DeFries, R, T K Rudel, M Uriarte and M Hansen. 2010. *Deforestation Driven by Urban Population Growth and Agricultural Trade in the Twenty-First Century*. Nature Geoscience **3**: 178-181.
118. Lambin, E F and P Meyfroidt. 2011. *Global Land Use Change, Economic Globalization, and the Looming Land Scarcity*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **108**: 3465-3472.
119. United Nations Population Division. 2010. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2009 Revision*. New York: UN Population Division.
120. David Wasdell, *Arctic Dynamics*,
<http://www.envisionation.co.uk/index.php/videos/arctic-dynamics>
121. Wikipedia, *Climate change in the Arctic*,
122. World Bank, *Climate Change Report Warns of Dramatically Warmer World This Century*,
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/18/Climate-change-report-warns-dramatically-warmer-world-this-century>
123. Wikipedia, *Retreat of glaciers since 1850*,
124. Natural Resources Defense Council, *Climate Change, Water, and Risk: Current water demands are not sustainable*, <http://www.nrdc.org/globalwarming/watersustainability/files/Wat>
125. Wikipedia, *2011 East Africa drought*,
126. OXFAM *Working for the Few: Political capture and economic inequality*, <http://www.oxfam.org/en/rfew>
127. Winnie Byanyima, *Inequality Is Not Inevitable: It's Time to Even It Up!*, Common Dreams <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/10/30/inequality-not-inevitable-its-time-even-it>
128. Abarbanel A, McClusky T (1950) *Is the world getting warmer?* Saturday Evening Post, 1 Jul, p22
129. Bagdikian BH (2004) *The New Media Monopoly*. Boston, MA, USA: Beacon
130. Bennett WL (2002) *News: The Politics of Illusion, 5th edition*. New York, NY, USA: Longman
131. Boykoff MT, Boykoff JM (2004) *Balance as bias: global warming and the US prestige press*. Glob Environ Change **14**: 125-136
132. Boykoff MT, Boykoff JM (2007) *Climate change and journalistic norms: A case study of U.S. mass-media coverage*. Geoforum (in press)

133. Carey JW (1989) *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. Boston, MA, USA: Unwin Hyman
134. Carvalho A (2005) *Representing the politics of the greenhouse effect: Discursive strategies in the British media*. *Critical Discourse Studies* **2**: 1-29
135. CEI (2006) *We Call it Life*. Washington, DC, USA: Competitive Enterprise Institute
136. Cowen RC (1957) *Are men changing the earth's weather?* *Christian Science Monitor*, 4 Dec, p13
137. Cushman JH (1998) *Industrial group plans to battle climate treaty*. *New York Times*, 26 Apr, p1
138. Doyle G (2002) *Media Ownership: The Economics and Politics of Convergence and Concentration in the UK and European Media*. London, UK: Sage Publications
139. Dunwoody S, Peters HP (1992) *Mass media coverage of technological and environmental risks: A survey of research in the United States and Germany*. *Public Underst Sci* **1**: 199-230
140. Entman RM (1993) *Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*. *J Commun* **43**: 51-58
141. Fleming JR (1998) *Historical Perspectives on Climate Change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
142. Gelbspan R (1998) *The Heat Is On*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Perseus Books
143. Grove RH (2003) *Green Imperialism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
144. Leggett J (2001) *The Carbon War*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge
145. McChesney RW (1999) *Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times*. Urbana, IL, USA: University of Illinois Press
146. McComas K, Shanahan J (1999) *Telling stories about global climate change: Measuring the impact of narratives on issue cycles*. *Communic Res* **26**: 30-57
147. McCright AM (2007) *Dealing with climate change contrarians*. In Moser SC, Dilling L (eds) *Creating a Climate for Change: Communicating Climate Change and Facilitating Social Change*, pp 200-212. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
148. McCright AM, Dunlap RE (2000) *Challenging global warming as a social problem: An analysis of the conservative movement's counter-claims*. *Soc Probl* **47**: 499-522
149. McCright AM, Dunlap RE (2003) *Defeating Kyoto: The conservative movement's impact on U.S. climate change policy*. *Soc Probl* **50**: 348-373
150. Mooney C (2004) *Blinded by science*. *Columbia Journalism Review* 6(Nov/Dec), www.cjr.org
151. NSF (2004) *Science and Engineering Indicators 2004*. Washington, DC, USA: National Science Foundation Project for Excellence in Journalism (2006) *The State of the News Media 2006*. Washington, DC, USA:
152. Project for Excellence in Journalism. www.stateofthenewsmedia.org Rajan SR (2006) *Modernizing Nature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
153. Sandell C, Blakemore B (2006) *ABC News reporting cited as evidence in congressional hearing on global warming*. *ABC News*, 27 Jul, <http://abcnews.go.com>
154. Shabecoff P (1988) *Global warming has begun, expert tells senate*. *New York Times*, 24 Jun, pA1

155. Shrader-Frechette KS (1993) *Burying Uncertainty*. Berkeley, CA, USA: University of California Press
156. Starr P (2004) *The Creation of the Media: Political Origins of Modern Communications*. New York, NY, USA: Basic Books
157. Ungar S (1992) *The rise and (relative) decline of global warming as a social problem*. *Sociol Q* **33**: 483-501
158. Weart SR (2003) *The Discovery of Global Warming*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press
159. Weingart P, Engels A, Pansegrau P (2000) *Risks of communication: Discourses on climate change in science, politics, and the mass media*. *Public Underst Sci* **9**: 261-283
160. Wilkins L (1993) *Between the facts and values: Print media coverage of the greenhouse effect, 1987-1990*. *Public Underst Sci* **2**: 71-84
161. Wilson KM (1995) *Mass media as sources of global warming knowledge*. *Mass Communication Review* **22**: 75-89
162. Wilson KM (2000) *Communicating climate change through the media: Predictions, politics, and perceptions of risks*. In Allan S, Adam B, Carter C (eds) *Environmental Risks and the Media*, pp 201-217. New York, NY, USA: Routledge
163. Zehr SC (2000) *Public representations of scientific uncertainty about global climate change*. *Public Underst Sci* **9**: 85-103
164. O.N. Larsen, ed., *Violence and the Mass Media*, Harper and Row, (1968).
165. R.M. Liebert et al., *The Early Window: The Effects of Television on Children and Youth*, Pergamon, Elmsford, NY, (1982).
166. G. Noble, *Children in Front of the Small Screen*, Constable, London, (1975).
167. H.J. Schneider, *Das Geschäft mit dem Verbrechen. Massenmedien und Kriminalität*, Kindler, Munich, (1980).
168. W. Schramm, ed., *Grundfragen der Kommunikationsforschung*, Munich, (1973).
169. J.L. Singer and D.G. Singer, *Television, Imagination and Aggression: A Study of Preschoolers*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NY, (1981).
170. O.N. Larsen, ed., *Violence and the Mass Media*, Harper and Row, (1968).
171. H.J. Skornia, *Television and Society*, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1965).
172. D.L. Bridgeman, ed., *The Nature of Prosocial Behavior*, New York, Academic Press, (1983).
173. N. Eisenberg, ed., *The Development of Prosocial Behavior*, New York, Academic Press, (1982).
174. W.H. Goodenough, *Cooperation and Change: An Anthropological Approach to Community Development*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, (1963).
175. J.R. Macauley and L. Berkowitz, *Altruism and Helping Behavior*, Academic Press, New York, (1970).
176. P. Mussen and N. Eisenberg, *Roots of Caring, Sharing and Helping*, Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
177. J.P. Rushton and R.M. Sorrentino, eds., *Altruism and Helping Behavior*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, (1981).

178. L. Wispé, ed, *Altruism, Sympathy and Helping*, Academic Press, New York, (1978).
179. J.-C. Guedon, *La Planète Cyber, Internet et Cyberspace*, Gallimard, (1996).
180. J. Segal, *Théorie de l'information: sciences, techniques et société, de la seconde guerre mondiale ' l'aube du XXI siècle*, Thèse de Doctorat, Université Lumière Lyon II, (1998), (<http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/staff/segal/thesis/>)
181. H. von Foerster, editor, *Cybernetics - circular, causal and feed-back mechanisms in biological and social systems*. Transactions of sixth- tenth conferences, Josiah J. Macy Jr. Foundation, New York, (1950- 1954).
182. G. Bateson, *Communication, the Social Matrix of Psychiatry*, Norton, (1951).
183. G. Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, Chandler, San Francisco, (1972).
184. G. Bateson, *Communication et Société*, Seuil, Paris, (1988).
185. R.M.. Liebert et al., *The Early Window: The Effects of Television on Children and Youth*, Pergamon, Elmsford, NY, (1982).
186. G. Noble, *Children in Front of the Small Screen*, Constable, London, (1975).
187. W. Schramm, ed., *Grundfragen der Kommunikationsforschung*, Munich, (1973).
188. J.L. Singer and D.G. Singer, *Television, Imagination and Aggression: A Study of Preschoolers*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NY, (1981).
189. P. Dasgupta, *Population, Resources and Poverty*, *Ambio*, **21**, 95-101, (1992).
190. L.R. Brown, *Who Will Feed China?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
191. L.R. Brown, et al., *Saving the Planet. How to Shape and Environmentally Sustainable Global Economy*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
192. L.R. Brown, *Postmodern Malthus: Are There Too Many of Us to Survive?*, *The Washington Post*, July 18, (1993).
193. L.R. Brown and H. Kane, *Full House. Reassessing the Earth's Population Carrying Capacity*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
194. L.R. Brown, *Seeds of Change*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1970).
195. L.R. Brown, *The Worldwide Loss of Cropland*, Worldwatch Paper 24, Worldwatch Institute, Washington, D.C., (1978).
196. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *Our Demographically Divided World*, Worldwatch Paper 74, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1986).
197. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *The Future of Urbanization: Facing the Ecological and Economic Constraints*, Worldwatch Paper 77, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
198. L.R. Brown, and others, *State of the World*, W.W. Norton, New York, (published annually).
199. H. Brown, *The Human Future Revisited. The World Predicament and Possible Solutions*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
200. H. Hanson, N.E. Borlaug and N.E. Anderson, *Wheat in the Third World*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1982).
201. A. Dil, ed., *Norman Borlaug and World Hunger*, Bookservice International, San Diego/Islamabad/Lahore, (1997).
202. N.E. Borlaug, *The Green Revolution Revisited and the Road Ahead*, Norwegian Nobel Institute, Oslo, Norway, (2000).

203. N.E. Borlaug, *Ending World Hunger. The Promise of Biotechnology and the Threat of Antiscience Zealotry*, *Plant Physiology*, **124**, 487-490, (2000).
204. M. Giampietro and D. Pimental, *The Tightening Conflict: Population, Energy Use and the Ecology of Agriculture*, in *Negative Population Forum*, L. Grant ed., Negative Population Growth, Inc., Teaneck, N.J., (1993).
205. H.W. Kendall and D. Pimental, *Constraints on the Expansion of the Global Food Supply*, *Ambio*, **23**, 198-2005, (1994).
206. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
207. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
208. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
209. D. Pimental and M. Pimental, *Food Energy and Society*, University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado, (1996).
210. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
211. RS and NAS, *The Royal Society and the National Academy of Sciences on Population Growth and Sustainability*, *Population and Development Review*, **18**, 375-378, (1992).
212. A.M. Altieri, *Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1995).
213. G. Conway, *The Doubly Green Revolution*, Cornell University Press, (1997).
214. J. Dreze and A. Sen, *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford University Press, (1991).
215. G. Bridger, and M. de Soissons, *Famine in Retreat?*, Dent, London, (1970).
216. W. Brandt, *World Armament and World Hunger: A Call for Action*, Victor Gollanz Ltd., London, (1982).
217. A.K.M.A. Chowdhury and L.C. Chen, *The Dynamics of Contemporary Famine*, Ford Foundation, Dacca, Pakistan, (1977)
218. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
219. M.E. Clark, *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1989).
220. J.-C. Chesnais, *The Demographic Transition*, Oxford, (1992).
221. C.M. Cipola, *The Economic History of World Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1974).
222. E. Draper, *Birth Control in the Modern World*, Penguin Books, Ltd., (1972).
223. Draper Fund Report No. 15, *Towards Smaller Families: The Crucial Role of the Private Sector*, Population Crisis Committee, 1120 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (1986).
224. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
225. E. Havemann, *Birth Control*, Time-Life Books, (1967).

226. J. Jacobsen, *Promoting Population Stabilization: Incentives for Small Families*, Worldwatch Paper 54, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1983).
227. N. Keyfitz, *Applied Mathematical Demography*, Wiley, New York, (1977).
228. W. Latz (ed.), *Future Demographic Trends*, Academic Press, New York, (1979).
229. World Bank, *Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, Washington D.C., (1986).
230. J.E. Cohen, *How Many People Can the Earth Support?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
231. J. Amos, *Climate Food Crisis to Deepen*, BBC News (5 September, 2005).
232. J. Vidal and T. Ratford, *One in Six Countries Facing Food Shortage*, The Guardian, (30 June, 2005).
233. J. Mann, *Biting the Environment that Feeds Us*, The Washington Post, July 29, 1994.
234. G.R. Lucas, Jr., and T.W. Ogletree, (editors), *Lifeboat Ethics. The Moral Dilemmas of World Hunger*, Harper and Row, New York.
235. J.L. Jacobson, *Gender Bias: Roadblock to Sustainable Development*, Worldwatch Paper 110, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
236. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
237. M. ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain: Choices for the Third World*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1976).
238. H. Le Bras, *La Planète au Village*, Datar, Paris, (1993).
239. E. Mayr, *Population, Species and Evolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, (1970).
240. Patz, J. A., Campbell-Lendrum, D., Holloway, T. and Foley, J. A. *Impact of regional climate change on human health*. *Nature* **438**, 310-317 (2005).
241. Basu, R. and Samet, J. M. *Relation between elevated ambient temperature and mortality: a review of the epidemiologic evidence*. *Epidemiol. Rev.* **24**, 190-202 (2002).
242. Kovats, R. S. and Hajat, S. *Heat stress and public health: a critical review*. *Annu. Rev. Publ. Health* **29**, 41-55 (2008).
243. Leon, L. R. *Pathophysiology of Heat Stroke* **Vol. 7** (Colloquium Series on Integrated Systems Physiology: From Molecule to Function to Disease, Morgan Claypool Life Sciences, 2015).
244. Ostro, B. D., Roth, L. A., Green, R. S. and Basu, R. *Estimating the mortality effect of the July 2006 California a heat wave*. *Environ. Res.* **109**, 614-619 (2009).
245. Glas er, J. et al. *Climate change and the emergent epidemic of CKD from heat stress in rural communities: the case for heat stress nephropathy*. *Clin. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **11**, 1472-1483 (2016).
246. Robine, J.-M. et al. *Death toll exceeded 70,000 in Europe during the summer of 2003*. *C. R. Biol.* **331**, 171-178 (2008).
247. Sillmann, J. and Roeckner, E. *Indices for extreme events in projections of anthropogenic climate change*. *Climatic Change* **86**, 83-104 (2008).
248. Meehl, G. A. and Tebaldi, C. *More intense, more frequent, and longer lasting heat waves in the 21st century*. *Science* **305**, 994-997 (2004).

249. Orłowsky, B. and Seneviratne, S. *Global changes in extreme events: regional and seasonal dimension*. Climatic Change **110**, 669-696 (2012).
250. Tebaldi, C., Hayhoe, K., Arblaster, J. M. and Meehl, G. A. *Going to the extremes*. Climatic Change **79**, 185-211 (2006).
251. Tebaldi, C. and Wehner, M. F. *Benefits of mitigation for future heat extremes under RCP4.5 compared to RCP8.5*. Climatic Change <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-016-1605-5> (2016).
252. Sterl, A. et al. *When can we expect extremely high surface temperatures?* Geophys. Res. Lett. **35**, L14703 (2008).
253. Huang, C. et al. *Projecting future heat-related mortality under climate change scenarios: a systematic review*. Environ. Health Persp. **119**, 1681-1690 (2011).
254. Guo, Y. et al. *Global variation in the effects of ambient temperature on mortality: a systematic evaluation*. J. Epidemiol. **25**, 781-789 (2014).
255. Luber, G. and McGeehin, M. *Climate change and extreme heat events*. Am. J. Prev. Med. **35**, 429-435 (2008).
256. Bouchama, A. and Knochel, J. P. *Heat stroke*. New. Engl. J. Med. **346**, 1978-1988 (2002).
257. Bobb, J. F., Peng, R. D., Bell, M. L. and Dominici, F. *Heat-related mortality and adaptation to heat in the United States*. Environ. Health Persp. **122**, 811-816 (2014).
258. Gasparrini, A. et al. *Temporal variation in heat-mortality associations: a multi-country study*. Environ. Health Persp. **123**, 1200-1207 (2015).
259. Lowe, D., Ebi, K. L. and Forsberg, B. *Heatwave early warning systems and adaptation advice to reduce human health consequences of heatwaves*. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health **8**, 4623-4648 (2011).
260. Hanna, E. G. and Tait, P. W. *Limitations to thermoregulation and acclimatization challenge human adaptation to global warming*. Int. J. Environ. Res. Publ. Health. **12**, 8034-8074 (2015).
261. Sherwood, S. C. and Huber, M. *An adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress*. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA **107**, 9552-9555 (2010).
262. Whitman, S. et al. *Mortality in Chicago attributed to the July 1995 heat wave*. Am. J. Public Health **87**, 1515-1518 (1997).
263. Dousset, B. et al. *Satellite monitoring of summer heat waves in the Paris metropolitan area*. Int. J. Climatol. **31**, 313-323 (2011).
264. Shaposhnikov, D. et al. *Mortality related to air pollution with the Moscow heat wave and wildfire of 2010*. Epidemiology **25**, 359-364 (2014).
265. Barnett, A. G., Tong, S. and Clements, A. *What measure of temperature is the best predictor of mortality?* Environ. Res. **110**, 604-611 (2010).
266. Willett, K. M. and Sherwood, S. *Exceedance of heat index thresholds for 15 regions under a warming climate using the wet-bulb globe temperature*. Int. J. Climatol. **32**, 161-177 (2012).
267. Argüeso, D., Di Luca, A., Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S. and Evans, J. P. *Seasonal mean temperature changes control future heatwaves*. Geophys. Res. Lett. **43**, 7653-7660 (2016).

268. Jones, B. and O'Neill, B. *Spatially explicit global population scenarios consistent with the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways*. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11**, 084003 (2016).
269. Diffenbaugh, N. S. and Field, C. B. *Changes in ecologically critical terrestrial climate conditions*. *Science* **341**, 486-492 (2013).
270. Mitchell, D. et al. *Attributing human mortality during extreme heat waves to anthropogenic climate change*. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11**, 074006 (2016).
271. P. Dasgupta, *Population, Resources and Poverty*, *Ambio*, **21**, 95-101, (1992).
272. L.R. Brown, *Who Will Feed China?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
273. L.R. Brown, et al., *Saving the Planet. How to Shape and Environmentally Sustainable Global Economy*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
274. L.R. Brown, *Postmodern Malthus: Are There Too Many of Us to Survive?*, *The Washington Post*, July 18, (1993).
275. L.R. Brown and H. Kane, *Full House. Reassessing the Earth's Population Carrying Capacity*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1991).
276. L.R. Brown, *Seeds of Change*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1970).
277. L.R. Brown, *The Worldwide Loss of Cropland*, Worldwatch Paper 24, Worldwatch Institute, Washington, D.C., (1978).
278. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *Our Demographically Divided World*, Worldwatch Paper 74, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1986).
279. L.R. Brown, and J.L. Jacobson, *The Future of Urbanization: Facing the Ecological and Economic Constraints*, Worldwatch Paper 77, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1987).
280. L.R. Brown, and others, *State of the World*, W.W. Norton, New York, (published annually).
281. H. Brown, *The Human Future Revisited. The World Predicament and Possible Solutions*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
282. H. Hanson, N.E. Borlaug and N.E. Anderson, *Wheat in the Third World*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1982).
283. A. Dil, ed., *Norman Borlaug and World Hunger*, Bookservice International, San Diego/Islamabad/Lahore, (1997).
284. N.E. Borlaug, *The Green Revolution Revisited and the Road Ahead*, Norwegian Nobel Institute, Oslo, Norway, (2000).
285. N.E. Borlaug, *Ending World Hunger. The Promise of Biotechnology and the Threat of Antiscience Zealotry*, *Plant Physiology*, **124**, 487-490, (2000).
286. M. Giampietro and D. Pimental, *The Tightening Conflict: Population, Energy Use and the Ecology of Agriculture*, in **Negative Population Forum**, L. Grant ed., Negative Population Growth, Inc., Teaneck, N.J., (1993).
287. H.W. Kendall and D. Pimental, *Constraints on the Expansion of the Global Food Supply*, *Ambio*, **23**, 198-2005, (1994).
288. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
289. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).

290. D. Pimental et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, Population and Environment, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
291. D. Pimental and M. Pimental, *Food Energy and Society*, University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado, (1996).
292. D. Pimental et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, Science, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
293. RS and NAS, *The Royal Society and the National Academy of Sciences on Population Growth and Sustainability*, Population and Development Review, **18**, 375-378, (1992).
294. A.M. Altieri, *Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1995).
295. G. Conway, *The Doubly Green Revolution*, Cornell University Press, (1997).
296. J. Dreze and A. Sen, *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford University Press, (1991).
297. G. Bridger, and M. de Soissons, *Famine in Retreat?*, Dent, London, (1970).
298. W. Brandt, *World Armament and World Hunger: A Call for Action*, Victor Gollanz Ltd., London, (1982).
299. A.K.M.A. Chowdhury and L.C. Chen, *The Dynamics of Contemporary Famine*, Ford Foundation, Dacca, Pakistan, (1977).
300. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
301. M.E. Clark, *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1989).
302. C.M. Cipola, *The Economic History of World Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1974).
303. E. Draper, *Birth Control in the Modern World*, Penguin Books, Ltd., (1972).
304. Draper Fund Report No. 15, *Towards Smaller Families: The Crucial Role of the Private Sector*, Population Crisis Committee, 1120 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (1986).
305. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
306. E. Havemann, *Birth Control*, Time-Life Books, (1967).
307. J. Jacobsen, *Promoting Population Stabilization: Incentives for Small Families*, Worldwatch Paper 54, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1983).
308. N. Keyfitz, *Applied Mathematical Demography*, Wiley, New York, (1977).
309. W. Latz (ed.), *Future Demographic Trends*, Academic Press, New York, (1979).
310. World Bank, *Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, Washington D.C., (1986).
311. J.E. Cohen, *How Many People Can the Earth Support?*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1995).
312. J. Amos, *Climate Food Crisis to Deepen*, BBC News (5 September, 2005).
313. J. Vidal and T. Ratford, *One in Six Countries Facing Food Shortage*, The Guardian, (30 June, 2005).
314. J. Mann, *Biting the Environment that Feeds Us*, The Washington Post, July 29, 1994.

315. G.R. Lucas, Jr., and T.W. Ogletree, (editors), *Lifeboat Ethics. The Moral Dilemmas of World Hunger*, Harper and Row, New York.
316. J.L. Jacobson, *Gender Bias: Roadblock to Sustainable Development*, Worldwatch Paper 110, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
317. J. Gever, R. Kaufmann, D. Skole and C. Vorosmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Ballinger, Cambridge MA, (1986).
318. M. ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain: Choices for the Third World*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1976).
319. H. Le Bras, *La Planète au Village*, Datar, Paris, (1993).
320. E. Mayr, *Population, Species and Evolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, (1970).
321. N.E. Borlaug, *Ending World Hunger. The Promise of Biotechnology and the Threat of Antiscience Zealotry*, *Plant Physiology*, **124**, 487-490, (2000).
322. M. Giampietro and D. Pimentel, *The Tightening Conflict: Population, Energy Use and the Ecology of Agriculture*, in *Negative Population Forum*, L. Grant ed., Negative Population Growth, Inc., Teaneck, N.J., (1993).
323. H.W. Kendall and D. Pimentel, *Constraints on the Expansion of the Global Food Supply*, *Ambio*, **23**, 198-2005, (1994).
324. D. Pimentel et al., *Natural Resources and Optimum Human Population*, *Population and Environment*, **15**, 347-369, (1994).
325. D. Pimentel et al., *Environmental and Economic Costs of Soil Erosion and Conservation Benefits*, *Science*, **267**, 1117-1123, (1995).
326. RS and NAS, *The Royal Society and the National Academy of Sciences on Population Growth and Sustainability*, *Population and Development Review*, **18**, 375-378, (1992).
327. A.M. Altieri, *Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1995).
328. J. Dreze and A. Sen, *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford University Press, (1991).
329. B. Commoner, *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*, Bantam Books, New York, (1972).
330. Council on Environmental Quality and U.S. Department of State, *Global 2000 Report to the President: Entering the Twenty-First Century*, Technical Report, Volume 2, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., (1980).
331. A.B. Durning, *Action at the Grassroots: Fighting Poverty and Environmental Decline*, Worldwatch Paper , Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1989).
332. P. Donaldson, *Worlds Apart: The Economic Gulf Between Nations*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1973).
333. J.C.I. Dooge et al. (editors), *Agenda of Science for Environment and Development into the 21st Century*, Cambridge University Press, (1993).
334. E. Draper, *Birth Control in the Modern World*, Penguin Books, Ltd., (1972).
335. Draper Fund Report No. 15, *Towards Smaller Families: The Crucial Role of the Private Sector*, Population Crisis Committee, 1120 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (1986).

336. Economic Commission for Europe, *Air Pollution Across Boundaries*, United Nations, New York, (1985).
337. A.H. Ehrlich and U. Lele, *Humankind at the Crossroads: Building a Sustainable Food System*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
338. P.R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, Sierra/Ballentine, New York, (1972).
339. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Human Ecology*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1972).
340. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
341. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Extinction*, Victor Gollancz, London, (1982).
342. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Healing the Planet*, Addison Wesley, Reading MA, (1991).
343. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *The Population Explosion*, Arrow Books, (1991).
344. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of War and Peace*, Thames and Hudson, New York, (1979).
345. Food and Agricultural Organization, *The State of Food and Agriculture*, United Nations, Rome, (published annually).
346. K. Griffin, *Land Concentration and Rural Poverty*, Holmes and Meyer, New York, (1976).
347. G. Hagman and others, *Prevention is Better Than Cure*, Report on Human Environmental Disasters in the Third World, Swedish Red Cross, Stockholm, Stockholm, (1986).
348. M. ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain: Choices for the Third World*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1976).
349. E. Mayr, *Population, Species and Evolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, (1970).
350. N. Myers, *The Sinking Ark*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).
351. N. Myers, *Conservation of Tropical Moist Forests*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C., (1980).
352. K. Newland, *Infant Mortality and the Health of Societies*, Worldwatch Paper 47, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1981).
353. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
354. D.W. Orr, *Ecological Literacy*, State University of New York Press, Albany, (1992).
355. A. Peccei, *The Human Quality*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, (1977).
356. A. Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1977).
357. A. Peccei and D. Ikeda, *Before it is Too Late*, Kodansha International, Tokyo, (1984).
358. E. Pestel, *Beyond the Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York, (1989).
359. Bonan, G. B. (2008). *Forests and climate change: Forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits of forests*. *Science*. **320** (5882): 1444-1449.
360. Scheil, D.; Murdiyarso, D. (2009). *How Forests Attract Rain: An Examination of a New Hypothesis*. *BioScience*. **59** (4): 341-347.

361. Ahmad, Y.J. and M. Kassas. 1987. *Desertification: Financial Support for the Biosphere*. West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.
362. Barrow, C. J. 1991. *Land Degradation - Developments and Breakdown of Terrestrial Environments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
363. Gadgil, M. 1989. *Deforestation: Problems and prospects*. Foundation Day Lecture, Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development, 12 May, New Delhi. Centre of Ecological Sciences and Theoretical Studies, Indian Institute of Science Bangalore.
364. Government of India. 1987. *State of Forest Report 1987*. Forest Survey of India, Dehradun.
365. Government of India. 1991. *State of Forest Report, 1987-1989*. Forest Survey of India, Dehradun.
366. Kassas, M. 1987. *Drought and desertification*. *Land Use Policy* **4**(4): 389-400.
367. Kemp, D. D. 1990. *Global Environmental Issues - A Climatological Approach*. London: Routledge.
368. Maheshwari, J. K. 1989. *Processing and Utilization of Perennial Vegetation in the Arid Zone of India* in **Role of Forestry in Combatting Desertification**. Rome: FAO Conservation Guide 21, pp. 137-172.
369. Reining, P. 1978. *Handbook on Desertification Indicators*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
370. Tolba, M. K. 1987. *Sustainable Development: Constraints and Opportunities* London: Butterworth.
371. Tolba, M. K., O. A. El-Kholy, et al. 1992. *The World Environment 1972-1992. Two Decades of Challenge*. London: Chapman and Hall.
372. Tucker, C. J., H. E. Dregne, and W. W. Newcomb. 1991. *Expansion and contraction of Sahara Desert from 1980-1990*. *Science* **253**.
373. UNCED (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development). 1992. *Agenda 21*. United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Brazil, June 3-14,1992. Brazil: UNCED.
374. UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 1984. *General Assessment of Progress in the Implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, 1978-1984*. GC-12/9.
375. UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 1991. *Status of Desertification and Implementation of the United Nations Plan of Action to Control Desertification*. Nairobi: UNEP.
376. Winpenny, J. T. (ed.). 1990. *Development Research: The Environmental Challenge*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, for the ODI.
377. Wood, W. B. 1990. *Tropical Deforestation. Balancing Regional Development Demands and Global Environmental Concerns*.
378. World Bank. 1992. *World Development Report 1992*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 7

WE NEED A NEW ECONOMIC SYSTEM

7.1 Introduction: The need for reform

The Industrial Revolution marked the start of massive human use of fossil fuels. The stored energy from several hundred million years of plant growth began to be used at roughly a million times the rate at which it had been formed. The effect on human society was like that of a narcotic. There was a euphoric (and totally unsustainable) surge of growth of both population and industrial production. Meanwhile, the carbon released into the atmosphere from the burning of fossil fuels began to duplicate the conditions which led to the 5 geologically-observed mass extinctions, during each of which more than half of all living species disappeared forever.

Economists (with a few notable exceptions, such as Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, Herman Daly and Aurelio Peccei) have long behaved as though growth were synonymous with economic health. If the gross national product of a country increases steadily by 4% per year, most economists express approval and say that the economy is healthy. If the economy could be made to grow still faster (they maintain), it would be still more healthy. If the growth rate should fall, economic illness would be diagnosed.

However, it is obvious that on a finite Earth, neither population growth nor economic growth can continue indefinitely. A 4% rate of growth corresponds to an increase by a factor of 50 every century. No one can maintain that this is sustainable in the long run except by refusing to look more than a short distance into the future.

Of course, it is necessary to distinguish between industrial growth, and growth of culture and knowledge, which can and should continue to grow. Qualitative improvements in human society are possible and desirable, but resource-using and pollution-producing industrial growth is reaching its limits, both because of ecological constraints and because of the exhaustion of petroleum, natural gas and other non-renewable resources, such as metals. The threat of catastrophic climate change makes it imperative for us to stop using fossil fuels within very few decades.

Today, as economic growth falters, the defects and injustices of our banking system have come sharply into focus, and light has also been thrown onto the much-too-cozy relationship between banking and government. The collapse of banks during the sub-prime mortgage crisis of 2008 and their subsequent bailout by means of the taxpayer's money can give us an insight into both phenomena, the faults of our banking system and its infiltration into the halls of government. The same can be said of the present national debt crisis in the Euro zone and elsewhere.

One feature of banking that cries out for reform is "fractional reserve banking", i.e. the practice whereby private banks keep only a tiny fraction of the money entrusted to them by their depositors, and lend out all the remaining amount. By doing so, the banks are in effect coining their own money and putting it into circulation, a prerogative that ought to be reserved for governments. Under the system of fractional reserve banking, profits from any expansion of the money supply go to private banks rather than being used by the government to provide social services. This is basically unjust; the banks are in effect issuing their own counterfeit money.

When the economy contracts instead of expanding, the effect of fractional reserve banking is still worse. In that case the depositors ask the banks for their money, which it is their right to do. But the banks do not have the money; they have lent it out, and thus they fail. However, the bankers have insured themselves against this eventuality by buying the votes of government officials. Thus the banks are bailed out and the taxpayers are left with the bill, as in the recent example in which the US Federal Reserve secretly gave 7.7 trillion of the taxpayers' dollars to bail out various banks.

In a later section (on entropy and economics) we will discuss in detail Frederick Soddy's criticisms of the fractional reserve banking system, and his proposals for monetary reform.

The fact that our fractional reserve banking system is stable when the economy is expanding, but collapses when the economy contracts explains, in part, the irrational and almost religious belief of governments and economists in perpetual growth. Also contributing to growth-worship are the unearned profits that investors reap when they own property in growing cities, or shares of growing businesses. But growth cannot continue forever. It is destroying the earth.

Pope Francis has called for economic reform. Our battered earth calls for it. The case of Greece shows clearly that our present economic system is not working; it is destroying nature and at the same time producing human misery. We need to replace our present economic system by one that has both an ecological conscience and a social conscience.¹

¹<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-5/article/urgent-need-renewable-energy>
<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jul/08/exxon-climate-change-1981-climate-denier-funding>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/06/25/militarisms-hostages/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/07/13/pope-calls-world-youth-rise-against-global-capitalism>
<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/07/tpp-ttip-tisa-a-tipping-edge-from-democracy/>
<http://dissidentvoice.org/2015/05/secretcy-and-democracy-are-incompatible/>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/roberts100715.htm>
<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-6/article/institutional-and-cultural-inertia>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/07/04/will-the-real-issues-be-discussed-in-2016/>

7.2 The Club of Rome

In 1968 Aurelio Peccei, Thorkil Kristensen and others founded the Club of Rome, an organization of economists and scientists devoted to studying the predicament of human society. One of the first acts of the organization was to commission an MIT study of future trends using computer models. The result was a book entitled “Limits to Growth”, published in 1972. From the outset the book was controversial, but it became a best-seller. It was translated into many languages and sold 30 million copies. The book made use of an exponential index for resources, i.e. the number of years that a resource would last if used at an exponentially increasing rate.

Today the more accurate Hubbert Peak model is used instead to predict rate of use of a scarce resource as a function of time. Although the specific predictions of resource availability in “Limits to Growth” lacked accuracy, its basic thesis, that unlimited industrial growth on a finite planet is impossible, was indisputably correct. Nevertheless the book was greeted with anger and disbelief by the community of economists, and these emotions still surface when it is mentioned.

Economic activity is usually divided into two categories, 1) production of goods and 2) provision of services. It is the rate of production of goods that will be limited by the carrying capacity of the global environment. Services that have no environmental impact will not be constrained in this way. Thus a smooth transition to a sustainable economy will involve a shift of a large fraction the work force from the production of goods to the provision of services.

In his recent popular book “The Rise of the Creative Class” the economist Richard Florida points out that in a number of prosperous cities, for example Stockholm, a large fraction of the population is already engaged in what might be called creative work, a type of work that uses few resources, and produces few waste products, work which develops knowledge and culture rather than producing material goods. For example, producing computer software requires few resources and results in few waste products. Thus it is an activity with a very small ecological footprint.

Similarly, education, research, music, literature and art are all activities that do not weigh heavily on the carrying capacity of the global environment. Furthermore, cultural activities lead in a natural way to global cooperation and internationalism, since cultural achievements are shared by the people of the entire world. Indeed, the shared human inheritance of culture and knowledge is growing faster than ever before.

Florida sees this as a pattern for the future, and maintains that everyone is capable of creativity. He visualizes the transition to a sustainable future economy as one in which a large fraction of the work force moves from industrial jobs to information-related work. Meanwhile, as Florida acknowledges, industrial workers feel uneasy and threatened by such trends.²

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AjZaFjXfLec>

<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/video/2012/oct/25/david-attenborough-climate-change-video>

²<http://www.clubofrome.org/?p=326>

<http://www.donellameadows.org/wp-content/userfiles/Limits-to-Growth-digital-scan-version.pdf>




Figure 7.1: Aurelio Peccei (1908-1984), main founder of the Club of Rome. Concerning our present economic system, he wrote: “The only way we have devised to meet the surging waves of our rampant militarism and consumerism is to draw increasingly on the natural environment and to exploit, indiscriminately, the most accessible mineral and fuel deposits and all living resources we can lay our hands on. Such actions irreversibly impoverish our unique, irreplaceable, world, whose bounty and generosity are not infinite. Even if all the other adverse situations we find ourselves in today were to be alleviated, in itself, our high-handed treatment of Nature can bring about our doom.” Photograph by Koen Suyk/Anefo (Nationaal Archief), CC BY-SA 3.0, Wikimedia Commons

7.3 Biological Carrying capacity and Economics

Classical economists pictured the world as largely empty of human activities. According to the empty-world picture of economics, the limiting factors in the production of food and goods are shortages of human capital and labor. The land, forests, fossil fuels, minerals, oceans filled with fish, and other natural resources upon which human labor and capital operate, are assumed to be present in such large quantities that they are not limiting factors. In this picture, there is no naturally-determined upper limit to the total size of the human economy. It can continue to grow as long as new capital is accumulated, as long as new labor is provided by population growth, and as long as new technology replaces labor by automation.

Biology, on the other hand, presents us with a very different picture. Biologists remind us that if any species, including our own, makes demands on its environment which exceed the environment's carrying capacity, the result is a catastrophic collapse both of the environment and of the population which it supports. Only demands which are within the carrying capacity are sustainable. For example, there is a limit to regenerative powers of a forest.

It is possible to continue to cut trees in excess of this limit, but only at the cost of a loss of forest size, and ultimately the collapse and degradation of the forest. Similarly, cattle populations may for some time exceed the carrying capacity of grasslands, but the ultimate penalty for overgrazing will be degradation or desertification of the land. Thus, in biology, the concept of the carrying capacity of an environment is extremely important; but in economic theory this concept has not yet been given the weight which it deserves.

Exponential growth of human population and economic activity have brought us, in a surprisingly short time, from the empty-world situation to a full-world situation. In today's world, we are pressing against the absolute limits of the earth's carrying capacity, and further growth carries with it the danger of future collapse.

Full-world economics, the economics of the future, will no longer be able to rely on industrial growth to give profits to stockbrokers or to solve problems of unemployment or to alleviate poverty. In the long run, neither the growth of industry nor that of population is sustainable; and we have now reached or exceeded the sustainable limits.

The limiting factors in economics are no longer the supply of capital or human labor or even technology. The limiting factors are the rapidly vanishing supplies of petroleum and metal ores, the forests damaged by acid rain, the diminishing catches from over-fished oceans, and the cropland degraded by erosion or salination, or lost to agriculture under a cover of asphalt.

Neoclassical economists have maintained that it is generally possible to substitute man-made capital for natural resources; but a closer examination shows that there are only very few cases where this is really practical. (See G.E. Tverberg, "Thoughts on why energy use and CO₂ emissions are rising as fast as GDP", www.ourfiniteworld.com, November 30, 2011.)

The size of the human economy is, of course, the product of two factors the total number of humans, and the consumption per capita. If we are to achieve a sustainable global society in the future, a society whose demands are within the carrying capacity of of the global environment, then both these factors must be reduced.

The responsibility for achieving sustainability is thus evenly divided between the North and the South: Where there is excessively high consumption per capita, it must be reduced; and this is primarily the responsibility of the industrialized countries. High birth rates must also be reduced; and this is primarily the responsibility of the developing countries. Both of these somewhat painful changes are necessary for sustainability; but both will be extremely difficult to achieve because of the inertia of institutions, customs and ways of thought which are deeply embedded in society, in both the North and the South.

7.4 Social Values and Levels of Consumption

Let us next turn to the problem of reducing the per-capita consumption in the industrialized countries. The whole structure of western society seems designed to push its citizens in the opposite direction, towards ever-increasing levels of consumption. The mass media hold before us continually the ideal of a personal utopia filled with material goods. Every young man in a modern industrial society feels that he is a failure unless he fights his way to the “top”; and in recent years, women too have been drawn into this competition.

Of course not everyone can reach the top; there would not be room for everyone; but society urges all us to try, and we feel a sense of failure if we do not reach the goal. Thus, modern life has become a struggle of all against all for power and possessions.

One of the central problems in reducing consumption is that in our present economic and social theory, consumption has no upper bound; there is no definition of what is enough; there is no concept of a state where all of the real needs of a person have been satisfied. In our growth-oriented present-day economics, it is assumed that, no matter how much a person earns, he or she is always driven by a desire for more.

The phrase “conspicuous consumption” was invented by the Norwegian-American economist Thorstein Veblen (1857-1929) in order to describe the way in which our society uses economic waste as a symbol of social status. In “The Theory of the Leisure Class”, first published in 1899, Veblen pointed out that it wrong to believe that human economic behavior is rational, or that it can be understood in terms of classical economic theory. To understand it, Veblen maintained, one might better make use of insights gained from anthropology, psychology, sociology, and history.

The sensation caused by the publication of Veblen’s book, and the fact that his phrase, “conspicuous consumption”, has become part of our language, indicate that his theory did not completely miss its mark. In fact, modern advertisers seem to be following Veblen’s advice: Realizing that much of the output of our economy will be used for the purpose of establishing the social status of consumers, advertising agencies hire psychologists to appeal to the consumer’s longing for a higher social position.

When possessions are used for the purpose of social competition, demand has no natural

upper limit; it is then limited only by the size of the human ego, which, as we know, is boundless. This would be all to the good if unlimited economic growth were desirable. But today, when further industrial growth implies future collapse, western society urgently needs to find new values to replace our worship of power, our restless chase after excitement, and our admiration of excessive consumption.

The values which we need, both to protect nature from civilization and to protect civilization from itself, are perhaps not new: Perhaps it would be more correct to say that we need to rediscover ethical values which once were part of human culture, but which were lost during the process of industrialization, when technology allowed us to break traditional environmental constraints.

Our ancestors were hunter-gatherers, living in close contact with nature, and respecting the laws and limitations of nature. There are many hunter-gatherer cultures existing today, from whose values and outlook we could learn much. Unfortunately, instead of learning from them, we often move in with our bulldozers and make it impossible for their way of life to continue. During the past several decades, for example, approximately one tribe of South American forest Indians has died out every year. Of the 6000 human languages now spoken, it is estimated that half will vanish during the next 50 years.

In some parts of Africa, before cutting down a tree, a man will offer a prayer of apology to the spirit of the tree, explaining why necessity has driven him to such an act. The attitude involved in this ritual is something which industrialized society needs to learn, or relearn. Older cultures have much to teach industrial society because they already have experience with full-world situation which we are fast approaching.

In a traditional culture, where change is extremely slow, population has an opportunity to expand to the limits which the traditional way of life allows, so that it reaches an equilibrium with the environment. For example, in a hunter-gatherer culture, population has expanded to the limits which can be supported without the introduction of agriculture. The density of population is, of course, extremely low, but nevertheless it is pressing against the limits of sustainability. Overhunting or overfishing would endanger the future. Respect for the environment is thus necessary for the survival of such a culture.

Similarly, in a stable, traditional agricultural society which has reached an equilibrium with its environment, population is pressing against the limits of sustainability. In such a culture, one can usually find expressed as a strong ethical principle the rule that the land must not be degraded, but must be left fertile for the use of future generations.

Today, the whole world seems to be adopting values, fashions, and standards of behavior presented in the mass media of western society. The unsustainable, power-worshipping, consumption-oriented values of western society are so strongly propagandized by television, films and advertising, that they overpower and sweep aside the wisdom of older societies. This is unfortunate, since besides showing us unsustainable levels of affluence and economic waste, the western mass media depict values and behavior patterns which are hardly worthy of imitation. We need to reverse this trend. The industrialized countries must learn from the values of older traditional cultures. The wisdom of our ancestors, their respect for nature and their hospitable traditions of sharing, can help us to create a new economic

system founded on social and environmental ethics.³

7.5 Entropy and economics

We urgently need to shift quickly from fossil fuels to renewable energy if we are to avoid a tipping point after which human efforts to avoid catastrophic climate change will be futile because feedback loops will have taken over. The dangerous methane hydrate feedback loop is discussed in an excellent short video made by Thom Hartmann and the Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation.⁴

Celebrated author and activist Naomi Klein has emphasized the link between need for economic reform and our urgent duty to address climate change.⁵

Rebel economist Prof. Tim Jackson discusses the ways in which our present economic system has failed us, and the specific reforms that are needed. In one of his publications, he says: “The myth of growth has failed us. It has failed the two billion people who still live on 2 dollars a day. It has failed the fragile ecological systems on which we depend for survival. It has failed, spectacularly, in its own terms, to provide economic stability and secure people’s livelihood.”⁶

7.6 What is entropy?

Entropy is a quantity, originally defined in statistical mechanics and thermodynamics. It is a measure of the statistical probability of any state of a system: The greater the entropy, the greater the probability. The second law of thermodynamics asserts that entropy of the universe always increases with time. In other words, the universe as a whole is constantly moving towards states of greater and greater probability.

For any closed system, the same is true. Such systems move in time towards states of greater and greater probability. However, the earth, with its biosphere, is not a closed system. The earth constantly receives an enormous stream of light from the sun. The radiation which we receive from the sun brings us energy that can be used to perform work, and in physics this is called “free energy”. Because of this flood of incoming sunlight, plants, animals and humans are able to create structures which from a statistical point of view are highly unlikely.

³<http://www.learndev.org/dl/harmony8.pdf>
<http://dissidentvoice.org/2015/05/gandhi-as-an-economist/>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3401804813.html>

⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sRGVTK-AAvw>
<http://lasthours.org/>

⁵<http://thischangeeverything.org/naomi-klein/>
<http://www.theguardian.com/profile/naomiklein>

⁶<http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/rio-20-tim-jackson-leaders-green-economy?newsfeed=true>
<http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/consumerism-sustainability-short-termism>

The disorder and statistical probability of the universe is constantly increasing, but because the earth is not a closed system, we are able to create local order, and complex, statistically improbable structures, like the works of Shakespeare, the Mona Lisa and the Internet. The human economy is driven by the free energy which we receive as income from the sun. Money is, in fact, a symbol for free energy, and free energy might be thought of as “negative entropy”. There is also a link between free energy and information.⁷

7.7 Human society as a superorganism

A completely isolated human being would find it as difficult to survive for a long period of time as would an isolated ant or bee or termite. Therefore it seems correct to regard human society as a superorganism. In the case of humans, the analog of the social insects’ nest is the enormous and complex material structure of civilization. It is, in fact, what we call the human economy. It consists of functioning factories, farms, homes, transportation links, water supplies, electrical networks, computer networks and much more.

Almost all of the activities of modern humans take place through the medium of these external “exosomatic” parts of our social superorganism. The terms “exosomatic” and “endosomatic” were coined by the American scientist Alfred Lotka (1880-1949). A lobster’s claw is endosomatic; it is part of the lobster’s body. The hammer used by a human is exosomatic, like a detachable claw. Lotka spoke of “exosomatic evolution”, including in this term not only cultural evolution but also the building up of the material structures of civilization.

The economy associated with the human superorganism “eats” resources and free energy. It uses these inputs to produce local order, and finally excretes them as heat and waste. The process is closely analogous to food passing through the alimentary canal of an individual organism. The free energy and resources that are the inputs of our economy drive it just as food drives the processes of our body, but in both cases, waste products are finally excreted in a degraded form.

Almost all of the free energy that drives the human economy came originally from the sun’s radiation, the exceptions being geothermal energy which originates in the decay of radioactive substances inside the earth, and tidal energy, which has its origin in the slowing of the motions of the earth-moon system. However, since the start of the Industrial Revolution, our economy has been using the solar energy stored in of fossil fuels. These fossil fuels were formed over a period of several hundred million years. We are using them during a few hundred years, i.e., at a rate approximately a million times the rate at which they were formed.

The present rate of consumption of fossil fuels is more than 13 terawatts and, if used at the present rate, fossil fuels would last less than a century. However, because of the very serious threats posed by climate change, human society would be well advised to stop the consumption of coal, oil and natural gas well before that time.

⁷<http://www.amazon.com/Information-Theory-And-Evolution-Edition/dp/9814401234>

The rate of growth of new renewable energy sources is increasing rapidly. These sources include small hydro, modern biomass, solar, wind, geothermal, wave and tidal energy. There is an urgent need for governments to set high taxes on fossil fuel consumption and to shift subsidies from the petroleum and nuclear industries to renewables. These changes in economic policy are needed to make the prices of renewables more competitive.

The shock to the global economy that will be caused by the end of the fossil fuel era will be compounded by the scarcity of other non-renewable resources, such as metals. While it is true (as neoclassical economists emphasize) that “matter and energy can neither be created nor destroyed”, free energy can be degraded into heat, and concentrated deposits of minerals can be dispersed. Both the degradation of free energy into heat and the dispersal of minerals involve increases of entropy.

7.8 Frederick Soddy

One of the first people to call attention to the relationship between entropy and economics was the English radiochemist Frederick Soddy (1877-1956). Soddy won the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1921 for his work with Ernest Rutherford demonstrating the transmutation of elements in radioactive decay processes. His concern for social problems then led him to a critical study of the assumptions of classical economics. Soddy believed that there is a close connection between free energy and wealth, but only a very tenuous connection between wealth and money.

Soddy was extremely critical of the system of “fractional reserve banking” whereby private banks keep only a small fraction of the money that is entrusted to them by their depositors and lend out the remaining amount. He pointed out that this system means that the money supply is controlled by the private banks rather than by the government, and also that profits made from any expansion of the money supply go to private corporations instead of being used to provide social services. Fractional reserve banking exists today, not only in England but also in many other countries. Soddy’s criticisms of this practice cast light on the subprime mortgage crisis of 2008 and the debt crisis of 2011.

As Soddy pointed out, real wealth is subject to the second law of thermodynamics. As entropy increases, real wealth decays. Soddy contrasted this with the behavior of debt at compound interest, which increases exponentially without any limit, and he remarked:

“You cannot permanently pit an absurd human convention, such as the spontaneous increment of debt [compound interest] against the natural law of the spontaneous decrement of wealth [entropy]”. Thus, in Soddy’s view, it is a fiction to maintain that being owed a large amount of money is a form of real wealth.

Frederick Soddy’s book, “Wealth, virtual wealth and debt: The solution of the economic paradox”, published in 1926 by Allen and Unwin, was received by the professional economists of the time as the quixotic work of an outsider. Today, however, Soddy’s common-sense economic analysis is increasingly valued for the light that it throws on the problems of our fractional reserve banking system, which becomes more and more vulner-

able to failure as economic growth falters.⁸

7.9 Currency reform, and nationalization of banks

Frederick Soddy was writing at a time when England's currency was leaving the gold standard, and in order to replace this basis for the currency, he proposed an index system. Soddy's index was to be based on a standard shopping basket containing household items, such as bread, milk, potatoes and so on. If the price of the items in the basket rose, more currency would be issued by the nationalized central bank. If the price fell, currency would be withdrawn.

Nationalization of banks was proposed by Soddy as a means of avoiding the evils of the fractional reserve banking system. Today we see a revival of the idea of nationalized banks, or local user-owned cooperative banks. The Grameen Bank, founded by Prof. Muhammad Yunus, pioneered the idea of socially-motivated banks for the benefit poor people who would ordinarily be unable to obtain loans. The bank and its founder won a Nobel Peace Prize in 2006.⁹

7.10 Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen

The incorporation of the idea of entropy into economic thought also owes much to the mathematician and economist Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (1906-1994), the son a Romanian army officer. Georgescu-Roegen's talents were soon recognized by the Romanian school system, and he was given an outstanding education in mathematics, which later contributed to his success and originality as an economist.

Between 1927 and 1930 the young Georgescu studied at the Institute de Statistique in Paris, where he completed an award-winning thesis: "On the problem of finding out the cyclical components of phenomena". He then worked in England with Karl Pearson from 1930 to 1932, and during this period his work attracted the attention of a group of economists who were working on a project called the Harvard Economic Barometer. He

⁸www.fadedpage.com/link.php?file=20140873-a5.pdf
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/07/08/debt-slavery/>

⁹<http://www.grameen-info.org/history/>
<http://www.ibtimes.com/greece-drawing-contingency-plans-nationalize-banks-bring-parallel-currency-report-1868830>
<http://www.quora.com/Why-were-banks-nationalized-in-India>
<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-01-28/greek-bank-investors-hammered-as-3-day-slump-wipes-12-billion>
<http://www.armstrongeconomics.com/archives/30531>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nationalization>
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/23/beppe-grillo-calls-for-nationalisation-of-italian-banks-and-exit-from-euro>
<http://dissentvoice.org/2015/07/whats-wrong-with-our-monetary-system-and-how-to-fix-it/>




Figure 7.2: According to the second law of thermodynamics, the entropy of the universe constantly increases. Increase of entropy corresponds to increase of disorder, and also to increase of statistical probability. Living organisms on the earth are able to achieve a high degree of order and highly improbable structures because the earth is not a closed system. It constantly receives free energy (i.e. energy capable of doing work) from the sun, and this free energy can be thought of as carrying thermodynamic information, or “negative entropy”. Source: flowchainsensel.wordpress.co,

received a Rockefeller Fellowship to join this group, but when he arrived at Harvard, he found that the project had been disbanded.

In desperation, Georgescu-Roegen asked the economist Joseph Schumpeter for an appointment to his group. Schumpeter’s group was in fact a remarkably active and interesting one, which included the future Nobel laureate Wassely Leontief; and there followed a period of intense intellectual activity during which Georgescu-Roegen became an economist.

Despite offers of a permanent position at Harvard, Georgescu-Roegen returned to his native Romania in the late 1930’s and early 1940’s in order to help his country. He served as a member of the Central Committee of the Romanian National Peasant Party. His experiences at this time led to his insight that economic activity involves entropy. He was also helped to this insight by Borel’s monograph on Statistical Mechanics, which he had read during his Paris period.

Georgescu-Roegen later wrote: “The idea that the economic process is not a mechanical analogue, but an entropic, unidirectional transformation began to turn over in my mind long ago, as I witnessed the oil wells of the Plosti field of both World Wars’ fame becoming dry one by one, and as I grew aware of the Romanian peasants’ struggle against the deterioration of their farming soil by continuous use and by rains as well. However it was the new representation of a process that enabled me to crystallize my thoughts in describing the economic process as the entropic transformation of valuable natural resources (low entropy) into valueless waste (high entropy).”

After making many technical contributions to economic theory, Georgescu-Roegen re-

turned to this insight in his important 1971 book, “The Entropy Law and the Economic Process” (Harvard University Press), where he outlines his concept of bioeconomics. In a later book, “Energy and Economic Myths” (Pergamon Press, New York, 1976), he offered the following recommendations for moving towards a bioeconomic society:

1. The complete prohibition of weapons production, thereby releasing productive forces for more constructive purposes;
2. Immediate aid to underdeveloped countries;
3. Gradual decrease in population to a level that could be maintained only by organic agriculture;
4. Avoidance, and strict regulation if necessary, of wasteful energy use;
5. Abandon our attachment to “extravagant gadgetry”;
6. “Get rid of fashion”;
7. Make goods more durable and repairable; and
8. Cure ourselves of workaholic habits by re-balancing the time spent on work and leisure, a shift that will become incumbent as the effects of the other changes make themselves felt.

Georgescu-Roegen did not believe that his idealistic recommendations would be adopted, and he feared that human society is headed for a crash.

7.11 Limits to Growth: A steady-state economy

Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen’s influence continues to be felt today, not only through his own books and papers but also through those of his students, the distinguished economists Herman E. Daly and Kozo Mayumi, who for many years have been advocating a steady-state economy. As they point out in their books and papers, it is becoming increasingly apparent that unlimited economic growth on a finite planet is a logical impossibility. However, it is important to distinguish between knowledge, wisdom and culture, which can and should continue to grow, and growth in the sense of an increase in the volume of material goods produced. It is growth in the latter sense that is reaching its limits.

Daly describes our current situation as follows: “The most important change in recent times has been the growth of one subsystem of the Earth, namely the economy, relative to the total system, the ecosphere. This huge shift from an ‘empty’ to a ‘full’ world is truly ‘something new under the sun’... The closer the economy approaches the scale of the whole Earth, the more it will have to conform to the physical behavior mode of the Earth... The remaining natural world is no longer able to provide the sources and sinks for the metabolic throughput necessary to sustain the existing oversized economy, much less a growing one. Economists have focused too much on the economy’s circulatory system and have neglected to study its digestive tract.”¹⁰

¹⁰<http://dalynews.org/learn/blog/>
<http://steadystate.org/category/herman-daly/>

In the future, the only way that we can avoid economic collapse is to build a steady-state economy. There exists much literature on how this can be achieved, and these writings ought to become a part of the education of all economists and politicians.

7.12 Problems of globalization

In the early 19th century, industrial society began to be governed by new rules: Traditions were forgotten and replaced by purely economic laws. Labor was viewed as a commodity, like coal or grain, and wages were paid according to the laws of supply and demand, without regard for the needs of the workers. Wages fell to starvation levels, hours of work increased, and working conditions deteriorated.

John Fielden's book, "The Curse of the Factory System" was written in 1836, and it describes the condition of young children working in the cotton mills. "The small nimble fingers of children being by far the most in request, the custom instantly sprang up of procuring 'apprentices' from the different parish workhouses of London, Birmingham and elsewhere... Overseers were appointed to see to the works, whose interest it was to work the children to the utmost, because their pay was in proportion to the quantity of work that they could exact."

"Cruelty was, of course, the consequence; and there is abundant evidence on record to show that in many of the manufacturing districts, the most heart rending cruelties were practiced on the unoffending and friendless creatures...that they were flogged, fettered and tortured in the most exquisite refinements of cruelty, that they were in many cases starved to the bone while flogged to their work, and that they were even in some instances driven to commit suicide... The profits of manufacture were enormous, but this only whetted the appetite that it should have satisfied."

Dr. Peter Gaskell, writing in 1833, described the condition of the English mill workers as follows: "The vast deterioration in personal form which has been brought about in the manufacturing population during the last thirty years... is singularly impressive, and fills the mind with contemplations of a very painful character... Their complexion is sallow and pallid, with a peculiar flatness of feature caused by the want of a proper quantity of adipose substance to cushion out the cheeks. Their stature is low - the average height of men being five feet, six inches... Great numbers of the girls and women walk lamely or awkwardly... Many of the men have but little beard, and that in patches of a few hairs... (They have) a spiritless and dejected air, a sprawling and wide action of the legs..."

"Rising at or before daybreak, between four and five o'clock the year round, they swallow a hasty meal or hurry to the mill without taking any food whatever... At twelve o'clock the engine stops, and an hour is given for dinner... Again they are closely immured from one o'clock till eight or nine, with the exception of twenty minutes, this being allowed

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EN5esbvAt-w>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wIR-VsXtM4Y>

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2015/car031315a.htm>

for tea. During the whole of this long period, they are actively and unremittingly engaged in a crowded room at an elevated temperature.”

Dr. Gaskell adds a description of the housing of the workers: “One of the circumstances in which they are especially defective is that of drainage and water-closets. Whole ranges of these houses are either totally undrained, or very partially... The whole of the washings and filth from these consequently are thrown into the front or back street, which, often being unpaved and cut into deep ruts, allows them to collect into stinking and stagnant pools; while fifty, or even more than that number, having only a single convenience common to them all, it is in a very short time choked with excrementous matter. No alternative is left to the inhabitants but adding this to the already defiled street.”

“It frequently happens that one tenement is held by several families... The demoralizing effects of this utter absence of domestic privacy must be seen before they can be thoroughly appreciated. By laying bare all the wants and actions of the sexes, it strips them of outward regard for decency - modesty is annihilated - the father and the mother, the brother and the sister, the male and female lodger, do not scruple to commit acts in front of each other which even the savage keeps hid from his fellows.”

With the gradual acceptance of birth control in England, the growth of trade unions, the passage of laws against child labor and finally minimum wage laws, conditions of workers gradually improved, and the benefits of industrialization began to spread to the whole of society.

One of the important influences for reform was the Fabian Society, founded in London in 1884. The group advocated gradual rather than revolutionary reform (and took its name from Quintus Fabius Maximus, the Roman general who defeated Hannibal’s Carthaginian army by using harassment and attrition rather than head-on battles). The Fabian Society came to include a number of famous people, including Sydney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, Annie Besant, Leonard Woolf, Emaline Pankhurst, Bertrand Russell, John Maynard Keynes, Harold Laski, Ramsay MacDonald, Clement Attlee, Tony Benn and Harold Wilson. Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s first Prime Minister, was greatly influenced by Fabian economic ideas.

The group was instrumental in founding the British Labour Party (1900), the London School of Economics and the New Statesman. In 1906, Fabians lobbied for a minimum wage law, and in 1911 they lobbied for the establishment of a National Health Service.

The reform movement’s efforts, especially those of the Fabians, overcame the worst horrors of early 19th century industrialism, but today their hard-won achievements are being undermined and lost because of uncritical and unregulated globalization. Today, a factory owner or CEO, anxious to avoid high labor costs, and anxious to violate environmental regulations merely moves his factory to a country where laws against child labor and rape of the environment do not exist or are poorly enforced. In fact, he must do so or be fired, since the only thing that matters to the stockholders is the bottom line.

The movement of a factory from Europe or North America to a country with poorly enforced laws against environmental destruction, child labor, and slavery, puts workers into unfair competition. Unless they are willing to accept revival of the unspeakable conditions of the early Industrial Revolution, they are unable to compete.

Today, child labor accounts for 22% of the workforce in Asia, 32% in Africa, and 17% in Latin America. Large-scale slavery also exists today, although there are formal laws against it in every country. There are more slaves now than ever before. Their number is estimated to be between 12 million and 27 million. Besides outright slaves, who are bought and sold for as little as 100 dollars, there many millions of workers whose lack of options and dreadful working conditions must be described as slavlike.¹¹

Secret trade deals

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is one of the trade deals that is currently being negotiated in secret. Not even the US congress is allowed to know the details of the document. However, enough information has been leaked to make it clear that if the agreement is passed, foreign corporations would be allowed to “sue” the US government for loss of profits because of (for example) environmental regulations. The “trial” would be outside the legal system, before a tribunal of lawyers representing the corporations. A similar secret trade deal with Europe, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), is also being “fast-tracked”. One can hardly imagine greater violations of democratic principles.¹²

We can also consider the “non-discrimination” principle adopted by GATT (the General Agreement on Terriffs and Trade). This principle states that participating countries “cannot discriminate between like products on the basis of the method of production”. This single principle allows multinational commerce to escape from all the humanitarian and environmental reforms that have been achieved since the start of the Industrial Revolution. No matter if the method of production involves destruction of a tropical rain forest, no matter if forced labor was used, we are not allowed to discriminate “on the basis of the method of production”.

The present situation is that agriculture, trade and industry have become global, but the world still lacks adequate institutions at the global level to watch over what is happening and to ensure respect for human needs and respect for the natural environment. Today’s global economic interdependence, instantaneous worldwide communication, and the need

¹¹<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/04/state-dept-accused-watering-down-human-rights-ratings-advance-obama-trade-agenda>

<http://www.foodispower.org/slavery-chocolate/>

<https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2014/10/01/modi-o01.html>

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/oct/28/ethicalbusiness.retail>

<http://www.techtimes.com/articles/22530/20141221/apple-turning-blind-eye-to-miserable-working-conditions-of-workers-in-china-and-indonesia-secret-video.htm>

<http://www.waronwant.org/sweatshops-china>

<https://www.dosomething.org/facts/11-facts-about-sweatshops>

<https://sites.google.com/site/rgssenglishmsgswatshops/conditions-of-sweatshops-in-indonesia>

<http://www.greenpeace.org/eastasia/campaigns/air-pollution/problems/>

<http://www.wired.com/2015/04/benedikt-partenheimer-particulate-matter/>

¹²<http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=5411>

<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/03/world-at-a-crossroads-stop-the-fast-track-to-a-future-of-global-corporate-rule/>

<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/princeton-experts-say-us-no-longer-democracy>

for peaceful resolution of international conflicts all call for strong governmental institutions at the global level, but the United Nations today lacks many things that would be necessary if it is to perform such a role: It lacks a legislature with the power to make laws binding on individuals and corporations. It lacks mechanisms for enforcing such laws. And it lacks a large and dependable source of income.

It would be logical to improve the United Nations by giving it the things just mentioned, and by giving it at the same time the task of regulating multinational corporations to ensure that they act in a socially and ecologically responsible manner. It would also be logical to entitle the UN to a fee for acting as a referee in relationships between multinationals and the developing countries. These reforms must come someday because of the logic of our present situation. I hope that they will come soon.

The CEO's of Wall Street call for less government, more deregulation and more globalization. They are delighted that the work of the reform movement is being undone in the name of "freedom". But is this really what is needed? We need instead to reform our economic system and to give it both a social conscience and an ecological conscience. Governments already accept their responsibility for education. In the future they must also accept the responsibility for ensuring that their citizens can make a smooth transition from education to secure jobs. The free market alone cannot do this the powers of government are needed. Let us restore democracy! Let us have governments that work for the welfare of all their citizens, rather than for the enormous enrichment of the few!

7.13 A new social contract

Our present situation is this:

The future looks extremely dark because of human folly, especially the long-term future. The greatest threats are catastrophic climate change and thermonuclear war, but a large-scale global famine also has to be considered.

We give our children loving care, but it makes no sense do so and at the same time to neglect to do all that is within our power to ensure that they and their descendants will inherit an earth in which they can survive. We also have a responsibility to all the other living organisms with which we share the gift of life.

Inaction is not an option. We have to act with courage and dedication, even if the odds are against success, because the stakes are so high. The mass media could mobilize us to action, but they have failed in their duty. Our educational system could also wake us up and make us act, but it too has failed us. The battle to save the earth from human greed and folly has to be fought in the alternative media. Hence this book, printed by a small peace-oriented Swedish publisher, and hence urgent the tone of this final chapter.

We need a new economic system, a new society, a new social contract, a new way of life. Here are the great tasks that history has given to our generation: We must achieve a steady-state economic system. We must restore democracy. We must decrease economic inequality. We must break the power of corporate greed. We must leave fossil fuels in the ground. We must stabilize and ultimately reduce the global population. We must eliminate



Figure 7.3: **Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, a great pioneer of Ecological Economics. His writings cast much light on our present situation. Source: elcomercio.ep**

the institution of war. And finally, we must develop a more mature ethical system to match our new technology.

We must achieve a steady-state economic system

A steady-state economic system is necessary because neither population growth nor economic growth can continue indefinitely on a finite earth. No one can maintain that exponential industrial growth is sustainable in the long run except by refusing to look more than a short distance into the future.

Of course, it is necessary to distinguish between industrial growth, and growth of culture and knowledge, which can and should continue to grow. Qualitative improvements in human society are possible and desirable, but resource-using and pollution-producing industrial growth is reaching its limits, both because of ecological constraints and because of the exhaustion of petroleum, natural gas and other non-renewable resources, such as metals. The threat of catastrophic climate change makes it imperative for us to stop using fossil fuels within very few decades.

We discussed Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen's reasons for viewing our present economic system as unidirectional and entropic: Low-entropy resources are converted into high-entropy waste, a unidirectional process. By contrast, to be sustainable in the long run, a process must be cyclic, like the growth and regeneration of a forest.

Georgescu-Roegen's list of desiderata remains valid today: We need drastic cuts in weapons production, thereby releasing productive forces for more constructive purposes. We need immediate aid to underdeveloped countries and gradual decrease in population to a level that can be maintained by organic agriculture. We also need avoidance, and strict regulation if necessary, of wasteful energy use. Finally, we need to abandon our attachment to extravagant gadgetry and fashion, and we must cure ourselves of workaholic habits by re-balancing the time spent on work and leisure.

Today, the distinguished economist Herman Daly (a student of Georgescu-Roegen) continues to write perceptive articles and books documenting the need for a steady-state econ-

omy. Among his books, the following are noteworthy: “Steady-State Economics” (1977); “For the Common Good” (1989, with John B. Cobb, Jr.); “Valuing the Earth” (1993, with Kenneth Townsend); “Beyond Growth” (1996); “Ecological Economics and the Ecology of Economics” (1999); “Local Politics of Global Sustainability” (2000, with Thomas Prugh and Robert Costanza), and “Ecological Economics: Principles and Applications” (2003, with Joshua Farley. Prof. Daly is a recipient of the Right Livelihood Award, which is sometimes called the Alternative Nobel Prize.¹³

We must restore democracy

It is obvious, almost by definition, that excessive governmental secrecy and true democracy are incompatible. If the people of a country have no idea what their government is doing, they cannot possibly have the influence on decisions that the word “democracy” implies.

Governmental secrecy is not something new. Secret diplomacy contributed to the outbreak of World War I, and the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement later contributed to the bitterness of conflicts in the Middle East. However, in recent years, governmental secrecy has grown enormously.

The revelations of Edward Snowden have shown that the number of people involved in secret operations of the United States government is now as large as the entire population of Norway: roughly 5 million. The influence of this dark side of government has become so great that no president is able to resist it.

Many modern governments have become very expert in manipulating public opinion through mass media. They only allow the public to hear a version of the “news” that has been handed down by powerholders. Of course, people can turn to the alternative media that are available on the Internet. But on the whole, the vision of the world presented on television screens and in major newspapers is the “truth” that is accepted by the majority of the public, and it is this picture of events that influences political decisions. Censorship of the news by the power elite is a form of secrecy, since it withholds information that is needed for a democracy to function properly.

Snowden has already said most of what he has to say. Nevertheless, Washington was willing to break international law and the rules of diplomatic immunity by forcing its European allies to ground the plane of Bolivian President Evo Morales following a rumor that Snowden was on board. This was not done to prevent Snowden from saying more, but with the intention of making a gruesome example of him, as a warning to other whistleblowers.

In a democracy, the power of judging and controlling governmental policy is supposed to be in the hands of the people. It is completely clear that if the people do not know what their government is doing, then they cannot judge or control governmental policy,

¹³<http://steadystate.org/category/herman-daly/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herman_Daly
<http://grist.org/article/bank/>
<http://www.donellameadows.org/wp-content/userfiles/Limits-to-Growth-digital-scan-version.pdf>
<http://www.clubofrome.org/?p=326>

and democracy has been abolished. There has always been a glaring contradiction between democracy and secret branches of the government, such as the CIA, which conducts its assassinations and its dirty wars in South America and elsewhere without any public knowledge or control.

The gross, wholesale electronic spying on citizens revealed by Snowden seems to be specifically aimed at eliminating democracy. It is aimed at instilling universal fear and conformity, fear of blackmail and fear of being out of step, so that the public will not dare to oppose whatever the government does, no matter how criminal or unconstitutional.

We must restore democracy wherever it has been replaced by oligarchy. When we do so, we will free ourselves from many evils, including excessive economic inequality, violation of civil rights, and the suffering produced by perpetual wars.

We must decrease economic inequality

In his Apostolic Exhortation, “*Evangelii Gaudium*”, Pope Francis said:

“In our time humanity is experiencing a turning-point in its history, as we can see from the advances being made in so many fields. We can only praise the steps being taken to improve people’s welfare in areas such as health care, education and communications. At the same time we have to remember that the majority of our contemporaries are barely living from day to day, with dire consequences. A number of diseases are spreading. The hearts of many people are gripped by fear and desperation, even in the so-called rich countries. The joy of living frequently fades, lack of respect for others and violence are on the rise, and inequality is increasingly evident. It is a struggle to live and, often, to live with precious little dignity.”

“This epochal change has been set in motion by the enormous qualitative, quantitative, rapid and cumulative advances occurring in the sciences and in technology, and by their instant application in different areas of nature and of life. We are in an age of knowledge and information, which has led to new and often anonymous kinds of power.”

“Just as the commandment ‘Thou shalt not kill’ sets a clear limit in order to safeguard the value of human life, today we also have to say ‘thou shalt not’ to an economy of exclusion and inequality. Such an economy kills. How can it be that it is not a news item when an elderly homeless person dies of exposure, but it is news when the stock market loses two points? This is a case of exclusion. Can we continue to stand by when food is thrown away while people are starving? This is a case of inequality. Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape.”

“In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naive trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system. Meanwhile, the excluded are still waiting.”

In a recent speech, Senator Bernie Sanders quoted Pope Francis extensively and added: “We have a situation today, Mr. President, incredible as it may sound, where the wealthiest 85 people in the world own more wealth than the bottom half of the world’s population.”¹⁴

The social epidemiologist Prof. Richard Wilkinson, has documented the ways in which societies with less economic inequality do better than more unequal societies in a number of areas, including increased rates of life expectancy, mathematical performance, literacy, trust, social mobility, together with decreased rates of infant mortality, homicides, imprisonment, teenage births, obesity and mental illness, including drug and alcohol addiction.¹⁵ We must also remember that according to the economist John A. Hobson, the basic problem that led to imperialism was an excessively unequal distribution of incomes in the industrialized countries. The result of this unequal distribution was that neither the rich nor the poor could buy back the total output of their society. The incomes of the poor were insufficient, and rich were too few in number.

We must break the power of corporate greed

When the United Nations was established in 1945, the purpose of the organization was to abolish the institution of war. This goal was built into many of the articles of the UN Charter. Accordingly, throughout the world, many War Departments were renamed and became Departments of Defense. But the very name is a lie. In an age of nuclear threats and counter-threats, populations are by no means protected. Ordinary citizens are just hostages in a game for power and money. It is all about greed.

Why is war continually threatened? Why is Russia threatened? Why is war with Iran threatened? Why fan the flames of conflict with China? Is it to “protect” civilians? Absolutely not! In a thermonuclear war, hundreds of millions of civilians would die horribly everywhere in the world, also in neutral countries. What is really being protected are the profits of arms manufacturers. As long as there are tensions; as long as there is a threat of war, military budgets are safe; and the profits of arms makers are safe. The people in several “democracies”, for example the United States, do not rule at the moment. Greed rules.

As Institute Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT has pointed out, greed and lack of ethics are built into the structure of corporations. By law, the Chief Executive Officer of a corporation must be entirely motivated by the collective greed of the stockholders. He must maximize profits. If the CEO abandons this single-minded chase after corporate profits for ethical reasons, or for the sake of humanity or the biosphere or the future, he (or she) must, by law, be fired and replaced.

¹⁴https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9_LJpN893Vg
<https://www.oxfam.org/en/tags/inequality>
https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/cr-even-it-up-extreme-inequality-291014-en.pdf

¹⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZ7LzE3u7Bw>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_G._Wilkinson



Figure 7.4: Greed: one of the seven deadly sins. Pecados Capitaes. Avaricia.
Author: Jesus Solana from Madrid, Spain, Wikimedia Commons

Occasionally, for the sake of their public image, corporations seem to do something for other motives than their own bottom line, but it is usually window dressing. For example, Shell claims to be supporting research on renewable energy. Perhaps there is indeed a small renewable energy laboratory somewhere in that vast corporation; but the real interest of the organization is somewhere else. Shell is sending equipment on a large scale to drill for more and more environment-destroying oil in the Arctic.¹⁶

We must leave fossil fuels in the ground

The threat of catastrophic climate change requires prompt and dedicated action by the global community. Unless we very quickly make the transition from fossil fuels to 100% renewable energy, we will reach a tipping point after which uncontrollable feedback loops could take over, leading to a human-caused 6th geological extinction event. This might even be comparable to the Permian-Triassic event, during which 96% of all marine species and 70% of terrestrial vertebrates became extinct.

New hope that such a catastrophe for human civilization and the biosphere can be avoided comes from two recently-released documents: The Encyclical “*Laudato Si*” by Pope Francis, and the statistics on the rate of growth of renewable energy newly released by the Earth Policy Institute.

Arctic sea-ice is melting at an increasingly rapid rate, because of several feedback loops. One of these feedback loops, called the albedo effect, is due to the fact that white snow-covered sea-ice in the Arctic reflects sunlight, while dark water absorbs it, raising the temperature and leading to more melting.

Another feedback loop is due to the fact that rising temperatures mean that more water is evaporated. The water vapor in the atmosphere acts like a greenhouse gas, and raises the temperature still further.

If we consider long-term effects, by far the most dangerous of the feedback loops is the melting of methane hydrate crystals and the release of methane into the atmosphere, where its effects as a greenhouse gas are roughly twenty times great as those of CO₂.

When organic matter is carried into the oceans by rivers, it decays to form methane. The methane then combines with water to form hydrate crystals, which are stable at the temperatures which currently exist on ocean floors. However, if the temperature rises, the crystals become unstable, and methane gas bubbles up to the surface.

The worrying thing about methane hydrate deposits on ocean floors is the enormous amount of carbon involved: roughly 10,000 gigatons. To put this huge amount into perspective, we can remember that the total amount in world CO₂ emissions since 1751 has been only 337 gigatons.

Despite the worrying nature of the threats that we are facing, there are reasons for hope. One of the greatest of these is the beautiful, profound and powerful encyclical that

¹⁶<http://www.countercurrents.org/avery170715.htm>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/06/25/militarisms-hostages/>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FJUA4cm0Rck>

has just been released by Pope Francis.¹⁷

Pope Francis tells us that the dictates of today's economists are not sacred: In the future, if we are to survive, economics must be given both a social conscience and an ecological conscience. Nor are private property and profits sacred. They must be subordinated to the common good, and the preservation of our global commons. Less focus on material goods need not make us less happy. The quality of our lives can be increased, not decreased, if we give up our restless chase after power and wealth, and derive more of our pleasures from art, music and literature, and from conversations with our families and friends.

Another reason for hope can be found in the extremely high present rate of growth of renewable energy, and in the remarkable properties of exponential growth. According to figures recently released by the Earth Policy Institute,¹⁸ the global installed photovoltaic capacity is currently able to deliver 242,000 megawatts, and it is increasing at the rate of 27.8% per year. Wind energy can now deliver 370,000 megawatts, and it is increasing at the rate of roughly 20% per year.

Because of the astonishing properties of exponential growth, we can calculate that if these growth rates are maintained, renewable energy can give us 24.8 terawatts within only 15 years! This is far more than the world's present use of all forms of energy.

All of us must still work with dedication to provide the political will needed to avoid catastrophic climate change. However, the strong and friendly voice of Pope Francis, and the remarkable rate of growth of renewable energy can guide our work, and can give us hope and courage.

The award-winning author and activist Naomi Klein has emphasized that the climate crisis changes everything. Environmentalists and antiwar activists must unite! We need a new economic system! The people of the world don't want climate change; they want system change!¹⁹

¹⁷http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html

¹⁸<http://www.earth-policy.org/books/tgt>

¹⁹<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/03/naomi-klein-the-economic-system-we-have-created-global-warming/>
<http://thischangeseverything.org/naomi-klein/>
<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-5/article/urgent-need-renewable-energy>
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/18/Climate-change-report-warns-dramatically-warmer-world-this-century>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sRGVTK-AAvw>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MVwmi7HCmSI>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AjZaFjXfLec>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m6pFDu7ILV4>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MVwmi7HCmSI>
<http://therightsofnature.org/universal-declaration/>

We must stabilize and ultimately reduce the global population

According to the World Resources Institute and the United Nations Environment Programme, “It is estimated that since World War II, 1.2 billion hectares...[of agricultural land] has suffered at least moderate degradation as a result of human activity. This is a vast area, roughly the size of China and India combined.” This area is 27% of the total area currently devoted to agriculture 5 . The report goes on to say that the degradation is greatest in Africa.

David Pimental and his associates at Cornell University pointed out in 1995 that “Because of erosion-associated loss of productivity and population growth, the per capita food supply has been reduced over the past 10 years and continues to fall. The Food and Agricultural Organization reports that the per capita production of grains which make up 80% of the world’s food supply, has been declining since 1984.”

Pimental et al. add that “Not only is the availability of cropland per capita decreasing as the world population grows, but arable land is being lost due to excessive pressure on the environment. For instance, during the past 40 years nearly one-third of the world’s cropland (1.5 billion hectares) has been abandoned because of soil erosion and degradation. Most of the replacement has come from marginal land made available by removing forests. Agriculture accounts for 80% of the annual deforestation.”

The phrase “developing countries” is more than a euphemism; it expresses the hope that with the help of a transfer of technology from the industrialized nations, all parts of the world can achieve prosperity. An important factor that prevents the achievement of worldwide prosperity is population growth.

In the words of Dr. Halfdan Mahler, former Director General of the World Health Organization, “Country after country has seen painfully achieved increases in total output, food production, health and educational facilities and employment opportunities reduced or nullified by excessive population growth.”

The growth of population is linked to excessive urbanization, infrastructure failures and unemployment. In rural districts in the developing countries, family farms are often divided among a growing number of heirs until they can no longer be subdivided. Those family members who are no longer needed on the land have no alternative except migration to overcrowded cities, where the infrastructure is unable to cope so many new arrivals. Often the new migrants are forced to live in excrement-filled makeshift slums, where dysentery, hepatitis and typhoid are endemic, and where the conditions for human life sink to the lowest imaginable level. In Brazil, such shanty towns are called “favelas”.

If modern farming methods are introduced in rural areas while population growth continues, the exodus to cities is aggravated, since modern techniques are less labor-intensive and favor large farms. In cities, the development of adequate infrastructure requires time, and it becomes a hopeless task if populations are growing rapidly. Thus, population stabilization is a necessary first step for development.

It can be observed that birth rates fall as countries develop. However, development is sometimes blocked by the same high birth rates that economic progress might have prevented. In this situation (known as the “demographic trap”), economic gains disappear

immediately because of the demands of an exploding population.

For countries caught in the demographic trap, government birth control programs are especially important, because one cannot rely on improved social conditions to slow birth rates. Since health and lowered birth rates should be linked, it is appropriate that family-planning should be an important part of programs for public health and economic development.

A recent study conducted by Robert F. Lapham of Demographic Health Surveys and W. Parker Maudlin of the Rockefeller Foundation has shown that the use of birth control is correlated both with socio-economic setting and with the existence of strong family-planning programs. The implication of this study is that even in the absence of increased living standards, family planning programs can be successful, provided they have strong government support.

Education of women and higher status for women are vitally important measures, not only for their own sake, but also because in many countries these social reforms have proved to be the key to lower birth rates. As Sir Partha Dasgupta of Cambridge University has pointed out, the changes needed to break the cycle of overpopulation and poverty are all desirable in themselves. Besides education and higher status for women, they include state-provided social security for old people, provision of water supplies near to dwellings, provision of health services to all, abolition of child labor and general economic development. The money required to make these desirable changes is a tiny fraction of the amount that is currently wasted on war.

In order to avoid a catastrophic future famine, it is vitally important that all of the countries of the world should quickly pass through a demographic transition from a situation characterized by high birth rates and high death rates to a new equilibrium, where low death rates are balanced by low birth rates.

We must eliminate the institution of war

The problem of achieving internal peace over a large geographical area is not insoluble. It has already been solved. There exist today many nations or regions within each of which there is internal peace, and some of these are so large that they are almost worlds in themselves. One thinks of China, India, Brazil, Australia, the Russian Federation, the United States, and the European Union. Many of these enormous societies contain a variety of ethnic groups, a variety of religions and a variety of languages, as well as striking contrasts between wealth and poverty. If these great land areas have been forged into peaceful and cooperative societies, cannot the same methods of government be applied globally?

New ethics to match new technology

Modern science has, for the first time in history, offered humankind the possibility of a life of comfort, free from hunger and cold, and free from the constant threat of death through infectious disease. At the same time, science has given humans the power to

obliterate their civilization with nuclear weapons, or to make the earth uninhabitable through overpopulation and pollution.

The question of which of these paths we choose is literally a matter of life or death for ourselves and our children. Will we use the discoveries of modern science constructively, and thus choose the path leading towards life? Or will we use science to produce more and more lethal weapons, which sooner or later, through a technical or human failure, may result in a catastrophic nuclear war? Will we thoughtlessly destroy our beautiful planet through unlimited growth of population and industry? The choice among these alternatives is ours to make. We live at a critical moment of history, a moment of crisis for civilization.

No one living today asked to be born at such a moment, but by an accident of birth, history has given us an enormous responsibility, and two daunting tasks: If civilization is to survive, we must not only stabilize the global population but also, even more importantly, we must eliminate the institution of war. We face these difficult tasks with an inherited emotional nature that has not changed much during the last 40,000 years. Furthermore, we face the challenges of the 21st century with an international political system based on the anachronistic concept of the absolutely sovereign nation-state. However, the human brain has shown itself to be capable of solving even the most profound and complex problems. The mind that has seen into the heart of the atom must not fail when confronted with paradoxes of the human heart.

We must replace the old world of international anarchy, chronic war and institutionalized injustice, by a new world of law. The United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Criminal Court are steps in the right direction, but these institutions need to be greatly strengthened and reformed.²⁰

²⁰<http://www.countercurrents.org/zuesse050815.htm>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=16&v=hDsPWmioSHg>
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/04/14/us-oligarchy-not-democracy-says-scientific-study>
<http://www.treehugger.com/renewable-energy/striking-chart-showing-solar-power-will-take-over-world.html>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/richard120815.htm>
http://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2015/08/OCI-Untouchable_Arctic_FINAL.pdf
<http://priceofoil.org/2015/08/13/untouchable-the-climate-case-against-arctic-drilling/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/08/14/untouchable-climate-case-against-arctic-drilling>
https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=124&v=9_LJpN893Vg
<http://americamagazine.org/content/all-things/which-candidate-quotes-pope-most>
<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/32336-our-united-states-of-indebtedness>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/17/ahead-australia-visit-naomi-klein-brands-pm-abbott-climate-villain>
http://www.footprintnetwork.org/ecological_footprint_nations/
<http://ecowatch.com/2015/08/16/earth-overshoot-day/2/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/18/islamic-declaration-blasts-short-sighted-capitalism-demands-action-climate>
<http://islamicclimatedeclaration.org/islamic-declaration-on-global-climate-change/>
<http://ecowatch.com/2015/06/29/dalai-lama-pope-encyclical/>
<http://www.theguardian.com/music/2015/jun/28/dalai-lama-glastonbury-verdict-isis-unthinkable>
<http://ecowatch.com/2015/07/02/naomi-klein-people-planet-first/>

We also need a new global ethic, where loyalty to one's family and nation is supplemented by a higher loyalty to humanity as a whole. The Nobel laureate biochemist Albert Szent-Györgyi once wrote:

"The story of man consists of two parts, divided by the appearance of modern science.... In the first period, man lived in the world in which his species was born and to which his senses were adapted. In the second, man stepped into a new, cosmic world to which he was a complete stranger.... The forces at man's disposal were no longer terrestrial forces, of human dimension, but were cosmic forces, the forces which shaped the universe. The few hundred Fahrenheit degrees of our flimsy terrestrial fires were exchanged for the ten million degrees of the atomic reactions which heat the sun."

"This is but a beginning, with endless possibilities in both directions; a building of a human life of undreamt of wealth and dignity, or a sudden end in utmost misery. Man lives in a new cosmic world for which he was not made. His survival depends on how well and how fast he can adapt himself to it, rebuilding all his ideas, all his social and political institutions."

"...Modern science has abolished time and distance as factors separating nations. On our shrunken globe today, there is room for one group only: the family of man."

Suggestions for further reading

1. Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism and the Climate*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (2014).
2. Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, Knopf Canada, (2007).
3. Noam Chomsky, *Because We Say So*, City Lights Open Media, (2015).
4. Noam Chomsky, *Democracy and Power: The Delhi Lectures*, Open Book Publishers, (2014).
5. Noam Chomsky, *Masters of Mankind: Essays and Lectures, 1969-2013*, Haymarket Books, (2014).
6. Noam Chomsky, *Nuclear War and Environmental Catastrophe*, Seven Stories Press, New York, (2013).
7. A. Gore, *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It*, Rodale Books, New York, (2006).
8. A. Gore, *Earth in the Balance: Forging a New Common Purpose*, Earthscan, (1992).
9. A.H. Ehrlich and P.R. Ehrlich, *Earth*, Thames and Methuen, (1987).pro Simon and Schuster, (1990).
10. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Healing the Planet: Strategies for Resolving the Environmental Crisis*, Addison-Wesley, (1991).
11. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environmental Rhetoric Threatens our Future*, Island Press, (1998).
12. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *One With Nineveh: Politics, Consumption and the Human Future*, Island Press, (2004).
13. A.H. Ehrlich and U. Lele, *Humankind at the Crossroads: Building a Sustainable Food System*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
14. P.R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, Sierra/Ballentine, New York, (1972).
15. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Human Ecology*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1972).
16. P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. Ehrlich and J. Holdren, *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977)
17. P.R. Ehrlich and A.H. Ehrlich, *Extinction*, Victor Gollancz, London, (1982).
18. D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W.W. Behrens III, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, Universe Books, New York, (1972).
19. D.H. Meadows et al., *Beyond the Limits. Confronting Global Collapse and Envisioning a Sustainable Future*, Chelsea Green Publishing, Post Mills, Vermont, (1992).
20. D.H. Meadows, J. Randers and D.L. Meadows, *Limits to Growth: the 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Jct., VT 05001, (2004).
21. A. Peccei and D. Ikeda, *Before it is Too Late*, Kodansha International, Tokyo, (1984).
22. A. Peccei, *The Human Quality*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, (1977).
23. A. Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1977).

24. V.K. Smith, ed., *Scarcity and Growth Reconsidered*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1979).
25. R. Costanza, ed., *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1991).
26. M. McCarthy, *China Crisis: Threat to the Global Environment*, The Independent, (19 October, 2005).
27. L.R. Brown, *The Twenty-Ninth Day*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1978).
28. N. Myers, *The Sinking Ark*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).
29. N. Myers, *Conservation of Tropical Moist Forests*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C., (1980).
30. National Academy of Sciences, *Energy and Climate*, NAS, Washington D.C., (1977).
31. W. Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1977).
32. E. Eckholm, *Losing Ground: Environmental Stress and World Food Prospects*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1975).
33. E. Eckholm, *The Picture of Health: Environmental Sources of Disease*, New York, (1976).
34. Economic Commission for Europe, *Air Pollution Across Boundaries*, United Nations, New York, (1985).
35. G. Hagman and others, *Prevention is Better Than Cure*, Report on Human Environmental Disasters in the Third World, Swedish Red Cross, Stockholm, Stockholm, (1986).
36. G. Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons", *Science*, December 13, (1968).
37. K. Newland, *Infant Mortality and the Health of Societies*, Worldwatch Paper 47, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1981).
38. D.W. Orr, *Ecological Literacy*, State University of New York Press, Albany, (1992).
39. E. Pestel, *Beyond the Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York, (1989).
40. D.C. Pirages and P.R. Ehrlich, *Ark II: Social Responses to Environmental Imperatives*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, (1974).
41. Population Reference Bureau, *World Population Data Sheet*, PRM, 777 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington D.C. 20007, (published annually).
42. R. Pressat, *Population*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1970).
43. M. Rechcigl (ed.), *Man/Food Equation*, Academic Press, New York, (1975).
44. J.C. Ryan, *Life Support: Conserving Biological Diversity*, Worldwatch Paper 108, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1992).
45. J. Shepard, *The Politics of Starvation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1975).
46. B. Stokes, *Local Responses to Global Problems: A Key to Meeting Basic Human Needs*, Worldwatch Paper 17, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1978).
47. L. Timberlake, *Only One Earth: Living for the Future*, BBC/ Earthscan, London, (1987).
48. UNEP, *Environmental Data Report*, Blackwell, Oxford, (published annually).

49. UNESCO, *International Coordinating Council of Man and the Biosphere*, MAB Report Series No. 58, Paris, (1985).
50. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *A Bibliography of United Nations Publications on Population*, United Nations, New York, (1977).
51. United Nations Fund for Population Activities, *The State of World Population*, UNPF, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, 10017, (published annually).
52. United Nations Secretariat, *World Population Prospects Beyond the Year 2000*, U.N., New York, (1973).
53. J. van Klinken, *Het Dierde Punte*, Uitgiversmaatschappij J.H. Kok-Kampen, Netherlands (1989).
54. B. Ward and R. Dubos, *Only One Earth*, Penguin Books Ltd., (1973).
55. WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF, *The Reproductive Health of Adolescents: A Strategy for Action*, World Health Organization, Geneva, (1989).
56. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press, (1975).
57. E.O. Wilson (ed.), *Biodiversity*, National Academy Press, Washington D.C., (1988).
58. E.O. Wilson, *The Diversity of Life*, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, London, (1992).
59. G. Woodwell (ed.), *The Earth in Transition: Patterns and Processes of Biotic Impoverishment*, Cambridge University Press, (1990).
60. World Resources Institute (WRI), *Global Biodiversity Strategy*, The World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), (1992).
61. World Resources Institute, *World Resources 200-2001: People and Ecosystems: The Fraying Web of Life*, WRI, Washington D.C., (2000).
62. D.W. Pearce and R.K. Turner, *Economics of Natural Resources and the Environment*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, (1990).
63. T. Jackson, *Material Concerns: Pollution, Profit and the Quality of Life*, Routledge, (2004).
64. T. Jackson, *Motivating Sustainable Consumption*, Report to the Sustainable Development Research Network, January (2005).
65. T. Jackson, *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Consumption*, Earthscan, (2006).
66. J.S. Avery, *Information Theory and Evolution, 2nd Edition*, World Scientific, (2012).
67. A.J. Lotka, *Elements of Mathematical Biology*, Dover, (1956).
68. E.O. Wilson *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, Harvard University Press, (1975).
69. E.O. Wilson, *The Superorganism: The Beauty, Elegance, and Strangeness of Insect Societies*, W.W. Norton, (2009).
70. F. Soddy, *Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt. The solution of the economic paradox*, George Allen and Unwin, (1926).
71. F. Soddy, *The Role of Money*, George Routledge and Sons, London, (1934)
72. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Energy and Economic Myths : Institutional and Analytical Economic Essays*, Pergamon Press, (1976).
73. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*, Harvard University Press, (1971).
74. J. Rifkin and T. Howard, *Entropy: A New World View* The Viking Press, New York (1980).

75. P. Bartelmus, *Environment, Growth and Development: The Concepts and Strategies of Sustainability*, Routledge, New York, (1994).
76. H.E. Daly and K.N. Townsend, (editors), *Valuing the Earth. Economics, Ecology, Ethics*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1993)
77. C. Flavin, *Slowing Global Warming: A Worldwide Strategy*, Worldwatch Paper 91, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C., (1989).
78. S.H. Schneider, *The Genesis Strategy: Climate and Global Survival*, Plenum Press, (1976).
79. WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF, *The Reproductive Health of Adolescents: A Strategy for Action*, World Health Organization, Geneva, (1989).
80. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
81. W. Jackson, *Man and the Environment*, W.C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, (1971).
82. T. Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, (1988).
83. T.M. Swanson, ed., *The Economics and Ecology of Biodiversity Decline: The Forces Driving Global Change*, Cambridge University Press, (1995).
84. F.H. Bormann, *Unlimited Growth: Growing, Growing, and Gone?*, *BioScience* 22: 706-9, (1972).
85. L.G. Brookes, *A Low-Energy Strategy for the United Kingdom*, *Atom* 269: 73-8, (1979).
86. J. Cherfas, *Skeptics and Visionaries Examine Energy Saving*, *Science* 251: 154-6, (1991).
87. C.J. Cleveland, *Energy Quality and Energy Surplus in the Extraction of Fossil Fuels in the US*, *Ecological Economics* 6: 139-62, (1992).
88. C.J. Cleveland, Robert Costanza, Charlie A.S. Hall and Robert Kaufmann, *Energy and the US Economy: A Biophysical Perspective*, *Science* 225 (4665): 890-7, (1984).
89. P. Cloud, *Entropy, Materials, and Prosperity*, *Geologische Rundschau* 66: 678-96, (1978).
90. H.E. Daly, *From Empty-World Economics to Full-World Economics: Recognizing a Historical Turning Point in Economic Development*, in R. Goodland, H. E. Daly and S. Serafy (eds) *Population, Technology, and Lifestyle*, pp. 23-37. Washington, DC: Island Press, (1992).
91. H.E. Daly, *On Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen's Contributions to Economics: An Obituary Essay*, *Ecological Economics* 13: 149-54, (1995).
92. H.E. Daly, *Georgescu-Roegen versus Solow/Stiglitz*, *Ecological Economics* 22: 267-8, (1997).
93. M. Eigen, *Selforganization of Matter and the Evolution of Biological Macro- molecules*, *Naturwissenschaften* 58(10): 465-523, (1971).
94. S.O. Funtowicz and Jerry R. Ravetz, *Post Normal Science: A New Science for New Times*, *Scientific European* 266: 20-2, (1990).
95. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Fixed Coefficients of Production and the Marginal Productivity Theory*, *Review of Economic Studies* 3: 40-9, (1935a).

96. N. Georgescu-Roegen, (1935b) *Note on a Proposition of Pareto*, Quarterly Journal of Economics 49: 706-14.
97. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Marginal Utility of Money and Elasticities of Demand*, Quarterly Journal of Economics 50: 533-9, (1936a).
98. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Pure Theory of Consumer's Behavior*, Quarterly Journal of Economics 50: 545-93, (1936b).
99. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Process in Farming versus Process in Manufacturing: A Problem of Balanced Development*, in U. Papi and C. Nunn (eds) *Economic Problems of Agriculture in Industrial Societies*, pp. 497-528. London: Macmillan, (1969).
100. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, (1971).
101. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Energy and Economic Myths*, Southern Economic Journal 41: 347-81, (1975).
102. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Energy and Economic Myths*. New York: Pergamon Press, (1976).
103. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Inequality, Limits and Growth from a Bioeconomic Viewpoint*, Review of Social Economy 35: 361-75, (1977a).
104. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Steady State and Ecological Salvation: A Thermodynamic Analysis*, BioScience 27: 266-70, (1977b).
105. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Energy Analysis and Economic Valuation*, Southern Economic Journal 45: 1023-58, (1979a).
106. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Methods in Economic Science*, Journal of Economic Issues 13 (2): 317-28, (1979b).
107. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Methods in Economic Science: A Rejoinder*, Economic Issues 15: 188-93, (1981).
108. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Promethean Condition of Viable Technologies*, Materials and Society 7: 425-35, (1983).
109. Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas, *Man and Production*, in M. Baranzini and R. Scazzieri (eds) *Foundations of Economics: Structures of Inquiry and Economic Theory*, pp. 247-80. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, (1986).
110. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *An Emigrant from a Developing Country: Autobiographical Notes-I*, Banca Nazionale del Lavoro Quarterly Review 164: 3-31, (1988a).
111. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *The Interplay between Institutional and Material Factors: The Problem and Its Status*, in J.A. Kregel, E. Matzner and A. Roncaglia (eds) *Barriers to Employment*, pp. 297-326. London: Macmillan, (1988b).
112. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Production Process and Dynamic Economics*, in M. Baranzini and R. Scazzieri (eds) *The Economic Theory of Structure and Change*, pp. 198-226. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1990).
113. N. Georgescu-Roegen, *Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen about Himself*, in M. Szenberg (ed.) *Eminent Economists: Their Life Philosophies*, pp. 128-59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1992).

114. J. Gever, Robert Kaufmann, David Skole and Charles Vörösmarty, *Beyond Oil: The Threat to Food and Fuel in the Coming Decades*, Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, (1991).
115. M. Giampietro, *Sustainability and Technological Development in Agriculture: A Critical Appraisal of Genetic Engineering*, *BioScience* 44(10): 677-89, (1994).
116. M. Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi, *Another View of Development, Ecological Degradation and North-South Trade*, *Review of Social Economy* 56: 21-37, (1998).
117. M. Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi, *The Biofuel Delusion: The Fallacy of Large Scale Agro-biofuel Production*, London: Earthscan, (2009).
118. R. Goldschmidt, *Some Aspects of Evolution*, *Science* 78: 539-47, (1933).
119. S.J. Gould, *The Return to Hopeful Monsters*, *Natural History* 86: 22-30, (1977).
120. S.J. Gould and Niles Eldredge, *Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered*, *Paleobiology* 3: 115-51, (1977).
121. J. Gowdy, *The Value of Biodiversity: Markets, Society and Ecosystems*, *Land Economics* 73(1): 25-41, (1997).
122. J. Gribbin, *The Death of the Sun* New York: Delacorte Press, (1980).
123. C.A.S. Hall, Cutler J. Cleveland and Robert Kaufman, *Energy and Resource Quality* New York: John Wiley and Sons, (1986).
124. S.R. Ichtiaque and Stephen H. Schneider, *Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide and Aerosols: Effects of Large Increases on Global Climate*, *Science* 173: 138-41, (1971).
125. K. Ito, *Setting Goals and Action Plan for Energy Efficiency Improvement*. Paper presented at the EAS Energy Efficiency and Conservation Conference, Tokyo (19 June), (2007).
126. F. Jevons, *Greenhouse: A Paradox*, *Search* 21: 171-2, (1990).
127. W.S. Jevons, *The Coal Question* (reprint of 3rd edn, 1906). New York: Augustus M. Kelley, (1965).
128. N. Kawamiya, *Entropii to Kougyoushakai no Sentaku (Entropy and Future Choices for the Industrial Society)*, Tokyo: Kaimei, (1983).
129. J.D. Khazzoom, *Economic Implications of Mandated Efficiency Standards for Household Appliances*, *Energy Journal* 1: 21-39, (1980).
130. J.D. Khazzoom, *Energy Saving Resulting from the Adoption of More Efficient Appliances*, *Energy Journal* 8: 85-9, (1987).
131. T.C. Koopmans, *Three Essays on the State of Economic Science*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, (1957).
132. T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, (1962).
133. J. von Liebig, *Letters on Modern Agriculture* (J. Blyth ed.). New York: John Wiley, (1959).
134. A.J. Lotka, *Elements of Mathematical Biology*, New York: Dover Publications, (1956).
135. G. Luft, *Fueling the Dragon: China's Race Into the Oil Market*. <http://www.iags.org/china.htm>, (2007).
136. K. Mayumi, *The Origins of Ecological Economics: The Bioeconomics of Georgescu-Roegen*, London: Routledge, (2001).

137. K. Mayumi, *An Epistemological Critique of the Open Leontief Dynamic Model: Balanced and Sustained Growth, Delays, and Anticipatory Systems Theory*, *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 16: 540-56m (2005).
138. K. Mayumi, Mario Giampietro and John Gowdy, *Georgescu-Roegen/Daly versus Solow/Stiglitz Revisited*, *Ecological Economics* 27: 115-17. Legacies: Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen 1253, (1998).
139. W.H. Miernyk, *Economic Growth Theory and the Georgescu-Roegen Paradigm*, in K. Mayumi and J. Gowdy (eds) *Bioeconomics and Sustainability: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen*, pp. 69-81. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, (1999).
140. Newman, Peter, *Greenhouse, Oil and Cities*, *Futures* May: 335-48, (1991).
141. D. Pearce, *Substitution and Sustainability: Some Reflections on Georgescu-Roegen*, *Ecological Economics* 22: 295-7, (1997).
142. D. Pearce, Edward Barbier and Anil Markandya, *Sustainable Development*, Hampshire: Edward Elgar, (1990).
143. J. Polimeni, Kozo Mayumi, Mario Giampietro and Blake Alcott, *The Jevons Paradox and the Myth of Resource Efficiency Improvements*, London: Earthscan, (2008).
144. J.F. Randolph, *Basic Real and Abstract Analysis*, New York: Academic Press, (1968).
145. D. Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, in P. Sraffa (ed.) *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1951).
146. E. Schrödinger, *What is Life? With Mind and Matter and Autobiographical Sketches*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1967).
147. J.A. Schumpeter, *The Theory of Economic Development*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Economic Press, (1951).
148. G.T. Seaborg, *The Erehwon Machine: Possibilities for Reconciling Goals by Way of New Technology*, in S.H. Schurr (ed.) *Energy, Economic Growth, and the Environment*, pp. 125-38. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, (1972).
149. M.R. Simmons, *Twilight in the Desert: The Coming Saudi Oil Shock and the World Economy* New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., (2005).
150. B.J. Skinner, *Earth Resource (3rd edn)*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, (1986).
151. V. Smil, *Global Catastrophes and Trends: The Next Fifty Years* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, (2008).
152. R. Solow, *Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function*, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 39: 312-20, (1957).
153. R. Solow, *The Economics of Resources or the Resources of Economics*, *American Economic Review* 64: 1-14, (1974).
154. R.E. Ulanowicz, *Growth and Development: Ecosystem Phenomenology* New York: Springer-Verlag, (1986).
155. US Geological Survey, *Commodity Statistics and Information*, (2005).
156. G.K. Zipf, *National Unity and Disunity: The Nation as a Bio-social Organism*. Bloomington, IN: Principia Press, (1941).
157. John Fielden, *The Curse of the Factory System*, (1836).

158. A. Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments...* (1759), ed. D.D. Raphael and A.L. MacPhie, Clarendon, Oxford, (1976).
159. A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), Everyman edn., 2 vols., Dent, London, (1910).
160. Charles Knowlton *The Fruits of Philosophy, or The Private Companion of Young Married People*, (1832).
161. John A. Hobson, *John Ruskin, Social Reformer*, (1898).
162. E. Pease, *A History of the Fabian Society*, Dutton, New York, (1916).
163. G. Claey's, ed., *New View of Society, and other writings by Robert Owen*, Penguin Classics, (1991).
164. W. Bowden, *Industrial Society in England Towards the End of the Eighteenth Century*, MacMillan, New York, (1925).
165. G.D. Cole, *A Short History of the British Working Class Movement*, MacMillan, New York, (1927).
166. P. Deane, *The First Industrial Revolution*, Cambridge University Press, (1969).
167. Marie Boaz, *Robert Boyle and Seventeenth Century Chemistry*, Cambridge University Press (1958).
168. J.G. Crowther, *Scientists of the Industrial Revolution*, The Cresset Press, London (1962).
169. R.E. Schofield, *The Lunar Society of Birmingham*, Oxford University Press (1963).
170. L.T.C. Rolt, *Isambard Kingdom Brunel*, Arrow Books, London (1961).
171. J.D. Bernal, *Science in History*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1969).
172. Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society*, Unwin Books, London (1952).
173. Wilbert E. Moore, *The Impact of Industry*, Prentice Hall (1965).
174. Charles Morazé, *The Nineteenth Century*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London (1976).
175. Carlo M. Cipolla (editor), *The Fontana Economic History of Europe*, Fontana/Collins, Glasgow (1977).
176. Martin Gerhard Geisbrecht, *The Evolution of Economic Society*, W.H. Freeman and Co. (1972).
177. P.N. Stearns, *The Industrial Revolution in World History*, Westview Press, (1998).
178. E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, Pennguin Books, London, (1980).
179. N.J. Smelser, *Social Change and the Industrial Revolution: An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry*, University of Chicago Press, (1959).

Index

- A new economic system, 311, 318
- A new Joan of Arc, 197
- A new society, 311
- Abolition of child labor, 309, 320
- Abolition of nuclear weapons, 93, 125
- Abolition of war, 93, 119, 125, 320, 321
- Abrupt climate change, 193
- Absolutely sovereign nation-states, 226
- Accelerated melting, 188
- Acceptance of birth control, 309
- Accident waiting to happen, 102, 132
- Accidental nuclear war, 101, 119, 125, 131, 137
- Accidents, 133
- Acid rain, 299
- Acidification of oceans, 184
- Act of Valor, 115
- Administration of property, 23
- Adverse effects of globalization, 308
- Advertising agencies, 300
- Africa, 49, 52, 55, 57, 108
- African Union, 257
- Agent Orange, 123
- Agricultural societies, 21
- Agricultural yields, 52
- Agriculture, 16, 53, 103, 105, 127, 299
- Aid to underdeveloped countries, 312
- Air pollution in China, 163
- Air travel, 193
- Airbus, 111
- Al-Qaeda, 107, 136
- Albedo effect, 181, 188, 193, 317
- Albert Szent Györgyi, 321
- Albury, 11
- Alfred Lotka, 303
- Algeria, 180
- Alimentary canal, 303
- Alternative media, 313
- Altruism, 13
- Amazon deforestation causes, 250
- Amazon rainforest, 208, 250
- Amazon rainforest dieback, 193
- American Indians, 18
- American Sniper, 115
- Americium, 137
- Anderson, Kevin, 222, 223
- Anglican Church, 10
- Angola, 180
- Animal feed, 54
- Annan, Kofi, 104, 136
- Anne H. Ehrlich, 259
- Annihilation of modesty, 309
- Antarctic sea ice loss, 193
- Anthropocene, 115
- Anthropocene Extinction, 187
- Anthropogenic climate change, 137
- Anthropology, 300
- Anti-Catholic laws, 33
- Anti-war activists, 318
- Antimalarial program, 119
- Antonio Guterres, 94
- Anxiety about the future, 121
- Apprentices, 308
- Aquifers, 52, 55
- Arable land, 49, 254
- Arctic methane release, 193
- Arctic permafrost, 223
- Arctic sea ice loss, 188, 193
- Arctic sea-ice, 317
- Are we evil?, 195

- Area of cropland, 52
 Area under food production, 53
 Argentina, 48
 Arid grasslands, 52
 Aridity, 54
 Armaments (\$2 trillion spent on), 119
 Arms control agreements, 115
 Arms manufacturers' profits, 315
 Army training program, 115
 Arrhenius, Svante, 193
 Art, 297, 318
 Article VI, 101, 131
 Articles dominated by trivia, 227
 Asia, 133
 Asphalt melting, 173
 Assassination attempts, 136
 Assumptions of classical economics, 304
 Asteroids, 101, 131
 Asylum, 122
 Atmospheric water vapor, 188
 Attack on the Amazon rainforest, 250
 Attenborough, Sir David, 196, 226
 Aurelio Peccei, 297
 Australia, 48
 Automated agriculture, 11
 Automation, 299
 Avoidance of energy waste, 312

 Baby Tooth Survey, 267
 BAE Systems, 111
 Bailouts of banks, 295
 Bangladesh, 158
 Bangladesh under water, 223
 Banking and government, 295
 Barack Obama, 264
 Barnaby, Frank, 136
 Baron Stern of Brentford, 171
 Barry Commoner, 267
 Bedjaoui, Muhammad, 100, 130
 Bee populations declining, 242
 Bee-keeping, 257
 Beef and methane, 250
 Beef Industry in South America, 250
 Beef killing the rainforest, 250
 Behind Enemy Lines, 115
 Belarus, 133
 Belt of Tar, 175
 Benevolence, 23
 Bernard Lowen, 125
 Betrayal of Science, 260
 Beyond Growth, 312
 Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali, 135
 Big coal and oil corporations, 227
 Bilateral agreements, 180
 Biodiversity, 221
 Biodiversity loss, 184
 Biological annihilation, 187
 Biological diversity, 187
 Biology, 299
 Biology and Society, 259
 Biology of Natural Systems, 267
 Biomass, 303
 Biophysical capacity, 220
 Biosphere, 181
 Biosphere is being sacrificed, 215
 Birth anomalies, 124
 Birth control, 22, 62, 255, 309
 Birth control programs, 46, 62
 Birth rates, 10, 300, 319
 Black Hawk Down, 115
 Blackmail, 314
 Blair, Bruce G., 102, 132
 Blight, 33
 Blood for oil, 180
 Boeing, 111
 Bohr, Niels, 134
 Bohr-Wheeler theory, 134
 Bolsonaro, Jair, 208, 250
 Boreal forest dieback, 193
 Borel's Statistical Mechanics, 306
 Borlaug, Norman, 49
 Boterro, 9
 Bottom line, 315
 Bounties of nature, 23
 Brazil, 49
 Brazil subsidizes beef industry, 250

- Brazil's economy, 177
 Brazil's offshore oil, 177
 Brazil's presalt oil, 181
 Breivik, Anders Behring, 117
 Brexit, 115
 British Labour Party, 309
 British North Sea oil, 178
 Brown, Lester R., 55
 Brundtland Report, 53, 54
 Bulgaria bans fracking, 175
 Burning of peatlands, 249
 Business as usual, 181
 Bypassing the need for grids, 167

 Cairo population conference, 63
 Call of Duty, 117
 Calogero, Francesco, 104
 Cambridge University, 10
 Canada, 48
 Canadian government, 175
 Canadian oil sands, 174
 Cancer caused by radioactivity, 124
 Cannibalism, 18
 Canute, 24
 Capital, 299
 Captain Cook, 18
 Carbon bubble, 158
 Carbon budget, 158, 197, 228
 Carbon dioxide, 295, 299
 Carbon footprint, 197
 Carbon Tracker Initiative, 158
 Carbon-negative world, 222
 Carrying capacity, 23, 48, 297, 299
 Catastrophic climate change, 158, 173, 179, 181, 193, 207, 219, 295, 302, 312, 317, 318
 Catastrophic future famine, 320
 Catastrophic mistake, 102, 132
 Catastrophic nuclear war, 104, 105, 124, 127
 Cattle ranching in Amazonia, 250
 Causes of Amazon deforestation, 250
 Ceballos, Gerardo, 187
 Celibacy, 17

 Census, 25
 Central Asia, 19
 Cerrado, 49
 Chad, 110
 Chain of causes, 11
 Chain-reacting pile, 134
 Chance of survival, 104
 Change is coming, 215
 Change of diet, 254
 Change the system, 215
 Checks to population growth, 18, 21, 255
 Chemical pesticides, 244
 Chemical properties, 134
 Chemical warfare, 123
 Chernobyl disaster, 133
 Child labor, 19, 309
 Child soldiers, 121
 Children killed by wars, 99, 130
 Children killed in war, 120
 China, 52, 55, 62, 110
 China's coal, 181
 China's Great Green Wall, 257
 China's palm oil demand, 250
 China's use of coal, 171
 China, air pollution, 163
 China, rapid industrial expansion, 171
 Chinese Foreign Minister's statement, 96
 Chinese public opinion, 163
 Chronic war, 321
 Citizens Party, 267
 Civil society, 104
 Civil wars, 108, 120
 Civilian victims of war, 99, 130
 Civilians are hostages, 119
 Civilians as targets, 104
 Civilians killed in war, 120
 Civilization coming to an end, 224
 Clark, General Wesley, 107
 Classical economists, 299
 Clean energy, 225
 Climate action, 272
 Climate and environment, 115

- Climate change, 46, 52, 54, 133, 137, 181, 295, 302
- Climate change emission pledges, 184
- Climate crisis, 197, 200, 224
- Climate emergency, 181, 207, 218, 225
- Climate financing, 185
- Climate justice, 195
- Climate Justice Now, 215
- Climate tipping points, 193
- Climate-driven refugees, 208
- Closed system, 302
- Club of Rome, 297
- Cluster bombs, 123
- Coal, 137
- Coal per capita, 179
- Coal produced in Germany, 177
- Coal produced in Poland, 177
- Coal producers, 179
- Coal production in India, 173
- Coal reserves in China, 171
- Cold War, 101, 108, 119, 131
- Coleridge, William, 25
- Collapse of environment, 299
- Collapse of our civilization, 196, 226
- Collapse of population, 299
- Collective greed, 315
- Collective paranoia, 119
- Colombia, 180
- Come with a plan, 207
- Commoner's US presidential campaign, 267
- Commoner, Barry, 267
- Competition for territory, 21
- Computer games, 115
- Computer models, 297
- Computer networks, 303
- Computer software, 297
- Concerns are justified, 204
- Concubinage, 22
- Condorcet, Marquis de, 13, 15, 22
- Conflict-related deaths, 255
- Conscience, 25
- Conspicuous consumption, 300
- Construction and maintenance, 53
- Consumption lacking upper bound, 300
- Consumption of fossil fuels, 303
- Consumption per capita, 299
- Consumption-oriented values, 301
- Container ships, 136
- Continued extraction of fossil fuels, 171
- Contracting economy, 296
- Conversations with our families, 318
- Cooking, 53
- Cooperative banks, 305
- COP24, 213, 225
- Corbyn, Jeremy, 218
- Core meltdown, 133
- Corn Laws, 31
- Corn silk, 54
- Corporate greed, 315
- Corporate profits, 315
- Corporations, 310
- Corrupt governments, 180, 249
- Corruption of morals, 26
- Cosmetics and palm oil, 250
- Cosmic forces, 322
- Counterfeit money, 296
- Coup in Venezuela, 175
- COVID-19, 85
- Creating jobs, 170
- Creative Class, 297
- Cretaceous-Paleogene Extinction, 185
- Crime, 13, 23
- Crisis of civilization, 320
- Critical mass, 134, 136
- Crop failures, 54
- Cropland, 57, 299
- Cropland per capita, 58, 62
- Cropland per capita decreasing, 319
- Cropland, area of, 52
- Cropland, limitations on, 49
- Cruelty, 308
- Cuban Missile Crisis, 93
- Cultural activities, 297
- Cultural inertia, 227
- Culture, 295
- Culture of violence, 108, 115

- Cumulative risk, 104
- Currency reform, 305
- Current annual emissions, 173
- Cyclical components of phenomena, 305
- Czech Republic bans fracking, 175

- Dakar, 257
- Damage to infrastructure, 123
- Danger of nuclear war, 93
- Dangers of nuclear power, 133
- Danish wind industry, 169
- Dark side of government, 313
- Darkened snow, 188
- Darwin's Autobiography , 36
- Darwin's Origin of Species, 36
- Darwin, Charles, 13, 36
- David Pimental, 319
- Davos Economic Forum, 197
- DDT, 242, 244
- Death rate, 10
- Deaths from heat, 255
- Debt at compound interest, 304
- Debt crisis, 304
- Decay of democracy, 97
- Decay of real wealth, 304
- Declaration of Human Rights, 122, 314, 321
- Decrease in population, 312
- Deepwater Horizon, 177
- Deforestation, 57, 58, 319
- Deforestation in Amazonia, 250
- Degradation of agricultural land, 319
- Degradation of free energy, 304
- Degradation of grasslands, 299
- Degradation of topsoil, 58, 242
- Degraded form, 303
- Demand, 52
- Democratic Republic of Congo, 110
- Demographic studies, 22
- Demographic transition, 320
- Demographic trap, 62, 319
- Demography, 19
- Density of population, 301
- Departments of Defense, 315
- Dependable source of income, 310
- Depleted uranium shells, 123
- Depletion of minerals in soil, 52
- Depositors, 296
- Desertification, 52, 255, 299
- Destroying the earth, 296
- Destruction of forests, 57, 158
- Destruction of habitats, 187
- Destruction of rainforests, 310
- Deterrence, flaws in concept, 99, 129
- Developing countries, 167, 180, 300, 311, 319
- Developing world, 184
- Development, 62, 120
- Devil's Dynamo, 97
- Dickens, Charles, 26
- Dictatorships, 180
- Dietary changes can help, 254
- Diplomatic solution to Ukraine war, 94
- Direct costs of war, 119
- Directly used fuels, 137
- Dirt huts, 10
- Dirty wars, 313
- Dirzo, Rudolfo, 187
- Disappointment, 9
- Disarmament, 99, 130
- Disease, 15, 18, 19, 21, 110
- Disease-resistant strains, 49
- Diseases related to poverty, 120
- Disorder, 302
- Dispersal of minerals, 304
- Dissenting Academy, 10
- Distanced from killing, 117
- Distribution problems, 52
- Djibouti, 257
- Domestication of animals, 21
- Double-think totalitarian state, 220
- Drone operators, 117
- Drought, 52, 184
- Drying of forests and fires, 192
- Durable goods, 307
- Dysentery, 61, 319

- Earth is our mother, 272

- Earth Policy Institute, 162, 317, 318
 Earth's entire land surface, 254
 Earthquakes, 175
 East Asia, 110
 Eastern Asia, 49
 Eastern Europe, 133
 Ecological breakdown, 224
 Ecological conscience, 227, 311, 318
 Ecological constraints, 295, 312
 Ecological damage, 123
 Ecological footprint, 220, 297
 Economic activity, 297
 Economic collapse, 307
 Economic growth, 295, 312
 Economic inequality, 15
 Economic influence, 97
 Economic justice, 257
 Economic reform, 302
 Economic stability, 302
 Economic tipping point, 167
 Economic waste, 138
 Economics of Climate Change, 171
 Economists, 295
 Economy as a digestive system, 303
 Economy of Brazil, 177
 Economy of exclusion, 314
 Economy's circulatory system, 307
 Economy's digestive tract, 307
 Ecosphere, 307
 Ecosystem functioning, 187
 Education, 11, 119, 297
 Education of women, 63, 320
 Edward Snowden, 313
 Effects of war on children, 121
 Ehrlich, Anne H., 259
 Ehrlich, Paul R., 187, 259
 Eisenhower's farewell address, 97
 ElBaradei, Mohamed, 102, 104, 137
 Elderly homeless persons, 314
 Electric cars, 168
 Electric vehicles, 169
 Electrical generating plants, 123
 Electrical networks, 303
 Electricity generation, 135, 137
 Electronic spying, 314
 Eliminating democracy, 314
 Elisabeth I, Queen, 24
 Elon Musk, 169
 Emergency, 218
 Emissions have to stop, 194
 Empty-world picture, 299
 End of fossil fuel era, 303
 Endemic conflict, 110
 Endosomatic parts, 303
 Energy, 185, 264
 Energy crisis, 133
 Energy demand, global, 162
 Energy efficiency, 158
 Energy inputs of agriculture, 52
 Energy use per capita, 162
 Energy-intensive agriculture, 48, 53
 Enlightenment, 9
 Enrichment, 102
 Entertaining ourselves to death, 227
 Entropic process, 312
 Entropic transformation, 306
 Entropy, 304
 Entropy and economics, 302, 305
 Environment, 11
 Environmental destruction, 309
 Environmental ethics, 301
 Environmental holocaust, 123
 Environmental reforms, 310
 Environmentalists, 318
 Envy, 11
 Epidemics, 120
 Equilibrium with the environment, 301
 Equity, 135, 195
 Eradication of smallpox, 119
 Eritria, 110
 Erosion, 57, 299
 Escalatory cycles of violence, 99, 129
 Esquisse, 13
 Essay on Government, 10
 Essay on Population, 9
 Essay on Population, 2nd Ed., 22, 25

- Ethical principles, 99, 129
- Ethical values, 301
- Ethics, 11
- Ethiopia, 110
- Europe, 158
- European dependence on natural gas, 174
- European Parliament, 205
- Evangelii Gaudium, 314
- Evil, 23
- Evo Morales, 313
- Evolution, 13, 15
- Excessive economic inequality, 314
- Excrementous matter, 309
- Exhaustion of petroleum, 312
- Existential risk, 219
- Existential risk to civilization, 222
- Exosomatic parts, 303
- Expansion of the money supply, 296, 304
- Exploding population, 319
- Exponential growth, 16, 162, 228, 295, 299, 318
- Exponential increase, 304
- Exponential index for resources, 297
- Exponential industrial growth, 312
- Extinction of marine species, 186
- Extinction of terrestrial vertebrates, 186
- Extinction Rebellion, 218
- Extortion, 136
- Extravagant gadgetry, 307, 312
- Extreme heatwaves, 223
- Extreme-weather events, 222

- Fabian Society, 309
- Factories, 303
- Failure of epic proportions, 220
- Failure to respond adequately, 226
- Fake news, 221
- Fallout, 100, 130
- Family of Man, 322
- Family planning, 62, 255
- Family size, 17
- Famine, 15, 18, 21, 48, 55, 63, 103, 120, 255
- Famine relief, 119
- FAO, 49, 250, 254
- Farm buildings, 53
- Fashion, 312
- Fast breeder reactors, 135
- Fast neutrons, 135
- Fatal accident, 102
- Favelas, 61, 319
- Fear and conformity, 314
- Federal Reserve, 296
- Feed for livestock, 254
- Feedback loop, definition, 188
- Feedback loops, 158, 181, 223, 302, 317
- Feedstocks for fertilizer, 53
- Feedstocks for pesticides, 53
- Fermi, Enrico, 134
- Fertilizers, 52
- Field machinery, 53
- Films that glorify war, 115
- Finite earth, 295, 297, 312
- Finite supply of fossil fuels, 159
- Finland, 133
- Fire storms, 93, 105, 127
- Firebombing of Dresden, 99, 130
- Fires ignited by lightning, 158
- First professor of economics, 31
- Fission of uranium, 134
- Fission reaction, 124
- Fissionable isotopes, 104, 134
- Fissionable materials, 136
- Floods, 184
- Florida under water, 223
- Focus on what needs to be done, 213
- Food and Agricultural Organization, 250, 254
- Food calorie outputs, 53
- Food calories per capita, 54
- Food per capita, 57
- Food processing, 257
- Food production, 49
- Food shortages, 24
- Food supply, 15, 19
- Food-exporting countries, 48
- For the Common Good, 312
- Forced labor, 310

- Forest destruction, 158
- Forest die-back, 223
- Forest drying and wildfires, 256
- Forest drying feedback loop, 256
- Forest fires, 192
- Forest loss, 57
- Forest loss and population, 254
- Forest resources, 255
- Forestry, 257
- Forests, 299
- Forge of Empires, 117
- Former Soviet Republic, 49
- Former Soviet Union, 110
- Fosen project, 170
- Fossil fuel corporations, 167
- Fossil fuel energy inputs, 53
- Fossil fuel extraction must stop, 196, 226
- Fossil fuel industry, 175
- Fossil fuel producers, 178
- Fossil fuels, 52, 158, 226, 228, 295, 302, 303, 312, 317
- Fossil fuels, continued extraction, 171
- Fossil fuels, rate of use, 162
- Fourth Amendment, 314
- Fracking, 175
- Fracking banned by 9 countries, 175
- Fractional reserve banking, 295, 304
- Fragile ecological systems, 302
- Framework Convention, 184
- France, 110
- France bans fracking, 175
- France bans internal combustion engine, 168
- Franklin, Benjamin, 9
- Fraud, 11
- Frederick Soddy, 296, 304
- Free energy, 302, 303
- Free energy and wealth, 304
- French Revolution, 9
- Fridays for the Future, 200
- Fuel cells, 167
- Full Spectrum Warrior, 115
- Full-world economics, 299, 307
- Fully electric cars, 168
- Fusion energy, 138
- Future collapse, 299
- Future dangers, 181
- Future generations, 205, 301
- Future human needs, 220
- Future of human civilization, 181
- Game for power and money, 315
- Gas production, 179
- GATT, 310
- General Dynamics, 111
- General good, 11
- Genetic pool, 124
- Genocide, 99, 129
- Geological extinction events, 295
- Geometrical growth, 16
- George Orwell, 314
- Geothermal energy, 303
- German production of coal, 177
- Germanic tribes, 19
- Germany bans fracking, 175
- Germany bans internal combustion engine, 168
- Get rid of fashion, 307
- Giampietro, Mario, 53
- Gigawatts (GW), 161
- Glacial periods, 55
- Glaciation, 187
- Global catastrophic risk, 224
- Global Challenges Foundation, 223, 224
- Global Climate Disruption, 264
- Global climate strike, 200
- Global commons, 318
- Global cooperation, 297
- Global economic interdependence, 310
- Global environment, 297, 299
- Global governance, 46
- Global hegemony, 110
- Global inequalities, 204
- Global power, 110
- Global production of coal, 179
- Global temperature, 181
- Global warming, 52, 133, 137, 184, 204, 248

- Gobi desert, 255
 Godwin's Utopia, 23
 Godwin, William, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 21–23, 26
 Gold standard, 305
 Goodman, Amy, 107, 218
 Goods, 297
 Government birth control programs, 320
 Governmental secrecy, 313
 Gradual decrease in population, 307
 Grain production, 57
 Grameen bank, 305
 Graphite moderator, 134
 Grasslands, 52
 Grave implications, 97
 Great Green Wall, 257
 Great-power competition, 110
 Greece, 296
 Greed, 315
 Green Belt Movement, 257
 Green Berets, 115
 Green Revolution, 49, 52
 Greenhouse effect, 188
 Greenland, 133
 Greenland ice cores, 193
 Greta Thunberg's TED talk, 193
 Grey, Colin S., 102, 132
 Gross National Product, 295, 299
 Groundwater, 55
 Growth, 295
 Growth implies future collapse, 227
 Growth of culture, 295, 312
 Growth of knowledge, 295, 312
 Growth of population, 24
 Growth of population and industry, 227
 Growth-worship, 296
 Guardian, 218
 Guilt, 99, 129
 Gulf War of 1990, 123
 Gun-type bomb, 136
 Guns in schools?, 115
 Guterres, Antonio, 94, 196, 207, 208, 226
 Habeus Corpus, 314
 Hair-trigger alert, 101, 131
 Halfdan Mahler, 319
 Halt extraction of fossil fuels, 196, 226
 Halving CO₂ by 2030, 204
 Hanging, 11
 Hansen, James, 175, 222
 Harvard Economic Barometer, 305
 Harvard University, 263
 Harvest failures, 24
 Health, 185
 Heat deaths in India, 173
 Heat waves, 184
 Heat waves in Sweden, 215
 Hepatitis, 61, 319
 Herbicides, 123
 Hereditary transmission of power, 15
 Herman E. Daly, 307, 312
 HEU, 134, 135
 High labor costs, 309
 High population density, 21
 High-entropy waste, 312
 High-yield grain varieties, 52
 High-yield strains, 49
 Higher status for women, 63, 320
 Highly enriched uranium, 102, 134, 135
 Highly-enriched uranium, 104
 Highway development, 58
 Hillsides, 57
 Hiroshima, 124, 125, 133, 134
 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 93
 HIV/AIDS, 80
 Holdren, John P., 263
 Holocene Extinction, 187
 Hong Kong, 62
 Hoodbhoy, Pervez, 136
 Hospitality, 301
 House of Commons, 218
 Household items, 305
 Houseman, 21
 Housing of workers, 309
 Hubbert Peak model, 297
 Human ego, 300

- Human error and nuclear war, 125
- Human failings, 101, 131
- Human institutions, 23
- Human misery, 49
- Human rights abuses, 249
- Human society a superorganism, 303
- Humanitarian law, 99, 101, 130, 131
- Humanitarian reforms, 310
- Humanitarian tragedies, 114
- Humanity on a Tightrope, 260
- Humans cause global warming, 184
- Hume, David, 9
- Hunger, 11, 25
- Hunter-gatherer societies, 18, 21
- Hunter-gatherers, 301
- Huntington Ingals, 111
- Hurricanes more severe, 221
- Hybrid cars, 168
- Hydrogen technology, 167
- Hydrological cycle, 106, 128

- IAEA, 137
- Ignorance, 11, 13, 15
- Illegal burning of forests, 248
- Illegality of nuclear weapons, 99, 130
- Illiteracy, 120
- Imagine what we could do together, 196
- Immediate action required, 196, 226
- Imperialism, 315
- Improvement of society, 16
- Inappropriate agriculture, 256
- Inballanced diet, 242
- Incendiary bombings, 105, 127
- Increased arms trading, 114
- Index standard, 305
- India, 49, 104, 110
- India's coal, 181
- India's Energy Crisis, 173
- India's nuclear weapons, 135
- India's palm oil demand, 250
- India's Prime Minister Modi, 173
- Indian Minister of Power, 173
- Indian monsoon disruption, 193

- Indirect costs of war, 119
- Indiscriminate mass slaughter, 99, 129
- Indo-China conflicts, 120
- Indonesia, 62, 180, 248
- Indonesia's forest loss, 249
- Industrial growth, 295, 299
- Industrial infrastructure, 226
- Industrial Revolution, 177, 295
- Industrial workers, 9, 297
- Industrialization, 301
- Industrialized countries, 180, 300
- Industrialized nations, 319
- Industry, 16
- Inequality, 314
- Inequality between men and women, 15
- Infant mortality, 15, 26
- Infanticide, 26
- Infection with worms, 82
- Infectious disease, 320
- Information and free energy, 302
- Information-related work, 297
- Infrastructure, 61, 119
- Infrastructure failures, 319
- Inland rainfall, 57
- Inorganic fertilizer, 53
- Input/output ratio, 53
- Insect apocalypse, 242
- Installed photovoltaic capacity, 318
- Institution of war, 104, 119, 120
- Institutional inertia, 226
- Institutionalized injustice, 321
- Intellectual improvement, 11
- Intense flooding, 221
- Intensive farming practices, 242
- Intermittency, Denmark and Germany, 167
- Intermittency, Denmark and Norway, 167
- Intermittency, problem of, 167
- Internal combustion engine ban, 168
- Internal peace within nations, 320
- Internally displaced persons, 121
- International agreements, 185
- International anarchy, 321
- International borders, 122

- International control, 104, 134
International cooperation, 115
International Criminal Court, 321
International law, 180
Internationalism, 297
Intertribal wars, 21
Inundation of coastal cities, 184
Invasion of Ukraine not unprovoked, 94
Investment in solar energy, 170
Investment opportunity, 168
IPCC, 52, 184, 204, 221, 224, 225
IPCC report from Incheon, 2018, 207
Iran, 104, 108, 110, 180
Iran nuclear deal, 114
Iraq, 108, 180
Irish potato famine, 33, 52
Iron Law of Wages, 31
Irrational belief in growth, 296
Irreversible adverse climate change, 222
Irreversible biodiversity loss, 184
Irreversible damage to civilization, 124
Irrigation, 52, 58
Isotopes, 134, 135
Isotopes of uranium, 134
Israel, 110
Israel's nuclear weapons, 135
IUCN, 187
- Jair Bolsonaro, 250
James Hansen, 175
Japan, 62
Jesus College, 10
Jobs from renewables, 170
John Atkins Hobson, 315
John Fielden, 308
John P. Holdren, 263
John Stuart Mill, 48
Joseph Schumpeter, 306
- Keep that oil in the ground, 196, 197, 226
Khan, A.Q., 135, 136
Kilowatts (KW), 161
Kim Jong-un, 111
- Knowledge, 11
Known resources, 158
Korean Peoples Army, 111
Kuwait, 180
- L-3 Communications, 111
Labor, 299
Labor unions, 309
Lack of action, 184
Land surface used for cattle, 254
Landscape fires kill 100,000/y, 249
Lapham, Robert J., 62
Last frontier, 49
Late Devonian Extinction, 185
Late marriage, 21, 22, 33
Laterite, 59
Laterization of soil, 59
Latin America, 49
Laudato Si', 317
Laws binding on individuals, 310, 320
Laws of nature, 23
Lebanese civil war, 120
Lebanon, 108
Leeching by rain, 59
Leisure, 312
Leisure Class, 300
LeMay, General Curtis E., 102, 132
Lenton, Timothy Michael, 193
Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation, 302
Leonardo-Finmeccanica, 111
Lerma Rogo, 49
LEU, 134
Libya, 55, 108, 180
Licences to burn forests, 249
Lifestyles, 158
Light weapons, 108
Limitations on cropland, 49
Limiting factors, 299
Limiting global warming to 1.5°C, 207
Limits for adaption, 224
Limits of sustainability, 301
Limits to Growth, 227, 295, 297
Line in the sand, 207

- Linear progression, 17
- Linguistic groups, 15
- Linnean Society, 36
- Literature, 297, 318
- Lithium ion storage batteries, 167, 169
- Livestock feed, 53
- Living from war, 99
- Living standards, 181
- Lockheed Martin, 111
- London School of Economics, 309
- Long human childhood, 13
- Long-term future, 295
- Look for action. Then hope will come, 228
- Looming financial instability, 221
- Loss of 175 million lives, 123
- Loss of flying insects, 242
- Loss of life, 120
- Loss of profits, 310
- Low death rate, 21
- Low enriched uranium, 134
- Low-carbon economy, 196, 226
- Low-entropy resources, 312
- Lowest social class, 15
- Lust, 25
- Luxembourg bans fracking, 175
- Luxuries, 11
- Luxuries of the few, 215

- Maathai, Wangari, 257
- Mafia, 136
- Magna Carta, 314
- Magnetic bottles, 138
- Mahler, Halfdan, 61
- Major coal producers, 179
- Major extinction event, 187
- Major fossil fuel producers, 178
- Major oil producers, 178
- Making Peace with the Planet, 267
- Malaria, 69, 242
- Malice, 11
- Malnutrition, 19, 120, 184, 242
- Malthus, Daniel, 9, 13, 15
- Malthus, Thomas Robert, 9, 16, 21–24, 26, 31, 36
- Man and the Ecosphere, 259
- Man-made capital, 299
- Man-made disaster, 196, 226
- Manipulating public opinion, 313
- Mann, Michael E., 222
- Marginal land, 49, 57, 58
- Martineau, Harriet, 26
- Mass media, 115, 194, 227, 301, 313
- Massive non-linear events, 223
- Massive nuclear retaliation, 99, 129
- Material goods, 318
- Material possessions, 11
- Material structures, 303
- Mattas, James, 110
- Maudlin, W. Parker, 62
- Meat consumption, 54
- Medical consequences of war, 120
- Megawatts (MW), 161
- Melted asphalt, 173
- Melting of polar icecaps, 223
- Metabolic throughput, 307
- Metals, 295, 299
- Methane and beef, 250
- Methane hydrate feedback loop, 181, 186, 191, 193, 302, 317
- Methane, 10,000 gigatons, 191
- Mexico, 180
- Middle East, 55, 171
- Middle East conflicts, 114
- Migration to cities, 61
- Militarism and money, 97
- Militarism in North Korea, 110
- Militarization of governments, 180
- Military budgets, 315
- Military Expenditure Database, 111
- Military technology, 114
- Military use of oil, 180
- Military-industrial complex, 95, 97
- Milk and potato diet, 33
- Mill, John Stuart, 48
- Minimum wage law, 309

- Minimum wage laws, 309
Miscalculation, 101, 131
Misery, 16, 21, 23
Misplaced power, 97
Missile defense system, 104
Mistaken for a missile strike, 101, 131
MIT Technology Review, 173
Mitigation, 185
Modern warfare and oil, 180
Modernism, 104
Monbiot, George, 218
Monetary reform, 296
Money and growth our main concerns, 197
Money and wealth, 304
Money driving decisions, 175
Mono-cropping, 242
Monroe Doctrine, 94
Monsoon disruption, 193
Moral improvement, 11
Moral responsibility, 197
Moral restraint, 21, 22
Morality, 13
Morals, 25
More military spending, 114
More than hope, we need action, 196
More violent conflicts, 114
Mortality, 18
Mother Earth, 272
Movement of refugees, 114
Muhammad Yunus, 305
Musharraf, Pervez, 136
Music, 297, 318
Musk, Elon, 169
Mutually Assured Destruction, 132
Myopic national self-interest, 220

N. Georgescu-Roegen, 305, 312
Nagasaki, 133, 134
Nancy Pelosi, 96
Naomi Klein, 302, 318
Narrow and shrinking window, 225
National Academy of Sciences, 187
National Health Service, 309
National pride, 104
National Rifle Association, 115
Nationalism a dangerous anachronism, 226
Nationalism, nuclear, 136
Nationalization of banks, 305
NATO's eastward expansion, 94
Natural gas, 52, 295, 312
Natural gas production, 179
Natural habitat destruction, 187
Natural laws, 11
Natural resources, 185, 299
Natural selection, 36
Nature, Man and Technology, 267
Navigant Research, 170
Near East, 49
Necessity, 25
Need for enemies, 95
Negative entropy, 302
Neoclassical economists, 299
Neptunium, 137
Netherlands bans petrol driven cars, 169
Neutral countries, 99, 129
Neutrons, 134
New economic system, 301
New Agenda Resolution, 101, 131
New ethics, 320
New Joan of Arc, 197
New Statesman, 309
New technology, 299
New world of law, 321
Newton's solar system, 11
Nigeria, 255
No one ever talked about it, 194
Noam Chomsky, 315
Nobel Peace Prize, 264
Nomadic societies, 19
Non-discrimination principle, 310
Non-Proliferation Treaty, 135
Non-renewable resources, 304
Nonrenewable resources, 312
North America, 158
North Korea, 104, 110
North Korea's nuclear weapons, 135

- North Sea oil, 178
 Northern Africa, 49
 Northern Ireland bans fracking, 175
 Northrop Grumman, 111
 Norway, 19, 21
 Norway bans petrol driven cars, 169
 Norwegian mass-murderer, 117
 Norwegian North Sea oil, 178
 NPT, 135
 NPT, threatened failure of, 136
 Nuclear black market, 102
 Nuclear catastrophe, 124
 Nuclear darkness, 103
 Nuclear deterrence, flaws, 102
 Nuclear environmental catastrophe, 105, 127
 Nuclear fusion, 138
 Nuclear nationalism, 136
 Nuclear power dangers, 133
 Nuclear power generation, 133
 Nuclear power plant accidents, 125
 Nuclear proliferation, 104, 133, 135
 Nuclear reactor, 134
 Nuclear reactors, 104
 Nuclear terrorism, 102, 104, 136
 Nuclear tests, 124
 Nuclear threats, 315
 Nuclear war by accident, 137
 Nuclear war is possible, 223
 Nuclear warhead stockpiles, 111
 Nuclear weapons, 95, 267, 320
 Nuclear winter, 93, 105, 127
 Nucleon number, 134
 Nuremberg Principles, 138
 Nutrient-poor soils, 59

 Oakwood Chapel, 10, 15
 Obama, Barack, 264
 Ogallala aquifer, 52, 55
 Oil producers, 178
 Oil reserves in OPEC countries, 171
 Oil sands in Canada, 174
 Oil spills, 123
 Oklahoma, 52

 Oligarchy, 314
 Oliver Twist, 26
 One-China policy, 96
 OPEC countries, 171
 Oppression, 11
 Optimism, 9
 Optimum global population, 48
 Ordovician-Silurian Extinction, 185
 Organic agriculture, 307, 312
 Organized criminals, 136
 Orinoco River, 175
 Orwell, George, 220
 Our Common Future, 53
 Our house is on fire, 197
 Our leaders are behaving like children, 197,
 226
 Over-fishing, 299
 Overcrowded cities, 319
 Overgrazing, 52, 256
 Overpopulation, 320
 Overuse of pesticides, 244
 Ozone layer, 103, 106, 128

 Pace of change, 224
 Packaging and retailing, 53
 Pakistan, 49, 52, 104, 110
 Pakistan's nuclear weapons, 135
 Palestinians, 122
 Palm oil and biodiversity, 249
 Palm oil cultivation, 248
 Palm oil plantations, 248
 Paraguay, 62
 Paris Agreement, 195, 204, 219, 222, 225
 Paris Climate Agreement, 114
 Parish assistance, 24, 26
 Parr, Samuel, 17
 Partha Dasgupta, 320
 Passions of mankind, 23, 25
 Pastoral societies, 21
 Pasturage, 49, 57
 Paul Ehrlich, 106, 128, 259
 Paupers, 26
 Peace in Colombia, 114

- Peaceful resolution of conflicts, 310
Peanut butter and palm oil, 250
Pearl Harbor, 115
Peat fires, 249
Peatlands, 248
Pelosi's provocative visit to Taiwan, 95
Pelosi, Nancy, 96
Penal system, 11
People without electricity, 166
Per capita energy use, 158
Per capita food calories, 54
Perfectibility, 13, 22
Periodical misery, 22
Permafrost melting, 193
Permanent arms industry, 97
Permian extinction, 184, 317
Permian-Triassic Extinction, 181, 185
Permission to marry, 21
Perpetual wars, 314
Persistent organic pollutants, 242
Pesticides, 52
Peter Gaskell, 308
Petrobras, 177
Petroleum, 52, 295, 299
Petroleum price, 48
Petroleum production in Russia, 174
Petroleum-derived fertilizer, 242
Petrov, Stanislav, 132
Philanthropy, 11
Photovoltaics, rate of growth, 162
Physical properties, 134
Pimental, David, 53, 57
Pitt, William, 25
Planetary boundaries, 221
Plant diseases, 52
Plant energy, 54
Plant genetics, 49
Plasma physics, 263
Pledges remain unmet, 184
Ploesti oil fields, 306
Plutonium, 102, 104, 133–135
Poisoning of water supplies, 175
Policymakers' magical thinking, 221
Policymaking cognitatively dissonant, 220
Polish production of coal, 177
Polite conversation, 227
Political expediency, 220
Political influence, 97
Political instability, 114
Political Justice, 11, 17
Political will, 158, 208, 318
Politicians, next election, 181
Politics, 11
Pollution, 320
Poor and most vulnerable, 185
Poor Laws, 24, 25
Poor rural communities, 255
Pope Francis I, 205, 296, 314, 317, 318
Popularity and ratings, 227
Population, 9, 10, 16, 299
Population Action International, 255
Population and forest loss, 254
Population crash, 48
Population density, 48
Population extinction pulse, 187
Population growth, 9, 15, 17, 22, 23, 52, 295, 299, 312
Population growth and fossil fuel use, 46
Population growth and poverty, 61
Population losses and declines, 187
Population pressure, 18, 21
Population stabilization, 62
Population, Resources, Environments, 259
Populations in the tropics, 255
Positive checks, 18
Positive feedback loops, 188
Post-fossil-fuel era, 54, 220
Postman, Neil, 227
Potentially irreversible threat, 225
Potsdam Institute, 185
Poverty, 9, 13, 15, 18, 19, 24, 299
Poverty alleviation, 185
Poverty generated by war, 123
Power and wealth, 318
Power of taxation, 320
Power reactors, 134

- Power-worshipping values, 301
 Prejudices, 22
 Presalt oil, 177
 Preventable disease, 120
 Preventable diseases, 120
 Preventive checks, 18, 19
 Price of grain, 24
 Price of petroleum, 48
 Priest, eunuch and tyrant, 25
 Priestly, Joseph, 10
 Primary energy, 158
 Principle of population, 18, 22
 Private banks, 296, 304
 Private judgement, 23
 Private property and profits, 318
 Production of goods, 297
 Production of grains, 319
 Production of natural gas, 179
 Profits of stockholders, 227
 Progress, 13, 15
 Prohibition of weapons production, 307
 Proliferation risks, 135
 Proliferation, nuclear, 133, 135
 Promiscuity, 22
 Property, 11, 23
 Property in growing cities, 296
 Protesting at the Swedish parliament, 213
 Protons, 134
 Provision of health services, 320
 Provision of services, 297
 Prudence, 23, 26
 Psychological effects of war, 120
 Psychology, 300
 Pu-239, 134–136
 Public health, 62, 119
 Public image, 315
 Public opinion, 133
 Pugwash Conferences, 260, 263
 Pull the emergency brake, 213
 Putin, Vladimir, 93
 Pyush Goyal, 173
 Qaddafi, Muammar, 55
 Queens College, 267
 Quick action, 158
 Quick action must be taken, 228
 Radar, 101, 131
 Radiation sickness, 125
 Radical change, 25
 Radical transformation, 225
 Radioactive contamination, 267
 Radioactive fallout, 124, 133
 Radioactive graphite, 133
 Radioactive grass, 133
 Radioactive uranium, 133
 Radioactive waste disposal, 133
 Rainfall, 52, 55
 Rape of the environment, 309
 Rapid and unprecedented changes, 225
 Rapid change is required, 195
 Rate of fossil fuel use, 162
 Rate of species loss, 187
 Raytheon, 111
 Re-balance use of time, 307
 Real needs, 300
 Real power belongs to the people, 215
 Reason, 23, 25
 Record-breaking heatwaves, 221
 Red Dawn, 115
 Reforestation initiatives, 257
 Reform Act of 1832, 31
 Reform movement, 309
 Reformed economic system, 302
 Refugees, 121, 122
 Regeneration of a forest, 312
 Regional agreements, 185
 Regional Defense Strategy, 110
 Reign of Terror, 17
 Religious bigotry, 15
 Renewable energy, 181, 302, 303, 317, 318
 Renewables cheaper than fossil fuels, 163, 167
 Replanting forests, 257
 Replies to Malthus, 25
 Reply to Parr, 17

- Reprocessing, 102
- Reprocessing fuel rods, 134
- Research, 297
- Reserves of uranium, 135
- Resource curse, 180
- Resource wars, 117
- Resource-extracting firms, 180
- Resources, 303
- Respect for nature, 301
- Responsibility towards future generations, 228
- Restoring democracy, 313
- Restricting air travel, 193
- Revenge and counter-revenge, 99, 129, 138
- Revolutions in outlook and lifestyles, 226
- Ricardo, David, 31
- Richard Florida, 297
- Richard Wilkinson, 315
- Right to sustenance, 24
- Rights of Mother Earth, 272
- Rio Earth Summit, 219
- Rising death rates, 255
- Risk management, 185
- Risk to human civilization, 222
- River of money, 97
- Robespierre, 9
- Robock, A., 103
- Rockefeller Foundation, 49
- Roman Empire, 19
- Romanian National Peasant Party, 306
- Rooftop solar installations, 166
- Rookery, 9
- Rotblat, Sir Joseph, 264
- Roumania bans fracking, 175
- Rousseau, Henry, 9
- Roy, Arundhati, 119
- Rules have to be changed, 196
- Run-off of water, 257
- Russell-Einstein Manifesto, 263
- Russia, 102, 110, 133
- Russia's reserves of oil and gas, 174
- Russian Arctic oil production, 174
- Russian petroleum industry, 174
- Sadam Hussein, 107
- Safe water, 120
- Sahara desert, 256
- Sahel, 52, 256, 257
- Salination, 52, 58, 299
- Sanctions against Venezuela, 175
- Sanctity of the family, 13
- Sand dunes near Beijing, 255
- Sanitary water supply, 119
- Saturation pressure, 188
- Saudi Arabia, 55, 180
- Saudi Arabia and photovoltaics, 166
- Saving the future, 196, 197, 226
- Scandinavia, 19
- Scandinavians, 19
- Scarce resources, 297
- Schoolstrike for climate action, 200
- Science, 9, 204, 320, 322
- Science and Survival, 267
- Science means nothing to politicians, 196
- Science of Ecology, 260
- Scientific evidence, 184
- Scientific progress, 11
- Sea ice loss, 188
- Sea level rise, 184, 193
- Second Essay, 18
- Second law of thermodynamics, 304
- Second World War, 9
- Secrecy, 313
- Secret diplomacy, 313
- Secure jobs, 311
- Security Council, 108
- Security for old people, 320
- Seed, 54
- Seizing land from local people, 249
- Self-fulfillment, 11
- Self-love, 23
- Selfishness, 11, 23
- Sensibility, 13
- Sequestered carbon, 57
- Services, 297
- Servility, 11
- Several hundred million deaths, 99, 129

- Severe droughts, 106, 128
 Severe hurricanes, 221
 Shell drilling in the Arctic, 315
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 25
 Short-term political advantage, 220
 Shrunk globe, 322
 Siberian Traps, 186
 Sierra Club, 259
 Siemens, 169
 Singapore, 62
 SIPRI, 111
 SIPRI Yearbook, 2017, 114
 Sir Joseph Rotblat, 264
 Sixth mass extinction, 187, 195
 Size of the human economy, 299
 Slashing and burning, 250
 Slavelike working conditions, 309
 Slavery, 15, 309
 Slums, 61
 Small arms, 108
 Small arms, 639 million, 108
 Small hydro, 303
 Smallpox and biological warfare, 85
 Smith, Dan, 114
 Soap and palm oil, 250
 Social classes, 23
 Social competition, 300
 Social conscience, 227, 311, 318
 Social disruption by war, 120
 Social epidemiology, 315
 Social ethics, 301
 Social games, 194
 Social inequality, 52
 Social insects, 303
 Social services, 296
 Social status of consumers, 300
 Social values and consumption, 300
 Sociology, 300
 Soil erosion, 52, 58, 255, 257
 Solar energy, 228, 303
 Solar Foundation, 170
 Solar Jobs Census, 170
 Solar panel prices, 166
 Solar panels on new houses, 166
 Solutions exist, 204
 Somalia, 108, 110
 Sonora 64, 49
 Soot particles, 188
 Sources and sinks, 307
 South Africa's nuclear weapons, 135
 Southeast Asia, 248
 Southern Africa, 49
 Southern Asia, 49
 Southey, Robert, 25
 Southwest Asia, 110
 Sovereign states, 122
 Spain bans fracking, 175
 Speak out in clear language, 197
 Species loss, 187
 Spiritual influence, 97
 Stabilizing global population, 319, 321
 Stable family structure, 13
 Stanford University, 259, 263
 Starvation, 25, 33, 110, 120, 121, 308
 Starvation level wages, 308
 Statistical probability, 302
 Steady State Economics, 312
 Steady-state economic system, 312
 Steady-state economics, 307
 Stern Report, 52, 55, 57
 Stern Review, 171
 Stockbrokers, 299
 Stockholders, 315
 Stockholm Convention, 242
 Stop threatening Russia, 94
 Strategic competition, 115
 Strontium 90, 267
 Student climate strike in Belgium, 197
 Submarginal land, 49
 Subnational organizations, 136
 Subprime mortgage crisis, 295
 Subsistence, 16, 22
 Sudan, 108
 Suffering, 13
 Superorganisms, 303
 Superpower status, 110

- Superstition, 22
- Surrey, 10
- Survival, 15
- Survival of civilization, 119
- Survival of the fittest, 314
- Sustainability, 295
- Sustainability crisis, 194
- Sustainable global society, 299
- Sustainable limits, 299
- Sustainable process must be cyclic, 312
- Sustainable society, 204
- Svante Arrhenius, 193
- Svante Thunberg, 193
- Swaminathan, M.S., 49
- Sweden, 133, 213
- Switzerland bans fracking, 175
- Sykes-Picot Agreement, 313
- Syria, 108
- Systems of Equality, 22, 23

- Targeted individuals, 117
- Tartar tribes, 19
- Tax-gatherer, 25
- Technical defects, 101, 131
- Technology, 9, 299, 301, 314, 319
- Technology, transfer of, 61
- Television, 227
- Tell it like it is, 213
- Temperature and agriculture, 54
- Temperature inversion, 106, 128
- Terawatts (TW), 161
- Terrorism, 110
- Terrorism, nuclear, 102
- Thales Group, 111
- The Annihilation of Nature, 260
- The Cassandra Conference, 260
- The Closing Circle, 267
- The Guardian, 187, 218
- The party is over, 227
- The Population Bomb, 259
- The rules have to be changed, 197, 226
- The Silent Spring, 244
- Thermohaline circulation, 193
- Thermonuclear bombs, 135
- Thermonuclear reactions, 138
- Thermonuclear war, 97, 315
- Thermonuclear weapons, 124
- This changes everything, 318
- Thom Hartmann, 302
- Thorkil Kristensen, 297
- Thorstein Veblen, 300
- Thou shalt not kill, 314
- Threat of nuclear war, 124
- Threats and costs of war, 119
- Thunberg, Greta, 193, 197, 205, 213, 215, 226, 228
- Thunberg, Svante, 193
- Thyroid cancer, 133
- Tidal energy, 303
- Tim Jackson, 302
- Time Magazine, 268
- Tipping point, 158, 181, 208, 302
- Tipping points and feedback, 192
- Tipping points, definition, 192
- Tokyo, firebombing, 99, 130
- Tom Cruse, 115
- Toon, O., 103
- Top Gun, 115
- Topsoil, 57
- Topsoil, loss of, 52
- Torture, 308
- Total global supremacy, 110
- Total output of a society, 315
- Tradition of sharing, 301
- Traditional agricultural society, 301
- Traditional constraints, 301
- Traditional way of life, 301
- Trans Pacific Partnership, 310
- Transition to 100% renewable energy, 159, 167
- Transmission infrastructure, 166
- Transportation, 53
- Transportation links, 303
- Tree-killing spree, 250
- Tree-cutting for firewood, 256
- Trees, destruction of, 52

- Triassic-Jurassic Extinction, 185
- Trickle-down theories, 314
- Tropical cyclones, 184
- Tropical rain forests, 49, 187
- Trump, Donald, 115, 208, 225
- Truthout, 218
- TTAPS Study, 105, 127
- TTIP, 310
- Tuberculosis, 72
- Turco, R., 103
- Turkey, 52
- Twentieth century, 9
- Two billion risk starvation, 107
- Typhoid, 61, 319

- U-235, 133
- U-238, 134, 135
- UK declares climate emergency, 218
- Ukraine, 133
- Ukraine invasion not unprovoked, 94
- Ukraine war and nuclear weapons, 93
- Ultracentrifuges, 134, 135
- UN Framework Convention, 184
- UN General Assembly, 99, 101, 130, 131
- UN Secretary-General, 208
- UN Security Council, 108
- UN's Agenda 2030, 114
- Unauthorized act, 102
- Unbalance of power, 320
- Undemocratic government, 180
- Understatement of Existential Climate Risk, 219
- Unearned profits, 296
- Unemployment, 62, 299, 319
- Unenriched uranium, 124
- Unidirectional process, 312
- Unidirectional transformation, 306
- Union of Concerned Scientists, 225, 248
- United Kingdom, 110
- United Nations, 310, 311
- United Nations Charter, 122, 138, 315, 321
- United Nations Framework Convention, 219
- United States, 48, 52, 102, 110
- United Technologies, 111
- Universal education, 23
- Universal primary health care, 255
- Unlimited industrial growth, 297
- Unprecedented changes, 197
- Unprecedented heat waves, 184
- Unprecedented investment opportunity, 168
- Unregulated globalization, 309
- Unsanitary housing, 19
- Unwarranted influence, 97
- Uranium, 134
- Uranium enrichment, 135
- Uranium reserves, 135
- Uranium-235, 124
- Urban growth, 58
- Urbanization, 52, 61, 319
- Urgency of our situation, 208
- US Constitution, 314
- US Department of Energy, 175
- US food system, 53
- US grain belt, 54
- US threats to China, 95
- US-Russia proxy war in Ukraine, 93
- User-owned banks, 305
- USSR, 52
- Utility, 25
- Utopian societies, 22

- Values for the future, 301
- Vanishing resources, 299
- Vapor pressure, 188
- Vast proportions, 97
- Venezuela, 180
- Venezuela's Belt of Tar, 175
- Vestas, 169
- Vested-interest pressure, 221
- Vice, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23
- Vietnam, 123
- Village solar installations, 167
- Village wind turbines, 167
- Violation of civil rights, 314
- Violation of democratic principles, 310
- Violent death, 121

- Vladimir Putin, 93
Volcanic eruptions in Siberia, 186
Volvo bans petroleum driven cars, 168
- Wales, 133
Wali, Mohan, 54
Wall Street, 311
Wallace, Alfred Russell, 36
Wallace, Robert, 9
War, 15, 18, 19, 21, 108, 110
War as an institution, 99
War Departments, 315
Warning from the World Bank, 184
Wars manufactured to sell weapons, 119
Wassely Leontief, 306
Waste products, 303
Water availability, 52
Water erosion, 57
Water purification facilities, 123
Water resources, 55
Water scarcity, 184
Water supplies, 52, 303
Water supplies near dwellings, 320
Water vapor, 317
Water vapor a greenhouse gas, 188
Water, rapid run-off, 257
Water-borne diseases, 76
Watering-down scientific findings, 221
Watts, 161
Wave energy, 303
WCED, 53
We have the facts and solutions, 196
We have to change, 194
We have to speak clearly, 215
We must act now, 207
We Were Soldiers, 115
Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt, 304
Weapons production, 312
Weapons-usable materials, 135, 137
Weapons-usable Pu-239, 134
Welfare, 185
West African monsoon loss, 193
Western Europe, 110
Western society, 301
What Lies Beneath, 219
Wheat farms, 52
Wheat varieties, 49
Wheeler, John A., 134
Whistleblowers, 313
Why wasn't it made illegal?, 194
Why were there no restrictions?, 194
Wildfires in Sweden, 215
Will, 25
Wilson, E.O., 187
Wind energy, 166, 228, 303
Wind energy, rate of growth, 162
Wind erosion, 52
Wind farm's footprint, 166
Wind turbine cooperatives, 170
Window dressing, 315
Winter heating of homes, 174
Wisdom of older societies, 301
Wolfowitz Doctrine, 110
Women, education for, 63
Women, higher status for, 63
Workaholic habits, 307, 312
Workers treated like commodities, 308
Workhouses, 26, 308
Working conditions, 308
World arms spending, 119
World Bank, 181, 184
World Bank Group, 185
World Bank's warning, 184
World Development Report, 184
World Economic Forum survey, 222
World Health Organization, 119
World Meteorological Organization report, 207
World of Warcraft, 117
World Resources Institute, 319
World Trade Center, 2001, 104
World War II, 105, 123, 127
World's oil reserves, 175
World's poorest three billion, 223
Worldwatch Institute, 55

Years remaining, 159
Yields per hectare, 54
Yongbion Research Center, 111
Young population, 62

Zimbabwe, 110