



for a
sustainable
future



Population Matters Magazine

Issue 22 February 2013

Attenborough
60 years in the wild

ITV1
Is Britain overcrowded?

Blue Ventures
Sustainability in Madagascar

Contents

Gathering clouds and green shoots	3
It's time to reduce our impact on the planet	4
Making Population Matter	6
On demography and being a demographer	7
Dogs that don't bark in the night	8
Mea Culpa?	9
Reminiscences of Malawi	10
Attenborough: 60 years in the wild	11
The Women Are Waiting	12
Salama Soa Project	13
Margaret Pyke Centre	14
The Law of Population	15
Reviews	15
Letters	18
Local groups and promotional items	19

About Population Matters

Population Matters is a membership charity working for a global population size providing a good standard of living for all, a healthy environment and environmental sustainability.

We are a charity whose activities comprise education, research and policy promotion. We are funded entirely by our members and by donations and grants. We receive no funding from official or commercial bodies.

Population Matters is the working name of the Optimum Population Trust, Regd. charity no. 1114109 and a company registered by guarantee. Registered in England and Wales Regd. no. 3019081. Regd. office 135-137 Station Road London E4 6AG

Support Population Matters

We are a growing organization and welcome new members. The membership fee rates are available on our website or on enquiry. We are grateful to those who contribute higher fees, donations or legacies.

All members can participate in our activities and receive the monthly Newsletter and the bi-annual Magazine and Journal. Active Members can apply to become Guarantor Members. On acceptance, they can then vote at the AGM and stand for election as trustees. Contact the administrator or visit the website for further details.

Magazine

Members are warmly invited to submit material for consideration. These may include articles, letters, poems, reviews, comment on earlier magazine items, comment on current population issues in the media, or comment on how Population Matters do things.

Subjects can include all of mankind's impacts on the planet, and the social consequences of population growth – anything that you feel with a passion! In order to print more articles, and develop the diversity of the magazine, articles longer than 700 words will be abbreviated. All material may be edited and the editor's decision is final. Copy deadlines are the end of June and the end of December.

Views expressed are not necessarily those of Population Matters and no guarantee can be given as to the accuracy of the contents. Material may normally be reproduced if permission is obtained and its source attributed.

The magazine is printed using vegetable based inks on paper sourced from recycling and responsibly managed forests (FSC Mixed Credit). If you are happy to receive the magazine by email, which reduces our costs and helps the environment, contact the administrator. Additional copies are available on request: a donation is appreciated. Inserts from other organisations are included for commercial reasons and do not imply endorsement in either direction. We apologise for the erroneous chart in the last issue. A corrected version of the chart is shown in the website version and is available in hard copy on request.

This issue was edited by Norman Pasley, proofread by Elisabeth Richmond and distributed by our administrator, Julie Lewis. Norman Pasley is a chartered civil engineer, now retired, who has discovered a passion for the natural world and looking after the planet.

Guest editor sought: if you would like to be content editor for the summer issue of the magazine, contact enquiries@populationmatters.org.

Contacting us

Population Matters
135-137 Station Road, London, E4 6AG
Tel: 020 8123 9116 www.populationmatters.org

Chair: Roger Martin
roger.martin@populationmatters.org

Chief Executive: Simon Ross
simon.ross@populationmatters.org

Administrator/ Membership: Julie Lewis
julie.lewis@populationmatters.org

Magazine contributions:
enquiries@populationmatters.org

Contacting you

If you are a Population Matters member, have we got your email? If you want to receive the monthly newsletter and occasional e-alerts, please send your email to supporters@populationmatters.org.

Gathering Clouds and Green shoots

Simon Ross, Chief Executive, Population Matters



'New technologies, dwindling resources and explosive population growth in the next 18 years will alter the global balance of power and trigger radical economic and political changes at a speed unprecedented in modern history'.

In March 2009, the UK Government's Chief Scientist, Professor John Beddington, said that a 'perfect storm' of food shortages, scarce water and insufficient energy resources threatened to unleash public unrest, cross-border conflicts and mass migration. He attributed the causes to population growth and success in alleviating poverty and concluded that 'We head into a perfect storm in 2030, because all of these things are operating on the same time frame'.

Resource depletion is now clearly beginning to bite as rising demand hits limited supply. Successful financier Jeremy Grantham warned last November of soaring commodity prices and impending shortages. He pointed out that '...since 2002, prices of almost all (important) commodities tripled in six years; all without a world war and without much comment.' He noted that rising food prices and likely fertilizer shortages were particularly serious. A recent Chatham House report stated 'The world is undergoing a period of intensified resource stress, driven in part

by the scale and speed of demand growth from emerging economies and a decade of tight commodity markets' while another report, this time from US intelligence agencies, concluded that 'New technologies, dwindling resources and explosive population growth in the next 18 years will alter the global balance of power and trigger radical economic and political changes at a speed unprecedented in modern history'.

Prince Charles recently said he does not want to hand on an 'increasingly dysfunctional' environmental situation to his first grandchild, due this summer. The heir to the British throne added that he did not want to leave a 'poisoned chalice' to children of the future or for his grandchild to wonder why past generations did not act to protect the environment. He may be disappointed. The environment appears to be struggling, whether it be floods in the UK or wildfires in Australia. Eleven of the twelve warmest years on record have been in the last twelve years. Plant and animal numbers and variety continue to fall around the world. In its end of year messages, The Guardian newspaper and others bemoaned the lack of political agreement on action on sustainability at the Rio and Doha conferences, with governments instead focussing on how to reinvigorate struggling economies and restore public finances.

In our area of focus, population, there have been some positive developments. The current UN consultation on Sustainable Development Goals includes discussion of population dynamics, something that was notably absent from the preceding Millennium Development Goals. The recent television broadcast "Is Britain overcrowded?" is perhaps a sign that population is becoming an issue to be discussed rather than dismissed, even if contrary voices remain loud.

Good news on family planning, too, with the passing of legislation easing access to contraception for poor Filipinos and initiatives in both the UK and Scottish parliaments to address our high rates of unplanned pregnancies. More controversially, the ending of universal provision of child benefit and continued government action to reduce the level

of unbalanced migration may both contribute to a reduction in Britain's record rate of population growth.

On a global scale, the bulk of population growth occurs in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. People there are living longer, as they are almost everywhere, birth rates remain high and the age groups entering adulthood are very much larger than those of their parents and grandparents. It requires a major change both in access to contraception and in the attitudes of governments and peoples to family size for population growth to slow markedly from their current rates. What makes this harder is that the

highest birth rates are in the poorest countries, including 'fragile states' where government authority is weak and contested and where women's position is generally subordinate to relatives and traditional hierarchies.

The UK government/Gates Foundation sponsored summit on family planning last summer was a step change in the profile of and provision for family planning, aiming to provide contraception for an additional 120 million women within eight years, but this is far from sufficient to end population growth within most of our lifetimes. Much remains to be done.

Sources:

- Prince Charles ITV1 This Morning quoted by the BBC <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-20929387>
- Jeremy Grantham <http://www.nature.com/news/be-persuasive-be-brave-be-arrested-if-necessary-1.11796>
- Chatham House <http://www.chathamhouse.org/publications/papers/view/187947>
- US Intelligence Council <http://globaltrends2030.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/global-trends-2030-november2012.pdf>
- Guardian articles http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/dec/31/climate-another-year-of-living-dangerously?CMP=twtd_fd
- http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/dec/31/year-abandon-natural-world?CMP=twtd_fd

It's time to reduce our impact on the planet

Norman Pasley



“We have been God-like in our planned breeding of our domesticated plants and animals, but we have been rabbit-like in our unplanned breeding of ourselves.”

said Arnold Toynbee, the economic historian, who lived from 1852 to 1883.

He was not the first to notice the problem of increasing population. Twenty-four centuries before him, Confucius – a teacher of history, philosophy and ethics - declared: “Excessive (population) growth may reduce output per worker, repress levels of living for the masses and engender strife.” The population of his native China was about 27 million. If Confucius could return today, he would surely be astounded to find about 1,332 million people living in his country, 50 people for every one he saw.

Take another example of increasing population from Michael & Elspeth King's article in this magazine: "When we came to beautiful Malawi in 1976, its 5 million people were proudly self-sufficient in growing maize. Now the population has increased to 15 million – with huge deforestation, land degradation, drying rivers, sinking water tables....and famines. 85% of Malawians are still subsistence farmers and subdivided family gardens have become too small to grow enough food for survival."

This example would seem to bear out the words of Kenneth Boulding, an economist and President Kennedy's environmental advisor in 1966, who said: "Anyone who believes in indefinite growth of anything physical on a physically finite planet is either a madman or an economist."

In Malawi, as everywhere else, the concept of indefinite growth on a finite piece of land makes no sense. Isn't it time we addressed our myopia?

And we are not the only species trying to survive on the planet.

As Chris Packham points out: "There's no point in bleating about the future of pandas, polar bears and tigers when we're not addressing the one single factor that's putting more pressure on the ecosystem than any other — namely the ever-increasing size of the world's population."

How can anything in the natural world survive while humans multiply, spread out, and destroy their habitat?

Cameron Diaz sees the solution: "I think women are afraid to say that they don't want children because they're going to get shunned. But I think that's changing now. I have more girlfriends who don't have kids than those that do. And, honestly, we don't need any more kids. We have plenty of people on this planet."

In my view, our strategy to reduce human impact on the planet must include reducing our numbers. By doing this, we reduce the demand for food and consumer goods of every description. Every person in every corner of every country can support this view. And family planning is needed more than ever – an area in which the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is doing good work.

However, very powerful people are increasing our impact on the planet. I have heard the Chief Executive of an oil corporation talk about giving his customers what they want. He would not answer questions about ethics. He is paid to deliver oil and gas production and company profits, and he ignores the climate cliff he is making for all our grandchildren, his included. You might think that some religious leaders, unwilling to admit that overpopulation creates poverty, live on a different planet.

On the plus side, millions of thinking people are now joining environmental organizations to save our planet from destruction. Traditional forms of complaining are now complemented by activism using the worldwide reach of the internet. For a saner future we must: take personal responsibility; not support unethical behaviour; and question religious thinking.

In 2006 President Obama wrote, "... what's troubling is the gap between the magnitude of our challenges and the smallness of our politics – the ease with which we are distracted by the petty and trivial, our chronic avoidance of tough decisions, our seeming inability to build a working consensus to tackle any big problem."

So, let's build a consensus to reduce our impact on the planet. Reducing our population and impact matters more now than ever.

Making Population Matter

Mairi Rennie, Guildford Local Group

Why aren't the public worried about population growth? Such avoidance is an age-old story from before Cassandra tried to warn the Trojans of the Fall of Troy. While life is comfortable we either don't, or can't, imagine a coming catastrophe. 'Humankind cannot bear very much reality'.

Nor do facts easily change beliefs. Creationists or climate change deniers maintain their beliefs despite overwhelming contrary evidence. Facts tell, emotions sell, but fear simply frightens the public into denial. Can Population Matters therefore convey a positive message?



Everyone wants their grandchildren and their great grandchildren to inherit a safe and beautiful world - this is the supreme duty owed by one generation to another - a world where climate change has moderated, and humanity lives in balance with the environment; where wildlife habitats are restored, the tsunami of concrete has receded leaving the countryside again 'unspoilt'; and where there is enough food, water, shelter, energy and employment.

The price to be paid for this future is to limit our reproduction to balance the extra life won for us by medical science. Every third child born in 2012 has a life expectancy of 100 years. If we want these children to have fulfilled lives, there has to be fewer of them.

Every individual imposes a cost on the environment. Perhaps some index can quantify this, (regardless of consumption) so it is seen that every individual imposes a cost on everyone else and the other creatures of the planet. We all need enough living space, food, water and shelter, and we all generate waste.

'God' commanded all creatures - not just Man - to be 'fruitful and multiply'. Such scriptures come from the Bronze Age when Man was subject to famine, predation and plagues. Any increase was therefore almost imperceptible. By the time of Christ, the population of the Roman Empire was only about 50 million. As for the other creatures, the Hebrew word traditionally translated as 'dominion' should rather be translated as 'protecting and nurturing'; 'God' did not give Man permission to exploit the Earth for Himself.

Religious believers generally endorse modern medicine's intervention to preserve life, but inconsistently often deny any intervention to curb the resulting life abundance. The scriptures are silent on these matters.

It is anticipated that, as the standard of living rises, there will be a natural population transition with population reducing from a peak of some 10 billion in about 2100. But the standard of living might not rise as predicted. Or, as people become wealthier, they may decide to have more children? Should we hazard the future of the planet on speculation and the vague hope of a natural population transition?

Reducing the birth-rate will bring about a demographic hiatus for several generations, but we can plan for this. As a species we have tremendous ingenuity. Instead of using technology to accommodate a growing population, it can be used to improve the quality of life for the ageing and everyone else.

We have to hold our nerve as the elderly - ourselves, our children and grandchildren - outnumber the young until the lower birth-rate generation itself passes into old age. To increase the birth-rate or encourage immigration to avoid the hiatus, will simply postpone the solution. The coming crisis is inescapable.

The other huge problem is economic. There will be fewer consumers, so lower growth. It is now realised that consumption beyond a certain level does not promote greater well-being, so what is growth for? It is often simply to provide jobs because unemployment is so politically toxic. A growing population needs more jobs because jobs are the mechanism for distributing wealth; perhaps as technology makes human labour less essential, some other mechanism can be found.

'Accentuate the positive' as the old song goes. There needs to be a vision of a sustainable and secure

future, with a planned scaling down of the birth-rate to achieve it, and technological invention to make the transition as painless as possible. Of course critics will scoff at this, but it challenges them to offer their vision of the future, and how it will be accomplished with an exponentially expanded human population.

We in Population Matters must emphasize a benign purpose with a promise of fulfilment in prospect. Whatever happens we need to avoid being the merchants of doom.

On demography and being a demographer

Professor Tim Dyson, London School of Economics

Many people believe that the world's population is a problem. And, on learning that I am a demographer, they often tell me that much more should be done. While sympathetic, I sometimes feel reluctant to engage in detailed discussion.

People often reveal exasperation with demographers; population issues are big and important, so why is their voice not louder?

Demography is concerned with aggregate phenomena—the dynamics of whole populations. I was attracted to demography by the rigour of its methods; the 'hard' nature of the data it studies; and the fact that it connects with so much else—e.g. history, economics, medicine, and politics. There was also a view that rapid population growth would harm the economic development of poor countries.

However, demographers are few in number. Both here and in the US, they are arguably facing extinction. Reasons include: the rise of the view among economists that population growth did not have much influence on economic growth—a belief that indirectly contributed to reduced funding for teaching programmes in demography (and family planning programmes); and the huge increase in the taking of household surveys in developing countries—which transferred analysis

down to the household level, reducing the need for demographers' aggregate skills.

The ready availability of household survey data also meant that researchers from many other subjects (e.g. economics, sociology) increasingly analysed topics like fertility and mortality. This was inevitable, and often beneficial. However, it also reduced the contribution made by demographers on these topics. Similarly, in migration studies, many researchers have scant understanding of relevant data and methods.

Here and in the US many more people are working in the broad field of 'population studies' – many of them doing valuable research on household survey data. However, relatively few of them are demographers.

UK demographers are hugely outnumbered, for example, by sociologists and economists. The scope for any demographer to seriously address major issues is further reduced by forces that encourage specialization and publishing papers. Many social scientists dig deep, fairly narrow holes, rather than addressing larger themes.

Demographers also face problems in talking about their work. One is the sensitive nature of the phenomena that determine populations—i.e. births, deaths, and migration. We are all the outcome of sexual activity, but almost everyone has difficulty discussing sex. This may partly explain why many academics are often reluctant to talk, or even seriously think, about recommending family planning. Death and migration are also delicate

subjects. For example, those who discuss migration in the UK risk being labelled xenophobic.

These topics are rarely discussed calmly and objectively. The media's adversarial style does not help. I recall being asked on a radio programme about the 1991 census and having to argue with someone who questioned the need for any census. More recently, in a radio programme about Malthus, a person from the OPT (as then) was subjected to what I consider was unfair criticism. Alas, the programme contained little about Malthus. Small wonder, then, that demographers often stay in the lecture room.

The situation is similar regarding radio or television reporting of world population. One might expect that topics like mortality decline, population growth, fertility decline, urbanization, international migration, and population ageing—phenomena that are transforming the world—would merit serious attention. But no, the tendency of television programmes, in particular, is to entertain rather than educate.

The view of economists that population growth does

not exert a negative impact on economic growth has changed since the mid-1990s. Most informed economists now hold that population growth has had a negative impact on the economic growth of poor countries in recent decades. Some even suggest that family planning programmes should be revisited. Unfortunately, the reduction in funding for international family planning in recent decades has resulted in appreciably larger populations in many countries than there would otherwise have been—plus, presumably, lower living standards too.

Of course there are hugely important reasons to support family planning programmes, including: improving the health and welfare of children; raising the status of women; and limiting the speed and the scale of urban growth. These are among the many topics where research by demographers has increased our understanding. Given their small number, the fact that they are firstly scientists and teachers (rather than advocates), and the difficult nature of public debate, the contribution of demographers to the world's population problem has not been insignificant.

Population Matters and the dogs that don't bark in the night

By Alan Stedall, Trustee

Statesman, Barbara Stocking, then Chief Executive of Oxfam, writing about The UK Government/Gates Foundation summit on family planning, criticised Population Matters and our policies.

Stocking commented

“Population growth is the public's number one concern about development – yes, higher than corruption. This goes beyond simple prejudice about growing numbers of Africans or Asians (although that doubtless does exist) - it is also fuelled by concerns that population growth is responsible for climate change and other environmental problems.

This is based on a fallacy. It is consumption in the rich rather than the poor world



that is primarily responsible for the pressure on our planet. In the 25 years to 2005, for example, Sub-Saharan Africa accounted for almost a fifth of the growth in the world's population but only 2.4 per cent of the increase in CO2 emissions. By contrast, North America was responsible for four per cent of population growth but a staggering 13.9 per cent of the rise in emissions.”

Perhaps you, like me, struggle to understand why Stocking appears to think that population growth and consumption are not connected. Population growth and consumption per head are the two components of environmental destruction. Their destructive impact is the mathematical product of the two.

Stocking's argument would have some credibility if population numbers in the developed world, whose fossil-fuelled economies are driving climate change, were all static or declining. However, they are not.

The present USA population of 318m is projected to increase to 403m (plus 27%) by 2050 and the present UK population of 62m is projected to increase to 73m (plus 18%, equivalent to "ten more Birmingham") in the same period.

Of course, "population deniers" point out that this projected increase of numbers in the developed world arises, not from the birth rates of the indigenous population, but in large measure from inward migration from poor countries.

However, this argument misses the bigger point. Global over-population is exactly that, global. The growing numbers of the poor of the world will (quite understandably) seek legal or illegal means to gain access to the developed world and, once within it, their material demands will rapidly rise to those of the existing population.

When Oxfam was founded in 1942, world population stood at 2.3 billion. In 2011, world population passed 7 billion; a three-fold increase in just 70 years.

Oxfam cannot disregard a basic law of physics: the finite resources of a single planet cannot sustain the unlimited growth of any species, especially one as voracious as our own. The recently revised UN's medium forecast of world population, rather than

seeing it levelling off at 9 billion by 2050, now projects it to continue to grow, passing 10 billion by 2085.

In its 70-year history, Oxfam has stubbornly refused to recognise, let alone engage with, the need to restrain the growth of world population.

Now the world is close to "peak oil" and heading into a time of "peak everything", whereby a deadly combination of ever-increasing population and consumption, combined with dwindling resources, will cause ever-rising prices.

Resulting starvation will then bring about those reductions in population - starting with the poor of the world of course - that past family planning initiatives could have and should have brought about humanely.

As "a dog that failed to bark in the night" Oxfam continues to conspire with major environmental charities, e.g. Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, in their stubborn refusal to confront the greatest challenge ever to face mankind: how to avoid breeding ourselves out of existence.

Why do these NGOs appear to lack the ability to see the obvious? Clearly Population Matters could continue to attempt to persuade them by bombarding them with ever more facts and confronting them with ever more logical arguments.

However, to (slightly) mis-quote an American Indian proverb: "You can't wake a dog that is pretending to be asleep".

Mea Culpa?

Edmund Davey

On December the 18th 2012, CNN reported: "Lawmakers on Monday approved legislation calling for government-funded contraception and sex education classes in the Philippines, a first in the heavily Catholic nation."



etter late than never, though there will be opposition from Mother Church. According to 'ZENIT The World Seen from Rome' on January 4th 2013: "Less than two weeks after President Benigno Aquino III of the Philippines signed the Reproductive Health (RH) bill, now Republic Act (RA) 10354, lawyers James and Lovely-Ann Imbong filed a petition with the Supreme Court to

declare the measure null and void. The couple, who filed the petition on behalf of their minor children and joined by Catholic school Magnificat Child Development Center Inc., cited Article 12, Sec. 2 of the Constitution, which recognizes the State's duty to protect the family, the life of mothers and their unborn children, and to support the primary right of parents in rearing their children."

You will find the remainder of Edmund Davey's comments on the long saga of the Vatican and family planning on our website.

http://populationmatters.org/documents/mea_culpa.pdf

Reminiscences of Malawi

Michael and Elspeth King

When we came with our two children to beautiful Malawi in 1976, its 5 million people were proudly self-sufficient in growing maize. Now the population has increased to 15 million – with huge deforestation, land degradation, drying rivers, sinking water tables.... and famines. 85% of Malawians are still subsistence farmers and subdivided family gardens have become too small to grow enough food for survival. With birth rates of 7 children per woman, was UNICEF wrong to provide immunizations or distribute free food - without contraceptive programmes? Health cannot be imposed on malnutrition, so diseases like TB, pneumonia, and malaria flourish, as in several other countries.

Low birth rates benefit everybody - as our Malawian University students could see in their deteriorating villages: "In Chikwawa district, men with cattle can buy many wives. One man in my Paiwa village has 3 wives and 17 children. By begetting large families, my Sena people in the Lower Shire Valley are digging their own graves. Our land is desertifying. Malawi should at least strive to achieve a low birth rate". (University of Malawi male student -1992)

In Malawi, Banja La Mtosogola (Marie Stopes) – "Children By Choice not Chance" - has two dozen urban clinics, with staff going on outreach trips to villages for vasectomies and female sterilization. But the service is inadequate for 10 million Malawian adults. Universal family planning should now be a vital humanitarian service.

Melinda Gates is financing the contraceptive injections and implants which are popular in Africa. All types of family planning are needed, including the Morning-After Pill, and abortion facilities to reduce the high maternal mortality caused by unsafe abortions in Africa. There were 70,000 unsafe abortions in Malawi in 2009, causing 17% of maternal deaths and tragic morbidity. Michael has had to deal with young girls oozing after a village abortion.

Female education is not necessary for family planning. Ideas of gender and female empowerment are superfluous. Malnourished, barefoot ladies, struggling for survival, do not need to be literate to manage birth control.

Male authority is essential for social change in tribal societies. We saw a male paramedic summoned to discipline 30 ladies with high risk pregnancies - who slept on the floor at the end of a crowded

maternity ward at night, and often ran out to local witch doctors by day to get dangerous potions. He spoke very sternly: "Ladies, I am your doctor, I am in charge of you, and you must do as I order – you must stay within this hospital and NOT go out to the witches in town. " Then he said to us "Because I am an Nkhonde man, they will accept what I say."

At another hospital, a male Malawian doctor was talking loudly to the parents of 3 severely malnourished children aged 3 years, 2 years and 8 months. "You must have NO MORE pregnancies. Already you cannot grow enough food to last for more than 4 months after harvest, and family problems around here are worsening." This young man's male authority with his own people was vital in persuading the couple to accept sterilization.

Can readers envisage the fears of people with vanishing water supplies? We saw villagers walking along a path buzzing with tsetse flies to dig into a dried up river bed – to find even a bucket of muddy water. In the 1950s (population 2 million) British colonialists prevented Sleeping Sickness by moving villages out of the tsetse fly belts. Today people move into the tsetse belts and game parks in order to survive.

Should both Donor and African Governments meekly await worsening disasters? In Malaysia (1967), we saw improvement in Singapore's living standards once Mr. Lee Kwan Yew's government insisted on the One-Wife and Only-Two Children policy. In Chinese culture, the good of society takes precedence over individual human rights.

Arrogantly, we have imposed our own agendas on the Poor World – so local politicians did not face up to the problems of increasing populations. The two regimes which successfully reduced their birth rates (China and Iran) both established basic rural health facilities – with authoritarian family planning.

The world now faces a looming crisis due to the needs of 7 billion people for food, water and energy. The rich lay waste and pollute it. In a war-time world, individual human rights become subservient to Society's right to survival. We delude ourselves if we think otherwise. The UN and International Donors will not declare this – at least until the situation becomes much worse.

Books by Michael and Elspeth King

The Great Rift – Africa, Surgery AIDS, AID
ISBN 978-09539290-0-9 Arco Books 2000

AIDS, Surgery and Life – a Malawi Mosaic
ISBN 978-09539290-16 Arco Books 2007

Population Matters: The Population Matters position is that voluntary methods are sufficient to lower the birth rate to replacement level when pursued with sufficient political leadership, promotion of family planning and smaller families, and funding.

Attenborough: 60 years in the wild - an extract from part 3, Our Fragile Planet

Sir David Attenborough



“For me, as for countless others, the natural world is the greatest of all treasures. And yet in my lifetime we have damaged it more severely than in the whole of the rest of human history.

Indeed, significant parts of it are now in danger of total destruction. When I first came to Borneo in 1956 the rainforest stretched unbroken on either side of the river for hundreds of miles.

Today it is very different. Just beyond the trees lining the river bank, there is nothing but oil palm plantations. And the forest and all the rich variety of plants and animals that it once contained has been destroyed.....

The increasing size of the human population is having a devastating effect on the natural world. But fortunately people are becoming aware of that and doing something about it, and I'd like to think that natural history films helped in that process. And there are some signs of hope. Animals that I thought might become extinct in my lifetime are still with us and growing in numbers. We now have a better understanding of the natural world than ever. We know how best to protect it for future generations. I can only hope that we will.”

The Women Are Waiting: Conservation through Reproductive Health Service Provision

Taylor Mayol, Blue Ventures Conservation



Biodiversity is under siege from anthropogenic pressures worldwide. Bigger families mean more mouths to feed. In much of the rural developing world this leads to growing pressure on ecosystems and increased food insecurity.

It will simply not be possible for us to achieve our conservation and sustainable development goals if we do not address the unmet need for reproductive health services. Yet the world's environmental conservation community rarely addresses this self-evident interdependence between population and environment.

We at Blue Ventures, a Madagascar-based marine conservation organisation, are tackling this 'elephant in the lagoon' through a far-sighted approach that integrates community health service provision into more conventional biodiversity conservation efforts. Coastal communities we work with in the remote southwest live on under 1.5US\$ per day, have some of the lowest education rates in the country and have negligible access to basic public health services, including reproductive health.

Having worked in this region for the past decade, we recognised in 2005 that our work would ultimately prove futile without addressing the primary driver of Madagascar's booming population. What good does encouraging sustainable fishing practices do, if the women who must feed their families and depend solely on the ocean are having seven, eight or nine children?

Conservationists promote preservation of biodiversity for future generations. However, they tend to shy away from empowering women to avoid unwanted pregnancies through contraceptive service provision. Access to reproductive health care is a human right enshrined in Millennium Development Goal 5B, and should be treated no differently than access to clean drinking water. Importantly, it must be done in a way that respects and protects human rights. Reproductive health services must be provided in a culturally and socially acceptable way that allows families to take advantage of it if and when they so desire.

We have found our approach to be highly effective because it explicitly recognises these preconditions. There was clearly an unmet demand for family planning services in this region; over a fifth of all women of reproductive age surrounding Andavadoaka, our main field site, sought contraception on the very first day we opened the doors to our initial family planning clinic. The overwhelming response by women everywhere we have offered services has remained a constant. This has led our health project to evolve rapidly in response to the needs of the communities we work with.

Today we offer a high quality family planning services to 40 villages, together with maternal, child health services and counselling as well as an ambitious water, sanitation and hygiene programme. All of this reaches over 10,000 people.

The welcome reception that our health work has enjoyed should not be surprising. The challenges facing Madagascar's coastal population are similar to those endured by millions of people living in the tropical developing world. The tropics hold most of the world's biodiversity and account for the majority of the world's population growth. These booming populations are often highly dependent on natural environments for their cultural identity, livelihoods and subsistence, yet globally they have the poorest access to family planning.

In Madagascar, up to 70% of the coastal communities we work with depend on dwindling marine resources. They increasingly recognise that their family sizes and fish stocks are inextricably linked. We have witnessed that empowering women to control their own health creates partnerships with strong female figures, who can then serve as conservation ambassadors for the health of their families, neighbours, and environment.

As well as seeing immense health and social benefits to individuals, couples and local communities, we have gathered compelling data that support our integrated approach. In five years the contraceptive prevalence rate has gone from less than 10% to over 40%, bringing about a huge reduction in the regional birth rate. By conservative estimates the population of the southwest region would be 6% higher than it is now without our health intervention. The slowing population growth rate undoubtedly means that our community based conservation and fisheries

management programmes are likely to be more effective. Furthermore, providing health services to these isolated communities has led to greater interest in wider conservation initiatives.

Conservationists may still be wary of whispering the words contraception or sexual health, but this caution is rarely warranted. Our work in Madagascar has shown positive social and environmental outcomes, and demonstrates the large degree to which communities can be receptive to this 'population, health and environment' approach. Yet, despite compelling results, only a handful of such integrated initiatives are being developed today. It is time for other organisations to face the facts, and recognise the links between population growth and biodiversity conservation.

Time is ticking, resources are dwindling and people who want the opportunity to choose their family sizes and space their children must be given the means to do so. It is imperative for the health of our human population, and for the ecosystems upon which our own survival depends, that women are empowered with the ability to plan their family sizes and futures. This is not only a fundamental human right, but also a self-evident precondition that conservation planners must ensure is addressed within human populations around areas of conservation importance. Ask any of the community health workers working with Blue Ventures - they will tell you that the women are waiting.

Salama Soa Project - family planning in SW Madagascar

John Charnock-Wilson, Managing Director, PopOffsets



PopOffsets financed a year-long family planning pilot project in villages in the Bay of Ranobe, Southwest Madagascar in the year June 2011-12 with a donation of £5,000.

The project was managed by ReefDoctor, a marine conservation, reef research and social development organization. ReefDoctor's mission is to promote and establish sustainable fisheries in the area, which presently suffers from overfishing due largely to population pressure. Consequently, ReefDoctor – like its partner Blue

Ventures down the coast, which PopOffsets assisted in 2010 – has broadened its activities to include a family planning component. The focus of the project is on “empowering women to manage their reproductive status”. It thus joins a growing number of ‘Population, Health, Environment (PHE)’ projects with wider aims – a combination which seems to be a winning formula.

ReefDoctor selected two villages on the Bay of Ranobe, Ifaty (pop. 3,000) and Tsivinoe (pop. 600) to pilot their programme. Supply of contraceptives in this region, nominally free from the government (donated by international aid organizations) was at best erratic, and education on family planning and sexual health inadequate. The main objectives for this pilot project were to assess the response of the population to various forms of contraception, to understand why contraception may not be regularly used (e.g. lack of education, misinformation, or lack of access), and to introduce reproductive education and family planning through (female) contraceptive use. Male contraception (condoms) was not pursued as the men misuse condoms (to waterproof their flashlights for night fishing!).

The project consisted of three components: an initial survey and meetings with focus groups, and

recruitment of “Community Health Agents” (CHAs); education sessions, and; ongoing counseling and distribution of contraceptives

The initial work showed that there was an unmet need for both education about contraception, including dispelling myths (adverse effects, sterility, etc.), and a reliable supply of contraceptives. Six CHAs were retrained, and reliable supplies organized. Both 1-month supplies of pills and 3-month injections were made available.

Education outreach sessions were held, including village theatre productions focusing on safe sex and teen pregnancy and the social and economic advantages of a small family.

Some 360 units of contraceptives (1- and 3-month), together with advice on sexual and reproductive health, were distributed over the year to about 130 women, resulting in some 20 births averted. The villagers now understand far better the importance of family planning and the value of being able to control their fertility, and are keen to continue.

ReefDoctor are now seeking further funding to both continue and widen their project and PopOffsets wishes them every success.

Online contraception advice at Margaret Pyke Centre, Camden, London

John Charnock-Wilson, Managing Director, PopOffsets

The Margaret Pyke Memorial Trust is a charity which funds training and research in the field of sexual and reproductive health. Margaret Pyke Centre in Camden, London is the hub of a network of family planning clinics.

PopOffsets has donated £5,000 to support the development by Margaret Pyke Centre of an on-line counselling service for women considering intrauterine contraception. This will allow women to get preliminary advice on-line, freeing up professional staff time to deal with in-depth

enquiries. The Margaret Pyke Centre for Sexual and Reproductive Health is run alongside the NHS, but this aspect of their work is not covered by the NHS budget.

Dr Chris Wilkinson, Lead Consultant at Margaret Pyke said, “For many women, using this tool will avoid the need for a formal first counselling session, allowing us to provide more of a walk-in service”.

The Law of Population

Matthew Naylor

The Law of Population
When properly presented
Says checks to population
Can be positive or prevented

And Thomas Robert Malthus
Is spinning in his tomb
As he contemplates the numbers
Currently in the womb

Soon will come the moment
As cheap oil ceases to flow
That PM members tell their friends
“See, we told you so”

As Roger flies to meetings
To pursue our noble cause
He knows he'll meet indifference
Not rapturous applause

But still he keeps on trying
The trends must be rebuffed
For failure to do so
Means that we're all stuffed

“Growth is the disease for which it pretends to be the cure”.

Quoted by Australia's Stable Population Party

Reviews

Review of 2052: A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years, by Jorgen Randers

Vermont, Chelsea Green Publishing, 2012

Peter Graystone

Jorgen Randers (born 1945) is a Norwegian academic with special interests in futures research, sustainability and climate change. His 1972 co-authored book *The Limits to Growth* modelled the effects of unlimited economic and population growth in a finite world, and noted that they would lead to the probability of overshoot and collapse by the later 21st century. The (unrealised) hope of the authors was that such predictions would lead to world-wide debate and action, thus bringing about the changes needed for a sustainable future.

In this new book, Randers takes a different road: he makes a forecast – an ‘educated guess’ - of what will actually happen over the next forty years, from 2012 to 2052. His results are not as bleak as he feared – ‘quite gloomy not catastrophic’.

He believes that:

- World population will peak at 8.1 billion in 2042, as the world becomes increasingly urbanised.

- CO2 emissions will peak in 2030, raising global temperature above the two degrees necessary to cause dramatic climate change, which will intensify in the second half of the century.
- Food production will satisfy demand, at least until 2052, although food will remain unevenly distributed, and many will starve as they cannot afford the prices.
- The amount of land not used by humanity will drop dramatically, to less than 20%: we will be using practically all productive land. Wild nature will survive in a few protected areas.

Among other predictions are:

- The USA will decline as China rises to become the dominant power in the world.
- Despite the improvement of living standards in China and other emerging economies, there will be an overall stagnation and decline in the global economy, with the gap between rich and poor widening – leading to irresistible demands for some sort of redistribution of wealth.
- 80% of the world's population will live in cities, out of contact with land, animals and nature. The world will be urbanised, crowded, and ‘virtual’ (looking outward through TV/internet).
- The opportunities for enjoying wild places will disappear as they become crowded with tourists.
- Life expectancy will grow over most of the world.

Randers finishes with a list of 20 pieces of personal advice, in order to prepare for the future. These include 'Don't teach your children to love the wilderness' (it will be gone), and 'Encourage your children to learn Mandarin.'

His population prediction seems low, as the UN report "2010 Revision of World Population Prospects" predicted that the global population would reach 9.31 billion by 2050, and a study by the United Nations Population Fund – "The State of World Population 2011" – warns that the world's population could reach 15 billion by 2100 (this is the highest of the three published variants and is based on women having, on average, half a child more than the medium projection).

Review of The State and the Stork by Derek S. Hoff

Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2012

Max Kummerow

From earliest European settlement, many Americans felt that uncrowded wilderness provided for virtue, freedom, equality and prosperity unknown in crowded Europe. Others promoted population growth to enhance the new nation's power and their own personal wealth.

By the 1950s, a post-war "baby boom" together with concerns about declining quality of life and preservation of nature motivated many to advocate population stabilization. By the late 1960s, Paul Ehrlich appeared repeatedly on national television warning of future ecological disaster—the "population bomb." Support for NGO's such as the Population Council and Planned Parenthood International and for major U.N. and U.S. government foreign aid program family planning programs came from large foundations as well as the U.S. government.

President Nixon appointed a commission to study population issues, but then rejected the commission's recommendations of policies to stabilize U.S. population. Major initiatives to stabilize rising global population during the 1960s and '70s eventually fell victim to an effective counterattack from the political right. Nixon decided he could win Catholic votes by opposing abortion.

The major strength of this book is the insightful way Hoff shows key linkages between population and other issues such as slavery, racism, the labor movement, the women's movement, Keynesian economics,

immigration, economic boosterism and the Republican Party's re-election strategies. Hoff also skillfully takes us through two centuries of still unresolved debate among economists about whether population growth helps or hurts economic outcomes.

The major weakness of the book is that Hoff fails to offer a critical evaluation of the arguments on both sides of this key issue. In this reviewer's opinion, up to roughly 1960 population growth arguably facilitated higher American incomes via economies of scale and scientific innovation. By the 21st century, however, with state and federal governments going broke, fragile and corrupt banking systems, cuts in education budgets, oil running out, climate changing and growing populations wrecking forests, soils and fisheries and a species holocaust, the role of population growth has reversed. Now population growth makes nearly every economic problem more difficult to solve in a world of limited resources.

And results of a worldwide experiment are conclusive. Every country with high fertility is poor, barring a few temporarily rich oil sheikdoms. Every country with low fertility has become richer. Singapore, formerly poor and with no resources, now has one of the five highest incomes in the world and one of the lowest fertility rates. Meanwhile the Philippines and Haiti, with more resources and Catholic bishops who derailed family planning, slipped backwards towards chaos. The world's poorest most violent countries have the highest fertility rates.

Cutting population growth is certainly not the only reason for the divergence in outcomes between rich peaceful low fertility and poor violent high fertility countries, but lower fertility certainly seems to be one thing that cannot be omitted for incomes to rise and quality of life to improve and for maintaining a habitable planet.

Review of Overshoot: the ecological basis of revolutionary change by William Catton

University of Illinois Press, 1982

Pam Jones

Catton is an enlightened American sociologist who has noticed how human behaviour varies according to how close we are to carrying capacity. Carrying capacity is not constant but increases with developments such as acquisition of more land,

better agriculture, discovery of more resources, trade etc. and can decrease with war, pollution or other adverse conditions. Each time carrying capacity increases, an “age of exuberance” and optimism results until increased population (and raised living standards) again reaches or overshoots the carrying capacity, resulting in bewilderment and frequently bad policy decisions due to ignorance of the true state of affairs. This is a very different way of looking at history. Although American-based and 30 years old, this brilliantly written book is just so relevant for today. It makes me wonder if in addition to promoting the population message we should also campaign to have human ecology included in the history syllabus in the hopes that future policy makers might be a little more enlightened.

Review of a Million People to One Tiger by Brian Riley

Brian Riley, 2012

David Bradshaw

Described as a population fact book for Planet Earth, the author’s sharp wry humour, directed at those whose deliberate blindness is denying that the population problem exists, masks a serious and worthwhile work of reference.

The main body of the book is an A to Z guide for 161 countries. This contains for each country a brief history and geography, population records to date, comment on population trends, religious and ethnic mix of the population, and, where available, the total fertility rate of the country by ethnic mix.

While the country breakdown is good reference, the brief history of population growth for the last 10,000 years, along with the churches’ roles today and political attitudes all add to an instructive and entertaining read. Statistics that frighten any sane person jump out from every page. To round off, the author has recorded the breeding habits of the great and the good in our society today; illuminating to the curious. While slightly let down by the proof reader, this is a book every serious student of the population problem should have on their bookshelf.

Review of Is Britain overcrowded? – an ITV1 documentary broadcast on 3rd January 2013

Norman Pasley

Data just released by the Office for National Statistics reveals that Britain is approaching its biggest baby boom for 40 years. In this documentary, Fiona Foster looked at whether services like hospitals, schools, and the transport network - already being stretched to the limit - will be able to cope.

The population boom is being caused by fertility, net migration and longevity. Our population of 63 million is now growing at 1,000 people per day. We could have another 10 million people by 2050. England and Wales, in particular, are seeing the biggest increase in population since records began in 1801. Towns and cities are merging together.

The baby boom is being felt at Birmingham City Hospital where the maternity unit staff is working beyond the recommended 75% capacity. One staff member said, “We don’t know whether we are getting a tsunami or just a big wave on the beach”. It is not just maternity services. All parts of the NHS are under strain: dementia is expected to double by 2050; breast cancer in women of 65 and over is expected to quadruple by 2040; and people living with the effect of stroke is expected to increase by 46% by 2025.

Today’s babies will need schooling tomorrow. We will need another 800,000 primary school places by 2020. Gascoigne Primary School in Barking, East London is the largest primary school in the country with 1100 pupils, soon to have 1200 pupils. It has to stagger playtime and lunchtime and the staff have to work additionally hard.

Many of these children live in tower blocks. We need 300,000 new homes per year. There are 2 million people on housing and homes waiting lists.

Our larger population will need to get to work. Road traffic is expected to grow by 44% leading to increasing congestion unless we start planning for it now. Extra runways will be needed at London’s three largest airports after 2030. Rail is running at full capacity with over 1 billion rail journeys a year.

After work we will need to look after the retired. One third of children born today will reach their 100th birthday.

Interviewed by ITV, Simon Ross of Population Matters commented, “We need to go back to balanced migration. We had that for most of the last 100 years. It’s only in the last 10 years or so we’ve had this really large flow.... I think another thing we need to do, partly because we are living longer, is to move back to a lower birth rate.”

Jonathan Portes of the National Institute of Economics and Social Research, said, “Britain could quite easily cope with 80 million people if we get policy and planning right. I think Britain in 2050 could look like a society where we have more people but actually because we have solved some of these problems of transport and housing our daily lives are much smoother and more efficient than they are now.”

I would ask the following questions. As our services with 63 million people are already stretched to the limit, how will we possibly provide better services for 80 million? Jonathan Portes thinks we could do it “if we could get our policy and planning right”. The evidence in Britain today is that it is very difficult to get policy and planning right; we have, for example a £1 trillion national debt. Unfortunately, the programme failed to show that we are demolishing the natural world which means we became overcrowded a long time ago.

In my view, ITV has produced a brilliant, well researched programme describing Britain today and a disturbing Britain of 80 million in 2050. This film should be shown to every school child in Britain and followed by a debate about the issues.

Review of *Life on the Brink*, edited by Philip Cafaro and Eileen Crist

University of Georgia Press, 2012
Barbara Rogers

Environmentalists return to the issue of human numbers in this collection. Contributors acknowledge that there has recently been a shameful neglect of this crucial issue, especially in the US, and call for a radical reappraisal of human population growth as it threatens to overwhelm the natural world and the carrying capacity of our planet. There are useful reviews of why support and funding for family planning has fallen back, a detailed look at the influence of radio “soap” series, and why informed and enabled choice for all women is the key to a solution.

Letters

Fewer and fairer

Graeme Kemp

Jonathon Porritt raised some interesting points about unwanted or unplanned pregnancies as a factor in population growth, way back in Issue 19 of ‘Population Matters Magazine’. I have only just discovered it, but I thought I would comment anyway, as Porritt raises some important points. A key point is this: unwanted pregnancies, particularly teenage ones, tend to be higher in countries with a large gap between ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. Very unequal societies tend to have higher levels of unplanned pregnancies among the young. Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett highlighted this in their recent book ‘The Spirit Level’. They rely on very detailed and useful research on inequality and social issues. I found their arguments impressive. I think that the levels of income inequality in a society could have a direct relevance to population growth. It may be possible to reduce both at the same time.

Never anywhere to park

Mrs J Roberts

I have just joined your organisation. I remember happily playing in the street in Ilford in 1960; you hardly saw a car back then. We moved to Somerset in 1968 and in the 1970s cars seemed to spring up from nowhere. My husband and I moved to Cornwall in 1995. It was quieter than Somerset and we could always find a parking space in town. Today there is never anywhere to park and we drive miles out of town to a supermarket car park and then do all our shopping there. I can feel my quality of life is being affected. I feel ‘crowded’ every time we go out.

What will it be like in the future? We are running out of space and resources because of population growth. It will be an awful way to live for future generations. They will have no quality of life if there are too many people and not enough jobs to go round. They will fall into the benefit trap and surely that affects the economy.

You can plainly see that with too many people comes too many problems, transport issues, pollution, global warming, resources, housing, all the issues raised in your magazine.

I look forward to reading the next magazine and I’m glad I found your organisation to join.

Money talks

Viv Hony

Like Sally and Malcolm Ross (letter August 2012), I am also “thankful to be old enough not to expect to witness the coming catastrophes” of an overpopulated UK. We are where we are because of inaction twenty years ago by government and the politically correct who nobody dared challenge. Unfortunately, nothing we do now will have any meaningful effect till about 2030. So the problem is off the radar until, that is, our grandchildren demand, “Why didn’t you do something while you still could?”

The only way to reduce the rate of increase in the population of the UK is through peoples’ pockets and I urge ‘Population Matters’ to adopt a far more rigorous policy based on the following:

- Child Benefits (or equivalent) should be limited to two children per woman: 100% for the first and 50% for the second.
- Housing Benefit (or equivalent) should be capped at two children per family.
- Economic migrants and asylum seekers should not be allowed into the UK if they have more than two children.
- Women who agree to be sterilized after they have had two children should be given a cash sum of, say £5000.

Drastic measures must be put in place now; not when unemployment and energy costs have gone through the roof; not when our transport system, the NHS and our schools have ground to a halt; and not when there are riots in our cities.

The message is clear: “If you want more than two children don’t expect the taxpayer to pay for them. Take responsibility for your actions.”

Population Matters: The Population Matters position is that it is in society’s interest that the very poor be supported, that the right of asylum be respected and that users’ choice of family planning methods, including sterilization, be on the basis of what is in their own best interests. Economic migrants tend to be single, rather than large families. We do think that subsidies for larger families should be on the basis of need, rather than being paid to all basic rate tax payers, as it is now, and that users be made aware of the pros and cons of the full range of contraceptive methods, including long acting reversible contraceptives and male sterilization.

Local groups

Population Matters’ local groups campaign locally on population issues. They staff stalls at fetes and in shopping areas, leaflet door to door, provide educational material to schools and libraries, give talks to schools, colleges and interest groups, engage with the local press and radio, and lobby their local authorities and political representatives. Areas with existing or nascent groups include Bedford & Luton, Brighton, Cambridge, Colchester & Ipswich, Cumbria, Guildford, Fareham, High Wycombe, Oxford, Scotland, St Albans, Stockport, West London, Winchester and Worcester.

If you would like to be put in touch with one of these groups, or ask about setting up one of your own, let us know at supporters@populationmatters.org

More information is available at www.populationmatters.org/what-you-can-do/local-groups

Promotional items

LEAFLETS AND WINDOW STICKERS

Attenborough flyer
Stripy Leaflet
Window stickers
(All free)

BADGES AND PENS

OPT/ Stop at Two badges - enamelled
Population Matters badges - tin
Population Matters pens
(All one for £0.50 or three for £1)

CARDS, STICKERS AND BRIEFING SHEETS

David Attenborough pocket cards
David Attenborough bookmarks
(Both ten for £1 or fifty for £3)
Small envelope stickers for normal mail, A4 sheet of 24
Large envelope stickers, coloured, A4 sheet of 10
(Both two for £1)

BRIEFING SHEETS

01 Climate change and population
02 Desertification and migration
03 A population-based climate strategy
04 The sustainability of human populations
05 What population policy should we have?

- 06 Why the UK needs a population policy
- 07 Is there a "right" to have children?
- 08 The green gains from smaller families
- 09 Population, environment, migration
- 10 Ethical implications of population growth
- 11 Climate change and population

POSTERS

A4 - £1

A3 - £2

A1 Attenborough - £3

Data discs with approx. fifty posters, a selection of Powerpoint slides and academic studies - £2.50

Customise a poster for your local needs at no extra cost – ask Edmund Davey.

OTHER ITEMS

T-shirts of quality cotton, white with blue print, front: logo and For a sustainable future; back: A smaller family is a sustainable family and website address. Sizes S, M, L, XL - £7 each or two for £12

Images of our promotional items are on the website.

ORDERING

Due to rising costs, please add £2 for postage and packing. See below for our special offer on Christmas Cards.

Star Offer

**Santa Christmas Cards;
pack of 10 with envelopes,
now £2.50 incl. P&P
if ordered alone**

Your order should include: a receiving address, a daytime telephone number, quantity per item, itemised costs and a cheque for the total amount made out to Population Matters. Items may be despatched in several packages. Please allow ten working days for delivery. If the delivery address is outside the UK, please ask for a quote for postage and packing.

Orders should be sent to:

**Edmund Davey
68 Croxall Road
Tamworth
B79 9JE**

Enquiries: Edmund.davey@populationmatters.org 01827 383437



for a
sustainable
future