What’s at stake: Reducing population growth and its catastrophic increase of the human footprint: biodiversity loss/6th extinction, hunger, meat consumption, affluent overconsumption, CO2, warming, climate change, melting glaciers, rising seas, weather extremes, droughts, floods.
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Essential for effective political action.

Arkansas’ four House of Representatives and two Senators received a zero rating. Write them referencing the individual bills (pp. 3 and 16). See pp. 20-21 for four steadfast
congressional supporters of family planning and four extreme opponents of reproductive health and rights. Write them and your congressional reps too about them. See at end for Arkansas addresses.

FAMILY PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS

These groups seek to improve reproductive health and increase women’s choice in family planning by making contraception easily and universally available for those who choose. As far as I know none makes the connection with climate change; none promotes their work because it resists global warming. But population growth means increased CO2 and consumption, and anything that impedes that growth is part of the Stop Climate Change Movement.

I am working on a comprehensive, annotated draft list.

Emily’s List
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
CARE
China National Population and Family Planning Commission
DKT International Family Planning and HIV Prevention
Guttmacher Institute
HealthRight
International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)
NARAL
National Organization for Women (NOW)
Pathfinder International
Planned Parenthood
Planned Parenthood Heartland
Planned Parenthood International
Population Connection
Pro-choice America
RELIGIOUS COALITION FOR REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE

Support for International Family Planning Organizations (SIFPO)

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

UN World Health Organization (WHO)

Women Thrive

FEATURED ORGANIZATIONS

POPULATION CONNECTION

Population Connection - America's Voice for Population ...

www.populationconnection.org/

Since 1968, Population Connection (formerly Zero Population Growth or ZPG) has been America's voice for population stabilization. We are the largest ...

About Us

About Us. ZPG. Since 1968, Population Connection ...

Population Education

Population Education, a program of Population Connection, is the ...

Employment

Employment. Development Officer, Planned Giving Media ...

Membership

Population Connection is a national, nonprofit membership ...

Support Us

Support Us. A community-based family planning distribution ...

Frequently Asked Questions

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ). You don’t have to be a ...

More results from populationconnection.org »

PC has several Arkansas connections: Its Development Director, Shauna Scherer, has family in Fayetteville. It promotes free or cheap, long-lasting contraception (LARC). It invites Arkansas citizens to its annual conference in DC. And contact me for a free subscription to its excellent magazine.
I have read Pathfinder’s outstanding 2015 Annual Report of its work to reduce the 74 million unintended pregnancies in developing countries every year, which contributes to reducing the 36 million abortions, twenty million of which are unsafe, causing 22 thousand women to die every year. Although reducing suffering is their mission, every avoided unintended pregnancy is one less footprint of biodiversity loss/6th extinction, hunger, meat consumption, CO2, warming, climate change, melting glaciers, rising seas, weather extremes, droughts, floods. --Dick
Access to safe, voluntary family planning is a human right. Most of these women with an unmet need for contraceptives live in 69 of the poorest countries on earth. Access to reproductive health, including family planning, is recognized as a human right.

WHO | Family planning: a global handbook for providers

[www.who.int/topics/family_planning/en/](http://www.who.int/topics/family_planning/en/)

World Health Organization

Family planning: a global handbook for providers. Bloomberg School of Public Health/Center for Communication Programs and World Health Organization.

WHO | Family planning

[www.who.int/topics/family_planning/en/](http://www.who.int/topics/family_planning/en/)

World Health Organization

Family planning: WHO health topic page on family planning provides links to ... Family planning allows individuals and couples to anticipate and attain their desired ... information and services. Family planning: a global handbook for providers.

Pathfinder International: A Global Leader in Sexual and ...

[www.pathfinder.org/](http://www.pathfinder.org/)

Pathfinder International

a non-profit family planning and reproductive health organization working with developing countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Support for International Family Planning Organizations ...

[www.psi.org/.../Projects](http://www.psi.org/.../Projects)

Population Services International

Support for International Family Planning Organizations (SIFPO) ... Strengthen gender-sensitive and youth friendly family planning services at the global level.

Family Planning - Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

[www.gatesfoundation.org/.../Global.../F...](http://www.gatesfoundation.org/.../Global.../F...)

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Family planning is a smart, sensible, and vital component of global health and ... civil society organizations, foundations, and the private sector to commit to ...

Organizations working on family planning - The New York ...


Nicholas Kristof

Apr 7, 2009 - Organizations working on family planning ... and global access to reproductive health care and family planning options. [http://www.feminist.org](http://www.feminist.org).

The U.S. Government and International Family Planning ... kff.org/global.../the-u-s-
A Common Cause: Faith-Based Organizations and Promoting

https://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/.../gpr160418.html

On the global level, many faith-based organizations (FBOs) have had a long history, their commitment to family planning as part of their development...

International Planned Parenthood Federation: Home

www.ippf.org/

Those services include family planning, abortion, maternal and child health, and STI...

A global youth movement for sexual rights by The International Planned...

1. Birth Control Options

Ad


Searches related to family planning organizations global

international family planning organizations
family planning global handbook
the global family planning revolution
planned parenthood organizations
pregnancy organizations
birth control organizations
abortion organizations

TEEN PREGNANCY USA


In US 1 in 4 teens get pregnant by age 20. Report on coalition of over 100 organizations
calling on Congress to fund programs adequately “that advance the lifelong health of our nation’s youth” and to “eliminate funding for harmful abstinence only education.”

Is the U.S. imposing its own values about reproductive health and family planning on other countries? Should anyone fear family planning ideas and practices as prejudicial to colored people in economically stressed countries?

Not at all. The U.S. generally provides assistance to other countries through two avenues: the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

UNFPA assists governments and organizations at the receiving countries’ request. The agency maintains a democratically organized and implemented agenda, agreed upon by the 179 countries that took part in the Cairo International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in 1994. UNFPA extends assistance to countries at their request and works in partnership with governments, all parts of the United Nations system, development banks, bilateral aid agencies, non-governmental organizations, and civil society. Under internationally agreed upon population and development goals, each country decides for itself what approach to take in order to meet the specific needs of its residents. At the Cairo conference, developing countries agreed to provide 75% of the funding needed to provide family planning to everyone who wants to use it in their countries, and the industrialized nations agreed to provide the remaining 25% of the funding.

USAID grants assistance to foreign organizations that apply for funding and technical assistance. There is no U.S. funding for family planning in any country where it is not specifically requested by either the government or a local
(From Population Connection). Additional comment by Shauna Schere of PC: Basically, we’re advocating that the U.S. government increase the foreign aid it contributes to international family planning programs through USAID and UNFPA, so that the 225 million women worldwide with “unmet need” for family planning can gain access. Unmet need means that they are of childbearing age and want to use contraceptives, but cannot obtain them. We simply want to empower women to make the best decisions for themselves—that’s true around the world, and it’s true right here in the U.S.!
any scientific research or analysis, but from what appeared to be an arbitrary decision to change one of the inputs it fed into its model. Its previous analysis was based on the assumption that the average number of children per woman would fall to 1.85 worldwide by 2100. But this year it changed the assumption to 2.1. This happens to be the population replacement rate: the point at which reproduction contributes to neither a fall nor a rise in the number of people. The UN failed to explain this changed assumption, which appears to fly in the face of current trends, or to show why fertility decline should suddenly stop when it hit replacement level, rather than continuing beyond that point, as has happened to date in all such populations. I expected yesterday’s report to contain the explanation. I expected wrong. It appears to have plucked its fertility figure out of the air. Even so, and even if we’re to assume that the old figures are more realistic than the new ones, there’s a problem. As the new report points out “the escape from poverty and hunger is made more difficult by rapid population growth.” It also adds to the pressure on the biosphere. But how big a problem is it? If you believe the rich, elderly white men who dominate the population debate, it is the biggest one of all. In 2009 for example, a group of US billionaires met to decide which threat to the planet most urgently required their attention. Who’d have guessed? These men, who probably each consume as many of the world’s resources in half an hour as the average African consumes in a lifetime, decided that it was population. Population is the issue you blame if you can’t admit to your own impacts: it’s not us consuming, it’s those brown people reproducing. It seems to be a reliable rule of environmental politics that the richer you are, the more likely you are to place population growth close to the top of the list of crimes against the planet. The new report, inflated though its figures seem to be, will gravely disappoint the population obsessives. It cites Paul Murtaugh of Oregon State University, whose research shows that: “An extra child born today in the United States, would, down the generations, produce an eventual carbon footprint seven times that of an extra child in China, 55 times that of an Indian child or 86 times that of a Nigerian child.”And it draws on a paper published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences which makes the first comprehensive assessment of how changes in population affect carbon dioxide emissions. This concludes that: “slowing population growth could provide 16 per cent to 19 per cent of the emissions reductions suggested to be necessary by 2050 to avoid dangerous climate change”. In other words, it can make a contribution. But the other 81-84% will have to come from reducing consumption and changing technologies. The UN report concludes that “even if zero population growth were achieved, that would barely touch the climate problem.”This should not prevent us from strongly supporting the policies which will cause population to peak sooner rather than later. Sex education, the report shows, is crucial, so is access to contraception and the recognition of women’s rights and improvement in their social status. All these have been important factors in the demographic transition the world has seen so far. We should also press for a better distribution of wealth: escaping from grinding poverty is another of the factors which has allowed women to have fewer children. The highly unequal system sustained by the rich white men who fulminate about population is one of the major reasons for population growth. All this puts conservatives in a difficult position. They want to
blame the poor for the environmental crisis by attributing it to population growth. Yet some of them oppose all the measures – better and earlier sex education, universal access to contraception (for teenagers among others), stronger rights for women, the redistribution of wealth – which are likely to reduce it. And beyond these interventions, what do they intend to do about population growth? As the UN report points out: “Considerable population growth continues today because of the high numbers of births in the 1950s and 1960s, which have resulted in larger base populations with millions of young people reaching their reproductive years over succeeding generations.” In other words, it’s a hangover from an earlier period. It has been compounded by another astonishing transformation: since the 1950s, global life expectancy has risen from 48 to 68. What this means is that even if all the measures I’ve mentioned here – education, contraception, rights, redistribution – were widely deployed today, there will still be a population bulge, as a result of the momentum generated 60 years ago. So what do they propose? Compulsory sterilisation? Mass killing? If not, they had better explain their programme. Yes, population growth contributes to environmental problems. No, it is not the decisive factor. Even the availability of grain is affected more by rising livestock numbers and the use of biofuels – driven, again by consumption – than by human population growth. Of course we should demand that governments help women regain control over their bodies. But beyond that there’s little that can be done. We must instead decide how best to accommodate human numbers which will, at least for the next four decades, continue to rise.

www.monbiot.com

REPLY TO MONBIOT BY MARIAN STARKEY, POPULATION CONNECTION, 11-2-15

Rather than peaking at about 9 billion in the middle of this century, the UN says that human numbers will reach some 10 billion by 2100, and continue growing beyond that point.

That’s the middle scenario. The highest of its range of estimates is an astonishing 15.8bn by 2100. If this were correct, population would be a much greater problem – for both the environment and human development – than we had assumed. It would oblige me to change my views on yet another subject. But fortunately for my peace of mind and, rather more importantly, for the prospects of everyone on earth, it is almost certainly baloney.

· The UN Population Division updates its projections every two years, using the most recent demographic data (census and Demographic and Health Survey) available for each country. Sometimes new data forces them to revise their population estimates for the base years from which the new projections are formed. Sometimes fertility rates haven’t declined as much as they were projected to do, so numbers are revised upwards. That is what happened with this latest revision of the UN World Population Prospects, and also what happened in the 2010 revision that Monbiot references.

Writing in the journal Nature in May, Fred Pearce pointed out that the UN’s revision arose not
from any scientific research or analysis, but from what appeared to be an arbitrary decision to change one of the inputs it fed into its model. Its previous analysis was based on the assumption that the average number of children per woman would fall to 1.85 worldwide by 2100. But this year it changed the assumption to 2.1. ... The UN failed to explain this changed assumption, which appears to fly in the face of current trends, or to show why fertility decline should suddenly stop when it hit replacement level, rather than continuing beyond that point, as has happened to date in all such populations. I expected yesterday’s report to contain the explanation. I expected wrong. It appears to have plucked its fertility figure out of the air.

· The UN revised its future fertility assumptions based on the much slower rate of fertility decline that they have observed through new demographic data in the past several years, compared to how quickly they had previously projected that it would decline.

· In a way, all of the assumptions the UN or any other agency makes about future population trends are “plucked out of the air.” Nobody knows what will happen in the future, so we have to make educated guesses. The UN is no different than any other agency that does projections—they use the best data available to make the best educated guesses and then they let the model do the rest of the work.

In 2009 for example, a group of US billionaires met to decide which threat to the planet most urgently required their attention. Who’d have guessed? These men, who probably each consume as many of the world’s resources in half an hour as the average African consumes in a lifetime, decided that it was population.

· Population growth isn’t a problem only for environmental reasons. It has serious consequences for women’s rights and equality, girls education, health, and economic development.

It seems to be a reliable rule of environmental politics that the richer you are, the more likely you are to place population growth close to the top of the list of crimes against the planet.

· Most population activists would agree that rapid population growth in the poorest countries does not affect those of us who live in the industrialized world (except through immigration), especially in terms of environmental degradation. The linkages between rapid population growth and environmental harm are much more localized than that.

“An extra child born today in the United States, would, down the generations, produce an eventual carbon footprint seven times that of an extra child in China, 55 times that of an Indian child or 86 times that of a Nigerian child.”

· Probably true. Again, though, this movement is not about slowing population growth in the developing world in order to save the environment in the developed world. It’s about helping communities in the poorest regions protect their own environments, grow
economically, rise out of poverty at the household level, and improve women’s and children’s health.

“slowing population growth could provide 16 per cent to 19 per cent of the emissions reductions suggested to be necessary by 2050 to avoid dangerous climate change”.

In other words, it can make a contribution. But the other 81-84% will have to come from reducing consumption and changing technologies.

Agreed. All population stabilization advocates I know believe that slowing population growth is just one “wedge” in solving the climate change puzzle. It is important and needs to be considered, but on its own it won’t stop climate change or fix the damage already done.

All this puts conservatives in a difficult position. They want to blame the poor for the environmental crisis by attributing it to population growth. Yet some of them oppose all the measures – better and earlier sex education, universal access to contraception (for teenagers among others), stronger rights for women, the redistribution of wealth – which are likely to reduce it.

I can’t think of any conservatives who blame environmental crises on population growth. Maybe 30 years ago, but not now. In fact, conservatives are wont to acknowledge that the environment is suffering at all in the first place.

“Considerable population growth continues today because of the high numbers of births in the 1950s and 1960s, which have resulted in larger base populations with millions of young people reaching their reproductive years over succeeding generations.”

In other words, it’s a hangover from an earlier period. It has been compounded by another astonishing transformation: since the 1950s, global life expectancy has risen from 48 to 68.

This is true of countries such as the United States, where the TFR has been at or below replacement rate since the 1970s but the population has continued to grow. It is not, however, the reason that population is continuing to grow at such a rapid pace in the poorest, least developed countries. There, it is growing because of very high fertility that persists today.

What this means is that even if all the measures I’ve mentioned here – education, contraception, rights, redistribution – were widely deployed today, there will still be a population bulge, as a result of the momentum generated 60 years ago.

Correct

So what do they propose? Compulsory sterilisation? Mass killing? If not, they had better explain their programme.

No. We propose doing the things he mentioned above (education, contraception, rights, redistribution) and coping with the growth while momentum plays out. Obviously.
And this is exactly how our group views the situation in the United States—we are still growing because of momentum and because of immigration. Add to that the high rate of unplanned births (1/3 of all births in the U.S.) and we’ve still got a lot of work to do in the measures we all agree are important and necessary.

Even the availability of grain is affected more by rising livestock numbers and the use of biofuels—driven, again by consumption—than by human population growth.

- Rising numbers of livestock are a direct response to rising numbers of people who want to eat meat. Consumption can’t be separated completely from population growth—more people consume more things: food, water, trees (wood), etc.

Of course we should demand that governments help women regain control over their bodies. But beyond that there’s little that can be done.

- That is what Population Connection does—we don’t lobby on environmental issues; we lobby on reproductive health.

We must instead decide how best to accommodate human numbers which will, at least for the next four decades, continue to rise.

- Agreed, except for his use of the word “instead.” Population Connection believes that we need to do both: accept that the population is going to continue to grow for some decades, even if fertility rates decline significantly; AND expand access to sex education and birth control so that the population will peak at the earliest date, rather than continuing to grow well into the next century. These are not mutually exclusive responses to the situation.

**CONTACT ARKANSAS REPRESENTATIVES**

**Senator John Boozman:** (202)224-4843  
Website Email: [http://www.boozman.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/e-mail-me](http://www.boozman.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/e-mail-me)

**Senator Tom Cotton:** (202)224-2353  
Website Email: [http://www.cotton.senate.gov/content/contact-tom](http://www.cotton.senate.gov/content/contact-tom)

**Rep. Rick Crawford, 1st District:** (202)225-4076  
Website Email: [http://crawford.house.gov/contact/](http://crawford.house.gov/contact/)

**Rep. French Hill, 2nd District:** (202)225-2506  
Website Email: [https://hill.house.gov/contact/email](https://hill.house.gov/contact/email)

**Rep. Steve Womack, 3rd District:** (202)225-4301  
Website Email: [http://womack.house.gov/contact/](http://womack.house.gov/contact/)
Rep. Bruce Westerman, 4th District: (202) 225-3772
Website Email: https://westerman.house.gov/contact

DICK’S BLOGS, NEWSLETTERS, INDEX

Blog: It’s the War Department
http://jamesrichardbennett.blogspot.com/

Newsletters

Index:

See: abortion.doc, OMNI Climate Change Forums. doc, Planned Parenthood, OMNI Population Poverty Hunger Watch.doc (these should be one with OMNI population warming watch.doc), Population Organizations, Sierra Club Population Project, Worldwatch Institute, OneWorld US, Population Action International, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
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PREVENTION, CHOICE

World Contraception Day, September 26, 2015
McClain, Long-Acting Contraception
Endangered Species Condoms

Katha Pollitt, Population density affects everything: Women
Must Have Power Over Their Fertility

POPULATION GROWTH: BIODIVERSITY LOSS, HUNGER, COLLAPSE

Geiling, Population Growth Causes Biodiversity Loss

Population Growth Produces Hungry People

Speth and Diamond: Planetary Collapse from Population Growth

Weisman, *Countdown*: 2 Reviews

PLANNING, PREVENTION, CHOICE ORGANIZATIONS

UNFPA

Pathfinder International

Planned Parenthood International Federation

Population Action International

Population Connection Action Fund
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Dick Bennett


Blog: http://jamesrichardbennett.blogspot.com/

For research purposes, specific subjects can be located in the following alphabetized index, and searched on the blog using the search box. The search box is located in the upper left corner of the webpage.


Facebook: www.facebook.com/OMNIPeaceDept

j.dick.bennett@gmail.com
(479) 442-4600
2582 Jimmie Ave.