

13:23:36 From Jean and Dave Dougherty CACOR to Everyone:

C: 2016 story on a Russian anthrax outbreak affects dozens in north Siberia

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36951542>

13:24:48 From Phil Reilly to Everyone:

C: 2023 story on how A Drone Flew Into Siberia's 'Doorway to The Underworld' And The Footage Is Epic.

<https://www.sciencealert.com/a-drone-flew-into-siberias-doorway-to-the-underworld-and-the-footage-is-epic>

13:43:47 From Peter Bulkowski to Everyone:

Q: Due to other commitments, I must leave before the question period, but have a practical question for which I would like to see an answer. Given that the political elite (Liberal & Conservative & NDP) favour, perhaps not openly, a population in Canada of 100 million by the end of the century, how do you propose to have that policy rejected by the general population (and not just by believers such as those listening to this presentation)?

13:45:35 From Paul Beckwith to Everyone:

Q: What is your best gut feeling guess for peak global population and what year would you expect it to occur?

13:55:56 From Ted Manning to Everyone:

Q: The patterns are clearly different in different nations and regions. Do policies have to be different for each place, and/or do other nations have to help or absorb some of the overflows?

13:56:47 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

C: It is a well known fact that exposure to environmental toxins has a major effect on fertility rates.

13:59:36 From Paul Beckwith to Everyone:

Q: Rising heat reduces fertility, so rapid global temperature rise reduces population growth rates, but how much?

14:00:40 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

C: Stephen Hawking argues we need to look seriously at moving people to other inhabitable planets, if they exist.

14:01:54 From Paul Beckwith to Everyone:

Q: Do you expect a public backlash soon on Canada's enormous population growth rate from immigration at > 0.5 million per year.

14:02:25 From Samrat Bharadwaj to Everyone:

Q: If the population is set to explode, or already has, why have borders? That only makes it worse. To pack so many people in one place? After all, countries are imaginary constructs, unlike the space on earth (fixed).

14:09:44 From Jack Alpert to Everyone:

Q: If we got global births to 0.5 million per year (most women have no children for 50 years after that each could have as many as they want), would implementing the process create more injury or less injury than our present path?

14:10:58 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

Q: How much of the relationship between bird population and outcomes is causation vs correlation?

14:13:10 From Karen Shragg to Everyone:

Q: Great talk TOTALLY agree Madeline, its important to emphasize that we are billions OVER our capacity now so if people understood this, we would be cheering decline, except as you said we are NOT declining we are growing by 81 million a year. What do you think of the slogan Overpopulation is poverty's best friend? So, if you like poverty, traffic, water scarcity, etc., you can love and support overpopulation!

14:13:28 From Mike Nickerson to Everyone:

Q: We are encouraged to consume. \$600 billion a year advertising. Comparable education around sustainability would change the balance. How might we shift the focus of attention?

14:14:58 From Bill Tyson to Everyone:

Q: It is so blindingly obvious that the cause of our current problems is overpopulation. PIC is striving mightily to advertise this, but very few listen. Are we doomed?

14:16:28 From Jean and Dave Dougherty CACOR to Everyone:

Q: If discussion of population has been a no-go topic, do you think making religious teachings a no-go topic is also?

14:18:07 From William Rees to Everyone:

Q: Humans are nearing the peak of a one-off population boom bust cycle. Virtually all K-strategic species go through repeated cycles of boom, when conditions are favourable, followed by bust. The human cycle is "one off" because we will have depleted non-renewable and many renewable resources necessary for mere recovery. Future booms are impossible until the exosphere recovers from human over-consumption. Your thoughts?

14:18:09 From Jon Legg to Everyone:

Q: What are the real reasons that the federal Liberals are in favour of a radically higher Immigration? How do these Liberals justify this policy?

14:22:15 From William Rees to Everyone:

C: UN population projections are based purely on demographic factors. They are done in a contextual vacuum with no attention to ecological, political, or socio-cultural conditions.

14:24:59 From William Rees to Everyone:

C: Economics and techno-optimists disagree completely with dismal projections. Their perspective says that human ingenuity can resolve any eco-crisis and that the human enterprise will eventually decouple from nature. What, me worry?

14:26:47 From Karen Shragg to Everyone:

C: Growth ALSO happens by migration and yet has been deemed a taboo, yet that is the major reason why developed countries are growing. So, if fertility is under control but mass immigration is high, there is no progress.

14:29:05 From William Rees to Everyone:

Q: One can't critique immigration without risking being dismissed as a neo-Malthusian, neo-Nazi, or eco-terrorist.

14:29:39 From Ralph Martin to Everyone:

Q: By 2045 median human sperm count may be zero, given BPAs, other chemicals.

<https://bit.ly/2Pwudu2> <https://bit.ly/3Hs01Y5> Comments?

14:29:40 From Mike Nickerson to Everyone:

Q: Is the US anti-abortion activity a population growth policy?

14:36:59 From William Rees to Everyone:

C: When the world a whole is in overshoot, even total equality would not solve the problem. Average levels of consumption/pollution would remain excessive. In that sense, the issue of borders is irrelevant. We would still need to reduce population dramatically to reach a satisfactory average material standard of living.

14:44:50 From William Rees to Everyone:

C: With globalization and trade, population is a global not local problem. 80% of the world's countries are now trade-dependent.

14:47:45 From Ted Manning to Everyone:

C: China, with its impressive command and control capacity in fact did limit births and cause population growth to reverse. Yes, they are now dealing with the implications. This level of control is not likely be feasible for other governments. The only other policy tools which seem to be as powerful are women's education and electrification--with major success stories from worldwide. Collecting and sharing success stories among nations is instructive, but the cultural barriers are often nearly insurmountable.

15:01:59 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

C: The people of Japan work much longer as well.