

Attempts by scientists to suppress discussion of overpopulation: a California case that backfired nicely

Stuart H. Hurlbert¹

¹Department of Biology, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, U.S.A. 92014
Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics 29(5): 154-165, September 2019
<https://eubios.info/EJAIB92019.pdf>

(Mail to: 13913 Recuerdo Dr, Del Mar CA, U.S.A., 92014)
Email: hurlbert@sdsu.edu

ABSTRACT: Distribution of literature on population issues at a Sierra Club symposium in San Diego on marine conservation led to an invitation to speak at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO). A few hours before that talk was given, the speaker was attacked in an email sent to the entire SIO community by a SIO faculty member repeating a claim by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) that the speaker belonged to an “anti-immigrant hate group.” Some students then also objected to the speaker’s presence. Nevertheless, the talk was positively received by the two dozen people who came, though not by the SIO faculty member nominally in charge of the seminar series. The UCSD administration did not allow the SIO directorate to follow through on its promise to allow the speaker a convenient way to respond to his attackers. He did so anyway with a document that went to 1800 members of the SIO community. A flurry of email messages occurred within SIO; the few received by the speaker were mostly positive. The SIO community contributed \$600 to Californians for Population Stabilization, the organization falsely accused as being a “hate group.” One SIO faculty member concluded, “the controversy has resulted in a great deal more thought about US population stabilization at SIO than if only CMBC [Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation] students and faculty attended your talk.” Ethically challenged censors within the scientific community must always be confronted and exposed. It doesn’t take all that much to win local battles.

The population-environment connection has become a taboo subject. Many young people on university campuses, including Berkeley, have been taught over the past decade that the connection between population growth and environment is not an acceptable subject for discussion. In many circles it is politically incorrect to say that slowing population growth will help to make it possible to preserve the environment for future generations.

*At the **Scripps Institution of Oceanography** in San Diego I have learned that the countries whose scientists are involved in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have made a tacit agreement not to talk about the population factor because it is “too sensitive”. Think about this ... the panel is composed only of scientists, who are purposely avoiding discussion of a significant factor in their principal subject. What has been happening? I will try to answer this question.*

*-- Martha M. Campbell, University of California, Berkeley,
in “Why the Silence on Population?,” 2005*

*The recommendations for action are made in a spirit of consensus and international cooperation, recognizing that **the formulation and implementation of population policies is the responsibility of each country** and should take into account the economic, social, and environmental diversity of conditions in each country, with full respect for the various religious and ethical values, cultural backgrounds and philosophical convictions of its people, as well as the shared but differentiated responsibilities of all the world’s people for a common future.*

-- Preamble to “Report of the International Conference on Population and Development,” Cairo, 1994

INTRODUCTION

In the United States discussion of national population policies and their environmental, social and economic consequences is strongly discouraged if not censored or suppressed outright by many scientific, academic and environmental establishments (Grant 1994, Maher 1997, Beck & Kolankiewicz 2000, Hurlbert 2001, 2011a,b,c,d, 2012, 2016a, Meyerson 2004, Campbell 2005, 2007, 2012, Ehrlich 2008, Hull 2011, 2018, Kolankiewicz 2011, Walker 2011, Weld 2012, Schindler et al. 2012). When such discussions invade or threaten to invade the institutional spaces these establishments control ideologically, their self-appointed guardians and overseers react in unethical ways. Often they simply nip such discussions in the bud without the wider community even knowing the nipping has taken place. When that is not possible, instead of joining the discussion, they may engage in *ad hominem* attacks on the individuals or organizations initiating the discussion.

This article exemplifies one possible way in which well-informed contrarians with sufficient time on their hands can respond with positive result to attacks of the latter sort. Many important general issues are addressed relating to ethics, the behavior of scientists, students and their institutions, and the intellectual openness of academia in the U.S. generally. These are addressed, however, by recounting in detail a rather complex case history, the tangled sequelae of a Sierra Club meeting and a talk I gave at the world famous Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) at the University of California, San Diego, on February 28, 2017. This article departs in style from the drier, more academic tone of most EJAIB articles while being fully concordant with the journal's focus on ethics. Much of the article consists of direct quotes from email messages received, directly or indirectly, from SIO faculty members, staff members and students. Aside from a few principals in the controversy, these individuals have been granted anonymity here. And even where there are strong criticisms of me, I offer no individual rebuttals as none are needed.

This is a tale with many themes. One would be expressed most accurately by an old adage revised as, 'Lie down with the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), get up with egg on your face.' Another theme is the censoriousness of scientists.

More positive themes include how you should stick to high principle, and "when someone is cruel or acts like a bully you don't stoop to their level. No, our motto is: when they go low, we go high", as First Lady Michelle Obama told the July 2016 Democratic National Convention she advised her daughters. Another theme is that those who "go low" usually are paper tigers, and if you confront them publicly you will get private messages of support in your inbox from persons you have never met – and sometimes even cash contributions!

A final theme is to be wary of stereotyping entire organizations based on the bizarre politics or bad behavior of their leaders. Many organizations that initially seem to be apolitical or politically centrist or moderate evolve according to Conquest's second law of politics: "Any organization not explicitly right-wing sooner or later becomes left-wing" (Anonymous 2008).

Conquest's third law, as modified by John Moore, is: "The simplest way to explain the behavior of any bureaucratic organization is to assume that it is controlled by a cabal of the enemies of the stated purpose of that bureaucracy." To that we might add: "...or by a cabal intent on surreptitiously, without a membership referendum or vote, radically modifying the original stated mission of the organization." In any case, during the typical leftward evolution of an organization, there is an ephemeral increase in membership political diversity. It takes a while for the more centrist or politically moderate members to understand what has happened and drift away. In some cases, of course, they can't drift away because membership is essential to their livelihood. Professors in many colleges and universities whose central administrations have been taken over by ideologues of the far left would be one example.

With that odd introduction, let us begin the tale.

SIERRA CLUB'S WEST COAST OCEAN FORUM

This half-day symposium was held in La Jolla, California on November 5, 2016. Lead organizer was Renée Owens, chair of the Wildlife Committee of Sierra Club San Diego chapter and member of the SC's National Marine Action Team. Half a year later, she would receive the Club's highest award, the Silver Cup Award as "the person who has most significantly contributed to the success of the Club's mission" (Thomas 2014).

Promotional materials noted there would be coverage of "topics such as endangered species, climate change and offshore oil, aquaculture, ecosystem based fishery management, National Ocean Policy, and tools to effectively protect and preserve our ocean ecosystems for the future."

Prior to the event, I asked Renée if I could bring some literature to distribute and if there would be tables available for that. I knew Renée from back when she was an ecology Master's student in the Biology Department at San Diego State University and from private discussions of Sierra Club politics over the years. Her reply was, "Sure and yes."

The talks were excellent in substance and delivery, and some new friends were made. With the help of Allison McGee, wildlife enthusiast and member of the Sierra Club and of Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization (SEPS), we distributed about 1100 pieces of literature on national and global population policies and issues, censorship, and

population growth as a driver of environmental problems. This was accomplished mainly via pre-assembled literature packets containing 35 items each.

One new acquaintance who appreciated our packet was Scripps Institution of Oceanography researcher Jay Barlow. Within an hour of the end of the symposium, I received the following email message from him:

Thanks for the written material you provided at the Sierra Club meeting today. I read through most of it and found it to be very interesting.

It is amazing to me how many groups are afraid to even discuss issues of population growth. I was practically weaned reading the Population Bomb. Sad to see how far we haven't come.

At Scripps, there is a noon seminar sponsored most weeks by the Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation. If you or a member of your group were interested, I'd love to hear you speak there.

Currently I am the President for the Society for Marine Mammalogy, a professional society with approximately 2000 members. We host biennial conferences that attract 1500-2500 attendees. Speaking for myself, I'd welcome your group [SEPS] at an exhibitor table at our Society meetings. If your group were interested, I'd be happy to bring it up to our Board with my recommendation.

I said I'd be glad to talk at SIO, Jay passed that on to Penny Dockry, the administrator who handled arrangements for such, a date of February 28, 2017 was set for the talk, and I sent a title and abstract to Penny.

Penny sent out a notice to the SIO community at some point, and then sent, on the morning of my talk, a reminder with full details, as follows. The abstract of the talk was my own, not a put-down by Penny! Penny included a mini-bio for me copied from the SEPS website.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A TALK BY STUART HURLBERT

From: Dockry, Penny <pdockry@ucsd.edu>
 Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:23 AM
 Subject: CMBC Brown Bag: Sustainability, Population, Censorship, and Unholy Left-Right Alliances
 To: "all-at-sio@ucsd.edu" <all-at-sio@ucsd.edu>
 Cc: Stuart Hurlbert <hurlbert@mail.sdsu.edu>

Please join us:
 CMBC Brown Bag -TODAY - February 28 [Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation]
 12:30 - 1:30
 4500 Hubbs Hall [SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY]

Sustainability, Population, Censorship, and Unholy Left-Right Alliances

This talk will cover a number of boring, unimportant topics that may leave you with bad feelings either about some of your favorite scientific societies and environmental organizations -- or about the speaker. However, a very good packet of literature will be provided that could turn you into a dyspeptic and change your life.

Speaker: Stuart H. Hurlbert

Stuart H. Hurlbert is President of the Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization and Professor Emeritus of Biology at San Diego State University. His teaching and research have been primarily in the areas of lake ecology, biostatistics, and man-environment relations. He is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, member of several other scientific societies, and winner of the National Academy of Sciences 2003 Award for Scientific Reviewing. He encourages environmental scientists and their professional societies to show greater courage in addressing U.S. population growth, its consequences, and the urgent need to slow it down.

Penny Dockry, Operations Manager
 Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation
 Program for Interdisciplinary Environmental Research (PIER)
 MAS-MBC, 858-822-2790, <http://cmbc.ucsd.edu>

INCOMING FROM JENNIFER HAASE AND ACOLYTES

Two hours before my talk a message from a stranger, SIO geophysicist Jennifer Haase, popped up in my email inbox. Her message was sent directly to Penny Dockry and copied to me and the entire SIO community (ca. 2200 persons). Reflecting ignorance and poor researching skills, Jennifer used innuendo and a link to the Southern Poverty Law Center to accuse me and organizations I was (and am) associated with as being "racist," "anti-immigrant haters" and to imply my talk should be boycotted.

Jennifer also copied her message directly to Keira Auzenne, hired in September 2016, as SIO's "first ever equity, diversity and inclusion coordinator" (Hook 2017). Were they really going to roll out the big guns for a retired professor from the minor leagues at San Diego State, I mused? Someone with high potential for bringing "diversity" to SIO so long as he was "included"?

Though I did not discover it until later, Jennifer's attack excited the emotions of at least four younger members of the SIO community, inspiring them also to broadcast criticisms of me. Some of these were copied to me, some I saw only later.

Jennifer's attack got my adrenalin titer up a bit. My primary reaction, however, was neither surprise nor

anger but rather only that another teachable moment was at hand. So I hopped into my car, smiling, for the five-mile drive from my house to SIO.

Here verbatim is Jennifer's original 'warning' to her SIO colleagues:

From: Haase, Jennifer S <jhaase@ucsd.edu>
 Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:52 AM
 Subject: Re: [All-at-SIO] CMBC Brown Bag: Sustainability, Population, Censorship, and Unholy Left-Right Alliances
 To: "Dockry, Penny" <pdockry@ucsd.edu>
 Cc: "all-at-sio@ucsd.edu" <all-at-sio@ucsd.edu>, Stuart Hurlbert <hurlbert@mail.sdsu.edu>, Keiara Auzenne <kauzenne@ucsd.edu>

Dear Penny,

Thank you very much for the invitation to hear Mr. Hurlbert at the CMBC Seminar. Unfortunately I will not be able to attend. I will use this opportunity to use my first amendment rights to provide a few facts to the SIO community.

1) The website of Californians for Population Stabilization provides this background on Stuart Hurlbert: <http://www.capsweb.org/winter-2016-2017-newsletter>

"Stuart Hurlbert, President of Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization, CAPS member and former CAPS Board Member"

2) Californians for Population Stabilization was reported by the Southern Poverty Law Center to be an Anti-Immigrant hate group based in Santa Barbara California: <https://www.splcenter.org/hate-map>

I'd like to make a request to the administration of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to provide one additional fact, if possible, and that would be the number of faculty, staff, and students that were not born in the US but have emigrated to the US. I know quite a few personally and hold them in the highest esteem.

Among all of the seminars that are presented by outside speakers at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, there is only a finite amount of time to dedicate to seminars that may be tangentially related to our research interests, so I choose to attend those of the highest scientific quality. I'm choosing to sit this one out.

Sincerely,
 Jennifer S Haase, Research Geophysicist
 Scripps Institution of Oceanography
 University of California, San Diego
 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093-0225
jhaase@ucsd.edu, Phone: +1-858-534-8771, Fax: +1-858-534-9833

NORMANDY BEACHHEAD SECURED, TALK GIVEN, CENSOR FLUSHED OUT

Twenty minutes later I was meeting Penny, putting out literature packets for attendees, surveying the conference room, and being introduced by Jay and SIO oceanographer Lisa Levin. Haase's attempt to keep my audience small was at least partially successful. Only about two dozen people showed up, whereas 2-3 times that many had shown up when in 1996 I gave a more narrowly focused, technical talk in the same room on "The Life and Death of the Keystone Species Concept." Ironically, that then-about-to-be-published talk was also found irritating by some at SIO as it skewered a major 'sacred cow' of ecologists that had been birthed at SIO in the 1960s (Hurlbert 1997)!

Penny obviously felt embarrassed for SIO at Haase's attack on me. I told her not to worry, but asked her if I would be allowed to send out to the SIO community my response to the attack. She said that would be possible.

My audience was friendly and welcoming. With one exception, there wasn't a scintilla of Haase-like hostility during or after my talk, not even an aggressive question or comment. Of more than 1200 copies of 38 different articles, charts, policy statements, op eds, etc. that I and Alisson McGee provided in packets on a back table, 838 were picked up by attendees for leisurely digestion. They included 30 copies of the classic review article, "The environmental movement's retreat from advocating U.S. population stabilization (1970-1998)" (Beck and Kolankiewicz 2000). Within a day of my talk I received three complimentary email messages from talk attendees. So it seemed to me to have been another successful Johnny Appleseed operation, all the stay-at-homes notwithstanding.

That "one exception" was of some significance, however. During conversations just before and after my talk I learned that Lisa Levin was the official faculty advisor for these 'brown bag' seminars, that she learned of my talk only after it was scheduled, and that she was upset with Jay and Penny for not getting her permission first. And even after I had given a talk that seemed to rile or be thought improper by no one, to judge from the Q & A session or later comments received by email, Lisa expressed to me her feeling that I was an inappropriate speaker for SIO and would not have been approved by her, nor would a talk by anyone else that focused in part on past, current and proposed national population policies and their connections to conservation and environmental values. She opined that overconsumption is a problem in the U.S. but overpopulation is not.

In other words she is representative of that great mass of globalist academics who are responsible for most U.S. university graduates, even those coming out with PhDs in economics, political science, public health or the agricultural or environmental sciences, knowing no more about national and global population policies and issues

than they did when they graduated from high school. With that record as educators, they are on thin ice whenever they decide to criticize the obvious inadequacies of the journalists, lawyers, politicians, economists, businesspersons, etc. churned out by their very own institutions.

It is regrettable that Jay and Penny were castigated by some colleagues for their “error” in bringing me as a speaker to SIO. I understand that now speakers for this seminar series cannot be scheduled without first being vetted by Lisa for their political acceptability. George Orwell turns over in his grave once again.

FIRST CAVALRY CONTINGENT ARRIVES

On return to my office I began preparing rebuttals to the criticisms by Jennifer and her friends for later transmission to the SIO community. There were a number of discussions going on at SIO and UCSD that must have been interesting but that I was not privy to and that the principals were tight-lipped about. I apologized to Penny and Jay for getting them into hot water, and began checking on the procedure for sending out a rebuttal.

I did eventually hear that Keira, SIO’s diversity, equity and inclusivity coordinator, quizzed Penny about how the CMBC Brown Bag seminars are scheduled and promoted. One has to wonder who put Keira up to that and on what grounds. I guess when “racists” are afoot, one cannot be too careful.

More heartening was when Jay finally let me know of his behind-the-scenes defense of the open discussion of ideas. Here are his thoughtful February 29 messages to Penny and Lisa, passed on to me on March 2. Jay gives a pretty good summary of the main points of my talk, and that will have to suffice for the talk non-attendees until I am invited back.

***Hi Stuart.** I agree completely that this is a valuable teachable moment. One of my students was involved in the email exchange and I plan to spend an hour or more getting her to talk through her feelings. I was more alarmed than you sound to be about the viciousness of the attack. I suspect that you have been at this long enough to have developed some pretty thick skin.*

*Below is a message I sent to Lisa Levin (the academic head of CMBC) and to Penny to help them understand why I still feel that your talk was very appropriate to CMBC. **Jay***

***Hi Penny,** I feel badly for involving you in this controversy, but want to give you some background on why I think it is important for our students. Don't worry, I don't plan to invite any more speakers to CMBC. Below, I explain to Lisa why I think that this sort of talk is important for CMBC students. Lisa suggested that I forward this to you. I cc'd [XXX]*

*because she was one of the key opponents to Stuart's presence at SIO. **Jay***

***Lisa,** I respectfully disagree with you about the appropriateness of Stuart Hurlbert's lecture yesterday. I think that if we want our CMBC students to be comfortable leaving the ivory tower and to be successful in the policy arena, they need to be able to listen to (and debate) ideas that they fundamentally disagree with. Unfortunately, I don't think we have done a very good job in this aspect of educating our students. The response of the students to the talk by Stuart Hurlbert illustrates this. Instead of attending, listening, and disagreeing, they retreated into their like-minded twittersphere of political correctness. [Ok, they used mass emailings, but the effect is the same as twitter]. In this space, they feel comfortable with generalizations and name-calling-bordering-on-libel that would never occur in a public forum. Opinions seem to matter more than facts (sound like any other recent forums?).*

It is important to recall what was actually said by Stuart while fresh in our memories. He re-stated the commonly held belief that human population growth is bad for the environment (duh!). He explained at great length how that fact has fallen off the conservation agenda and documented that with several articles. He went on (too long) on how the AAAS has rejected participation of his group at commercial booths at their meetings. Finally, he discussed the implication of immigration policy on US population growth. Now that we are demographically at ZPG (fertility rate =2), immigration is a key component of population growth in the US. He showed a slide with the population consequences of a variety of different immigration policies. He did not, at Scripps, advocate for any particular policy other than a consideration of the conservation impact of population growth and immigration policy.

He did not say anything racist. He did not vilify non-white immigrants. Not all people who work on immigration policy are racist, even though some clearly are.

Just to be clear about my position, I agree with most things Stuart said yesterday, and I disagree with most of the solutions proposed by his group, Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization. We SHOULD consider the effect of population growth on the environment. A doubling of the US population in 50 years WOULD have a negative effect on the environment. Immigration IS a key component of current US population growth. I think the biggest unknown is the effect of immigration to the US (and to Europe) on the global environment. I suspect that is neutral or slightly positive.

We should be able to talk about these things.

Jay

REBUTTAL AND RE-EDUCATION OF JENNIFER & ACOLYTES

Here verbatim is my response to Jennifer's attack that went out to the SIO community. Below that I quote brief excerpts from the original messages of her acolytes with a few comments of my own. In the 10-page document that eventually went out to the SIO community the entireties of all the messages they sent me plus my accompanying detailed response to each were provided.

Ms. Haase is presumably an above average geophysicist if she's employed by SIO, but that is not incompatible with being completely uninformed or ideologically blinkered on other issues, and willing to shoot from the hip on them as well.

This problem is not confined to academics of course. Consider this quote from a recent piece about celebrity actors, "Hey Hollywood, Smugness Isn't a Political Strategy" (McArdle 2017):

[C]elebrities are stupid about policy, often breathtakingly so. On the other hand, so is everyone else. You want to hear some really stupid ideas about policy? Grab a group of whip-smart financial wizards, or neurosurgeons, or nuclear physicists, and sit them down for a nice dinner to debate some policy outside their profession. You will find that they are pretty much just as stupid as anyone else, because policy is not about smart. I mean, smart helps. But policy is fundamentally about domain knowledge, and that knowledge is acquired only by spending a great deal of time thinking about a pretty small set of problems. Funnily enough, this is also how one gets good at finance, or neurosurgery, or nuclear physics.

Ms. Haase and I have never met. She knew nothing about the detailed content of my talk. But she was determined to let the SIO community know that it probably would not be of "the highest scientific quality." Instead of attempting to compromise *my* "first amendment rights", she might have come off with less egg-on-her-face if she'd listened to my talk before exercising *her* "first amendment rights."

Ms. Haase brought up my connection with Californians for Population Stabilization (CAPS). But why? The announcement of my talk did mention that I am president of another organization, Scientists and Environmentalists for Population Stabilization (SEPS), but makes no mention of CAPS. I am a member of CAPS and proudly served on its board of directors for 12 years before starting up SEPS in 2012. The leadership of CAPS consists of some of the smartest, most civic-minded, politically courageous people I know. Why did Ms. Haase not also bring up the Sierra Club to which I also belong and which also takes positions on population

issues?

The answer to these questions is blatantly clear. Ms. Haase wants to use guilt-by-association and unsubtle indirection to smear me as being "anti-immigrant" and a "hater." Disappointing. A real blemish on SIO. It's none of Ms. Haase's business, but large numbers of my relatives are immigrants, the majority of my close friends are immigrants, and I've helped immigrants from half a dozen countries with their applications for entry [into the U.S].

Ms. Haase's core error is to regard the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) as a respectable, fair-minded organization. While it has occasionally done worthwhile things, in recent decades it has dedicated much of its effort to smearing in its messages and online "research articles" all the major U.S. population stabilization organizations as being "racist," "xenophobic," "white supremacist," and so on. And when SPLC decides any particular organization is proving too effective in informing the public and in stymying bad legislation (like bills that would double immigration rates), SPLC goes for the jugular: it puts that organization on its official list of "hate groups." Then SPLC issues press releases and newsletters saying the number of hate groups is growing fast, "and by the way, please send us more money."

Many who have taken a close look at the SPLC have concluded it has become a morally and intellectually bankrupt organization. Here are a few articles that make the case [all, and dozens more, are available online; just google the titles]:

- A Guide to Understanding the Tactics of the Southern Poverty Law Center in the Immigration Debate*
- The Church of Morris Dees: How the Southern Poverty Law Center Profits from Intolerance*
- The Hate List: Is America Really Being Overrun by Right-wing Militants?*
- Mission Creep and the Southern Poverty Law Center's Misguided Focus*
- Racial Racketeering for Fun and Profit: The Southern Poverty Law Center Scam*
- SPLC 2: The Search for More Money*
- The Hate Group That Incited the Middlebury Melee*
- Years of Turmoil and Complaints Led the Southern Poverty Law Center to Fire Its Founder Morris Dees*
- Turmoil Engulfs the SPLC: A Closer Look at the Underlying Scam of the Organization's 'Hate Group Designation'*

The SPLC has never articulated coherent population or immigration policies of its own. It just wants to keep proposals on these matters by other organizations off the table everywhere, and no methods are too unethical for their employ.

Below are the verbatim messages from the three graduate students and one postdoc who got stirred up. They were victims, were upset and had some valid concerns, albeit none relevant to my talk or qualifications or to the integrity of SEPS and CAPS.

Acolyte #1

Jennifer, thank you for bringing this to our attention. I just read the SEPS website and the Californians for Population Stabilization website. The list of policy recommendations, especially on the CAPS website, is almost entirely focused on anti-immigrant policies: ... Sex education and family planning are mentioned only briefly on each website (e.g. 2/13 policy recommendations on the CAPS website). These are racist, anti-immigrant organizations. I'm surprised and disappointed that they are being given a voice and an audience at SIO.

Acolyte #2

Thank you Jennifer for bringing this up, and I look forward to your comments being addressed officially. I am grateful for the link you provided because I am now aware that an invited speaker at SIO associates with an organization that clearly views French minorities in Canada, Natives' rights to their lands, and a good relationship with Mexico as major problems. I think I have officially been dis-invited. If anyone attends the event, please bring up SIO's loose policies on admitting me here.

Acolyte #3

For people attending could they also add that Mexican and Brazilian students bring 5 years of funding from their home countries' science foundations. Nonetheless, the intellectual property of the science produced by those students belongs to UC. This is migration of foreign-funded intellectual capital and may ease the feeling of "migration-is-tearing-the-country-apart".

Acolyte #4

While sustainability, natural resource utilization, and population growth are serious issues, it seems extraordinarily myopic (at best) to suggest that reducing immigration is somehow a solution to control world population. Recent research finds that countries which have developed see large reductions in population growth, so if anything, a viable solution is to improve standards of living (e.g. health care, education) for more people, either by increasing immigration or supporting development in poorer countries. And I note that much of the apocalyptic fear-mongering about population growth has its roots in Ehrlich's "The Population Bomb", well known for the following passage: "The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now. At

this late date nothing can prevent a substantial increase in the world death rate..." I wasn't around in the 1970s, but I don't recall reading about this in my history texts...

My responses to these posts were civil, information-rich and lengthy on the assumption these were smart people, and that the responses would eventually be made available to the whole SIO community. While the responses and private conversations they generated are not repeated here, some sense of them may be gained by this list of articles, each suggested to one acolyte or another (all can be found by googling the titles).

Pew Projection for U.S. Population in 2065: A Challenge to Clinton and Trump.
Beaver Fever: The Manic Quest to Grow Canada's Population
The Ecological Rights of Humans
International Migration as an Obstacle to Achieving World Stability
How Migration Hurts Poor Countries: Liberals, Take Note – Small Developing Nations Suffer When Good People Leave
There Is No Global Population Problem
The Environmental Movement's Retreat from Advocating U.S. Population Stabilization (1970-1998): A First Draft of History

BRINGING THE SIO COMMUNITY UP TO SPEED

I prepared a 10-page compilation of the attacks on me by Jennifer and others and my responses to them, titling it "Attack on a speaker by Scripps Institution of Oceanography geophysicist and students, and the speaker's response." I sent the document to SIO Director Margaret Leinen. I asked for her permission to put it out on the SIO-wide listserv. Both she and Penny had earlier said this would be possible, but I did not want Penny in particular to catch any more flak for simply being fair and open-minded. And as I wrote to Margaret, "Overall, my response may represent a more valuable educational contribution to the SIO community than did my talk. And, permitted by the SIO administration, it will be a clear sign that SIO is not in danger of becoming a West Coast version of Middlebury College!" (Saul 2017).

But Margaret later had heard from some high level UCSD central administrator, that "the LISTSERV is internal and not appropriate for facilitating non-SIO individuals' communications with SIO" or even "a note on your [my] behalf." In other words, let the attacks stand.

Apparently at some point during an email firestorm that I was not privy to, Margaret did send out to the SIO community this notice about use of the listserv:

The All-at-SIO list is for messages of immediate interest to the SIO community. The list is

unmoderated and self-regulating, but you must be a list member to post. Examples of acceptable messages include seminar time changes, notifications of road closures, events affecting SIO facilities, lost/found items, or "lights on" warnings. All-at-SIO is not to be used for political or collective bargaining purposes, to post items for sale, or for housing-related messages. ...If you take exception to an All-at-SIO posting please direct your comments to the sender only. Do not reply to the entire list.

So on March 10 I took the matter further upstairs with a message to the UCSD Chancellor that was copied to Margaret and read, in part, as follows:

*Dr. Pradeep Khosla, Chancellor
University of California, San Diego*

*Dear Chancellor Khosla,
Recently, as an invited speaker at SIO I had the "privilege" of being attacked in an email by a SIO faculty member that went out to the whole SIO community a couple of hours before my talk, as an anti-immigrant, hate-mongering racist. ... I would like to request that you authorize Dr. Leinen or one of her staffers to send out my response to the all-at-sio@ucsd.edu listserv. I'm told that this violates some newly discovered regulation that the faculty member attacking me was not held to. **But I think a chancellor can easily permit an exception, especially when it will be so strongly in the interests of the reputation of SIO and UCSD.** [bolding was in original]*

*Many thanks for your consideration.
Sincerely, Stuart Hurlbert*

He never responded.

So I turned to the SIO online directory and with a couple of helpers over a couple of hours obtained email addresses for about 1800 members of the SIO community, certainly the great majority of those on the SIO listserv. To these I sent my response with this cover letter:

*Friends at SIO,
You may recall receiving on February 28 attacks on me broadcast via all-at-sio@ucsd.edu by Jennifer Haase and others. This is my response [10-page document was attached]. It includes, verbatim, the attacking email messages and much supplementary information. This incident is peanuts compared to recent instances of ignorance-driven incivility, riots and attempted censorship at other academic institutions. I was not inconvenienced in the least, my talk was well received, no buildings were trashed and no one got beat up. Still, ethical aspects of the incident might merit internal SIO discussion. Not least of these would be attempts by others to prevent me from defending myself before the same audience*

*that received Haase's message.
Best regards, Stuart Hurlbert, SDSU*

Unsure about how successful my direct mail operation would be, for insurance I added to the Preface of the 10-pager this plea: "Perhaps there is among you, one brave and tenured soul who will be willing to simply forward this piece and its attachment to the whole all-at-sio list." At least two SIO faculty members and one student later told me they'd tried but I think no attempt succeeded.

There was an initial problem with the spam-blocking robots, but by sending to only one portion of the 1800 recipients at a time and by varying the subject line of the sendouts, everything worked like a charm. Among the subject lines were:

*Sequelae of chance meeting at Sierra Club
Topics for ethics discussions
Compliant technocrats arise!
Population policy, no, GHG emission policy, si
Need for more diversity training
SIO hardly measures up to UCLA
Interesting doings in Hubbs 4500*

The only missing item was the PowerPoint presentation of my actual talk.

GOOD RETURNS FOR THE EFFORT

From senior members of the SIO community, I got more than a dozen positive, if mostly brief responses and a single negative one. Below are given, without comment, excerpts from seven of these, including the negative one:

I just read your response with great interest. Thanks for taking time to do that. I think it is fair to say that the controversy has resulted in a great deal more thought about US population stabilization at SIO than if only CMBC students and faculty attended your talk. Opinions are hard to change, but thought is the first step.

Ha. Everybody is running scared - say anything and you will be labeled one of the -ists. In a kinder and gentler world, I would expect Haase to contact you to discuss her actions, Jay to provide you any and all support you need since he is your sponsor, and maybe even the director Leinen to discuss this with you directly since the whole mess reflects very poorly on Scripps.

When dealing with SIO individuals I suggest first reviewing Roger Revelle's papers, talks, and addresses on the importance of population control as the prime problem of the 21st century. He left UCSD and went on the Harvard faculty focused on this issue. You will find that quoting Revelle will give you weapons with more impact than any thing you say regardless of how correct you are.

Sure, those of us benefiting from the wealth and

culture those immigrants made possible may well suffer in some ways from an increased global population, or an increased population in the US or California. There are factual reasons for this, to which you allude in your complaint. Controlling immigration and keeping the present culture unchanged may be good for a large group. But, with the exception of things like the US government filling San Francisco with immigrants to ensure taking the state, immigration is a small-group activity of people who seek an improved life. It is fine to advocate controlling these people but, brother, you better be ready to be called anti-immigrant and, the correlation of wealth and race being what it is, a "racist."

Just to let you know this business didn't go by unheeded. Sad that the days when differing points of view or sensitive issues were discussed in a collegial manner seem pretty much to be of the past. I'd seen the Haase business at the onset which heightened my interest in attending your talk. But I missed it. If you will send me an appropriate address, I'll send you a fiver to cover the costs of the materials you mention which had best be sent to [XXX]. [I had offered to send, for \$5, a literature packet to anyone who didn't get one at my talk].

After the attacks started on all-at-sio, I wanted to attend your seminar to show my support, [but] I was unable to attend because of a previous meeting. Thank you for setting the record straight to everyone at SIO, and taking the time to send an email to each one of us. I'm disappointed, although not surprised, that you were denied the same medium (all-at-sio) to respond. It was also disappointing that SIO admin let the attack on you proceed, even though all-at-sio is for non-political information about upcoming events of interest to everyone at SIO. This is not the first time that SIO has helped and supported hate groups that further SIO's political agenda. [The reference is to the SPLC].

Thank you for your talk yesterday at SIO and for taking a few minutes to chat at the end. As I said yesterday, while our heated debates over climate are probably in large part proxy for talking about population, no one wants to have that conversation. I think this is for two reasons - first this whole "mishegas" appears insoluble but second and more importantly it calls up a complex moral issue and our shift away from viewing such issues from a community perspective to an individual perspective can cause considerable moral confusion and uncomfortableness. It is in this confusion that an innocent call for reviewing population as a driver in environmental change can be perceived as morally ambiguous - even racist. I appreciate your willingness to push on in this issue especially given the responses you have received. This is important

work.

I also got responses from three SIO students which led to some productive (I think) further email conversations with them. Here are excerpts from only their initial responses to my mailout:

I will be the one brave and [non-] tenured [non-graduated] soul who will be willing to simply forward this piece and its attachment to the whole all-at-sio list, because with the use of the bcc field, I have no idea to whom your ideas were originally sent and I also don't believe in censorship. How much courage did it take for you to take on junior scientists? I stand by what my colleagues and I said, and I welcome future discussions with you, around a cup of coffee, where you are not in a position of authority and in control of the dialogue.

First, I would like to thank you for coming to present your research at SIO. I was unable to attend your talk, for completely irrelevant reasons... I was deeply saddened upon hearing the reaction of some of the students and even faculty, many of whom were of the opinion that you should not have been allowed to speak at our institution. And by "saddened" I really mean "terrified"... I want to thank you for responding to the criticism you have received from our colleagues, and I am sorry that you were not given the chance to do so directly. I admire your clarity and courage. If I were more brave, and considerably more tenured, I would forward your email to all-at-sio. I sincerely hope somebody does.

While you might be thinking of it as a scientist, there is a whole other area of study that has more insight on the social implications that a notion like population control might have on communities of color and underrepresented communities. So please educate [sic] yourself on these issues because you clearly don't see the issues of power dynamics in our society.... Don't try and silence students with your spoofed up rebuttals for being revolutionary. You are a supporter of population control, so let me ask you, are you willing to be the first subject?

A FUNDRAISER FOR CAPS !

Just as the furor was dying down, a welcome dose of humor arrived from the Southern Poverty Law Center, courtesy of SIO graduate student Abby Cannon. This ended up enriching the coffers of CAPS by a good amount. Abby did not want to argue, she just wanted to honor me, so wrote SPLC:

*From: Southern Poverty Law Center <noreply@splcenter.org>
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 5:00 PM
Subject: A gift to the SPLC was made in your honor
To: Stuart Hurlbert <hurlbert@mail.sdsu.edu>*



Dear Stuart Hurlbert,
Abby Cannon sent you an eCard! And, made a gift in your honor to the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Remember to be an advocate for tolerance in your community. Please speak out against bigoted remarks whenever and where you hear them. Contact us online. We welcome your feedback.

400 Washington Ave., Montgomery AL 36104

No mention of the size of the donation. Perhaps \$10-20 as she's a student, but an honor nonetheless and one worth reciprocating. So a week later Abby received this message from CAPS:

From: Jo Wideman <jo@capsweb.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 24, 2017
Subject: Congratulations!
To: "alcannon@ucsd.edu" <alcannon@ucsd.edu>
Cc: Stuart Hurlbert <hurlbert@mail.sdsu.edu>

Dear Abigail Cannon,

Stuart Hurlbert has made a gift of \$200 to Californians for Population Stabilization in honor of your Excellence in Marine Biology and Status as #1 Quick-Thinking Jokester Among Scripps Institution of Oceanography Graduate Students.

Remember to be an advocate for diverse perspectives in your community. Please speak out against bigoted remarks whenever and wherever you hear them.

We send our best wishes as you work to implement these ancient words of wisdom from your grandparents' generation:

After two years of concentrated effort, we have concluded that, in the long run, no substantial benefits will result from further growth of the Nation's population, rather that the gradual stabilization of our population would contribute significantly to the Nation's ability to solve its problems. We have looked for, and have not found, any convincing economic argument for continued population growth. The health of our country does not depend on it, nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person.

John D. Rockefeller III, Chairman, Presidential Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972

Sincerely,
Jo Wideman, Executive Director
Californians for Population Stabilization (CAPS)
1129 State Street, Suite 3D

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

When I forwarded that to several dozen of my new acquaintances at SIO, I got a quick reply from one even more generous soul. That prompted me to inform Margaret, the Chancellor and dozens of others of further positive fallout from Abby's initiative, via the following message:

*Margaret Leinen, Director, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Pradeep Khosla, Chancellor, University of California, San Diego, and others*

Kudos to SIO grad student, Abby Cannon, for inspiring strong support for population stabilization! See below. [now above]

An SIO colleague is further supporting this effort by offering to provide a 1 for 1 match, up to a total of \$1000, for any donations to CAPS from the SIO community. Just ask the CAPS Executive Director to implement the "SIO match" when you make your donation and state that you work at SIO.

Don't be stingy!

Best regards, Stuart Hurlbert, SDSU

PS: here's a good recent article on the topic at hand from today's Wall Street Journal: "The Real Immigration Debate: Who to Let In and Why" (Krikorian 2017)

Within a few days CAPS had gotten \$300 in donations from the SIO community, which, with the match and my earlier contribution, gave it a total haul of \$800.

WHAT-MIGHT-HAVE-BEEN

When Renée Owens told me I could distribute population literature to attendees at the November 2016 Sierra Club symposium, neither she nor I could have envisaged the chain of positive educational consequences for SIO students, staff, faculty and administrators – and the larger scientific and environmental communities -- that would follow. Should Jennifer Haase get some of the credit, too? Yes, but only credit for a grave mistake that might easily have gone awry and had very different, negative consequences.

The main campus of UCSD, a community of about 40,000 students, staff and faculty members, is only about a mile from SIO's campus of about 2200. While denizens of SIO are mostly nose-to-the-grindstone natural scientists of diverse sorts, the main campus is home to, inter alia, all the humanities and social sciences, including ethnic studies and the UCSD Center for Comparative Immigration Studies (CCIS). Much of the output of the CCIS during the last two decades has consisted of apologetics for mass legal immigration and mass amnesties for illegal aliens. Always phrased in

super-scholarly language of course.

What would have happened if Jennifer had sent, or others had forwarded, to students and faculty on the UCSD main campus her announcement that an “anti-immigrant racist” representing a “white supremacist” organization was going to be speaking at SIO at 12:30pm? Especially if she’d given them a full day’s notice, not just two hours?

I don’t yet have the iconic status of a Charles Murray (Saul 2017), Milo Yiannopoulos (Doubek 2017) or Anne Coulter (National Review 2017). But maybe I’d have given them a run for the money with respect to crowd size and crowd violence. That would have been a real test for SIO director Leinen and UCSD chancellor Khosla. Would they have been able to quickly pour ‘oil on troubled waters’? If not, would they have sent a bill to Jennifer for damages to people and property? After all, drunk drivers don’t intend to destroy property or kill or maim people either.

NOT CULPABLE: MARGARET LEINEN

Margaret, the SIO director was in no way responsible for any of the silliness and misdeeds at SIO. And I don’t blame her for obstacles put in the way of my getting a response out to the SIO community. She was between a rock and a hard place, between some of her less civil, less informed minions on the one hand and a stonewalling UCSD chancellor on the other. I did not speak with her during these travails and have never met her.

My only prior interaction with Margaret left me impressed. SEPS has operated exhibitor booths on population issues at the meetings of 24 different scientific societies since 2013 (Schindler et al. 2012, Hurlbert 2016). These booths have always been well received by attendees and organizers, and we have been routinely invited back for the following year. But the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) has been rejecting booth applications from SEPS and other population-focused NGOs since 2011. When SEPS applied for a booth at the 2016 meeting of AAAS, we included an endorsement of our application by three dozen past or current presidents of scientific societies. Margaret, then president of the American Geophysical Union, signed on. But most society presidents we invited did not have the courage to do so. Endorsers were not endorsing any particular positions advocated by SEPS but only saying that SEPS is a credible educational organization dealing with important issues and operates under a highly reputable board of directors and advisory board, both consisting primarily of scientists. But that was not sufficient for many timid and/or censorious society presidents who were invited to endorse. The scientific community unfortunately has thousands more of these than it does of Margaret Leinens.

MARTHA CAMPBELL AND THE UN

I opened this essay with a quote from Martha Campbell (2005) and another from a UN document (POPIN 1994). Martha is a “veteran” of UC Berkeley politics and a savvy, worldly-wise scholar with long experience in dealing with global population issues especially in the context of family planning and empowerment of women in developing countries. She would not be at all surprised to see another variety of “political correctness” blossoming, hopefully briefly, at SIO. She is aware of the need to keep population out of the deliberations of the multinational IPCC. Too often, strong initiatives in the UN to deal with population issues have been nipped in the bud by the Catholic and Muslim nations that make up about half of the UN membership. The leadership of the IPCC has to be pragmatic if it is to be successful.

One can imagine, however, that Martha *might* be disdainful of the failure *of the U.S. members* of the IPCC, among whom are SIO scientists, to have internal discussions of the population factor in climate change and the contribution of U.S. population growth to it. Is there a critical mass of scientists in SIO with the requisite political and moral courage to take the lead here? To venture beyond their role as compliant, grant-hungry technocrats might of course bring down upon them the displeasure of the uninformed “it’s not overpopulation, it’s only overconsumption” zealots.

As Martha also well knows, and has demonstrated in her own undertakings and writings, our institutional failures are not grounds for inaction or despair. Until censors like those in the AAAS, SIO and Google take over larger portions of our society, there remain abundant opportunities for effective individual action. For example, while the IPCC needs to focus on its core technical mission and the ideally apolitical, nonpartisan quality of its output, discussion of the population growth-climate change nexus is being fostered by many individual journalists and academics (O’Neill et al. 2010, Stephenson et al. 2010, Weiss 2010, Cafaro 2012, PAI 2012, Hickey et al. 2013, Campbell et al. 2014, Plautz 2014, Palfrey 2017, Bongaarts & O’Neill 2018).

THE OMITTED ELEPHANT -- AND ITS REFUSAL TO LEAVE AND STOP TRUMPETING

On the other hand, Martha might *not* openly be so disdainful of the failure of U.S. scientists to engage on the topic of U.S. population growth as a driver of climate change.

In the body of her 2005 presentation, she adduced two answers to the question in her title, giving a good discussion of each. One was the hostile take-over of the 1994 Cairo conference by well-funded organizations who rejected the quoted preamble for the meeting, wanted no talk of population policy or population management or of encouraging small families, and wanted to focus only on matters such as women’s rights

and reproductive health. (Weld, 2012, also gives an excellent and pungent analysis of that travesty and its consequences.) The other answer was a simplistic ‘demographic transition’ theory that argued that it is necessary for a poor nation’s economy to greatly improve before women will get more rights and education and choose smaller family sizes (Potts et al. 2009, Ryerson 2012).

When Martha elaborated on her 2005 talk for a journal article with the same title (Campbell 2007), she discussed “six identifiable reasons” for the silence. That paper was in turn slightly revised and updated for a chapter (Campbell 2012) in the excellent Cafaro and Crist (2012) anthology. Some SIO and UC Berkeley colleagues may be pleased that castigating mention of their institutions has been expurgated from these 2007 and 2012 versions.

But why did Martha omit mention of a *seventh* reason for silence, the biggest ‘elephant in the living room’ and a major cause of high U.S. greenhouse gas emissions? That is the fact that for some decades immigration has been the primary driver of population growth in the U.S. as it has in many other developed countries. In the absence of major policy changes, the U.S. population now is projected to increase by 116 million between 2015 and 2065, with post-2015 immigrants and their descendants accounting for 88 percent of that growth (Pew Research Center 2015, Hurlbert 2016b).

As Martha realizes, however, there is extreme hostility on the part of both major political parties in the U.S., most of academia (especially the hard left that dominates most university central administrations and the ‘Arts and Letters left side’ of campus) and myopic U.S. environmental NGOs, both to development of a national population policy, as called for at the Cairo Conference in 1994 (POPIN 1994), and, in particular, to reduced immigration levels and population stabilization as advocated by various U.S. national commissions (Ryerson 2012, Hurlbert 2014, 2017) and a dozen U.S. NGOs dating from the 1960s. Those who go against this censorious juggernaut will be attacked, smeared, even physically assaulted or threatened with job loss. In a posthumously published piece, former CAPS president and SEPS advisory board member Diana Hull (2018) laid it on the line:

But the saddest spectacle of all is to realize the near universal acquiescence and collaboration of population specialists in the academic community, who claim to agree with the theory of inevitable and unstoppable U.S. growth. Yet we also know they have every right to be terrified of having ruined reputations and thwarted promotions as a result of being labeled racists or nativists. As a consequence they seek refuge in issues of global overpopulation, rather than getting involved in this issue at home, where they have a much better chance for success.

Thus Martha has always been smart to hold back a bit and save her energies and political capital for confronting the other six causes of silence. Allied battalions mostly outside of academia will cover for her on the seventh.

The commonest mantra used to suppress discussion of national population policies, or even the *idea* of formulating them, is ‘population is a global issue.’ This is taken, as an illogical non sequitur, to imply that individual nations have no moral right to stabilize their own populations if that requires restriction of immigration flows. The implication is patent nonsense of course, but it does provide a pretext for cowardice in the face of difficult and controversial national issues. In the real world, from national governments to average citizens in the street, a different and more responsible ethic holds. Garrett Hardin (1989) expressed it most succinctly:

We are not faced with a single global population problem but, rather, with about 180 separate national population problems. All population controls must be applied locally; local governments are the agents best prepared to choose local means. Means must fit local traditions. For one nation to attempt to impose its ethical principles on another is to violate national sovereignty and endanger international peace. The only legitimate demand that nations can make on one another is this: "Don't try to solve your population problem by exporting your excess people to us." All nations should take this position, and most do.

That statement may well have been one inspiration for the preamble to the 1994 Cairo conference. In any case there is a bright light on the horizon. An initiative led by Rob Harding (2018), and begun about the time I was speaking at SIO, hopes to gather international grassroots support to inspire the UN to develop a ‘Framework Convention on Population Growth’ that expands on the 1994 preamble as well as on the more recent ‘World Scientists’ Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice’ (Ripple et al. 2017). As of May 2018 more than 30 organizations and hundreds of scientists from 15 countries have signed on to the Harding initiative. Wish them well!

CONCLUSION

This episode ended favorably for the SIO community as a whole and certainly for CAPS and myself. That was due, in large part, to luck. If Jennifer Haase had put out her attack on me a few days earlier, Lisa Levin likely would have disinvited me, simply because her less-informed opinions on population issues differed from mine. And if Lisa did *not* cancel my talk SIO might have had a riot on its hands with all the possibilities that would have offered.

But what are the larger lessons? Ideology-driven censorship and suppression of diverse opinion and

inconvenient facts, especially on social issues, is common in the scientific community, academia generally, and the media. Much of this is carried out, overtly or covertly, by persons who run and staff those institutions and use their positions to advance narrow personal agendas, confident of their own moral superiority. Nothing new here. But the resulting generalized ignorance and misinformation across society on key social, environmental and economic issues is a major cause of social and political conflict in the U.S.

Bias and ignorance on the part of journalists is a major, if not the biggest, part of the problem; but where were those journalists (and their editors and publishers) trained....?

For those many topics and issues outside our own areas of expertise, we rely heavily on the popular media. We all have limited time. We would like at least one good newspaper or one good TV news program that would suffice to keep us up-to-date with balanced, fearless capsule summaries of all the major issues and accurate factual information relating thereto. Such newspapers and news programs do not exist. Some of the major news outlets that mostly loudly and repeatedly proclaim their objectivity and balance – National Public Radio, FOX News, CNN, and the New York Times come to mind – are often in fact among the least balanced and objective on many issues.

But censorship is also accomplished by persons outside the power structures, either by threatening mob violence or by ad hominem attacks like that by Jennifer. How many people decided not to attend my talk because they did not want to condone an “anti-immigrant hater” or be labeled “racist”? Perhaps quite a few, given the SIO scientist who noted that “everybody is running scared...[lest they] be labeled one of the –ists,” and the graduate student who felt “terrified” at the number of SIO faculty members and students expressing desire to suppress my talk.

Would-be censors like Jennifer Haase should be free to express their opinions. But university administrators still need to step up to the plate. They should disallow faculty and students bullying people into not attending talks by particular speakers or deplatforming anyone whose opinions the administrators find offensive. There is, after all, much rhetorical output by university administrators and professors that is found offensive by the general public. Also, human population issues, including migration, are transcendental ones of our time. University administrators need to take the lead in pushing for curricula that cover those issues in broader, more comprehensive, less technocratic and less ideological manners than they are covered now. Such would be especially relevant for programs in the environmental sciences, like those at SIO. At the moment, a “safe space” for diverse opinion on such topics presumably still remains unavailable there.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anonymous (2008) Robert Conquest’s three laws of politics. Isegoria (July 11, 2008). Available at: <http://www.isegoria.net/2008/07/robert-conquests-three-laws-of-politics/>
- Beck R, Kolankiewicz L (2000) The environmental movement's retreat from advocating U.S. population stabilization (1970-1998): a first draft of history. *J Policy Hist* 12:123-156.
- Bongaarts J, O’Neill BC (2018) Global warming policy: is population left out in the cold? *Science* 361:650-652.
- Cafaro P (2012) Climate ethics and population policy. *WIREs Clim Change* 3:45-61.
- Cafaro P, Crist E (eds) (2012) *Life on the brink: environmentalists confront overpopulation*. University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.
- Campbell MM (2005) Why the silence on population? Keynote address to the first annual meeting of the Population and Sustainability Network, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, October 13, 2005. Margaret Pyke Trust, London, United Kingdom.
- Campbell MM (2007) Why the silence on population? *Popul Envir* 28:237-246.
- Campbell MM (2012) Why the silence on population? Chapter 4 (pp. 41-55) in: Cafaro P, Crist E (eds) (2012) *Life on the brink: Environmentalists confront overpopulation*. University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.
- Campbell MM, Casterline J, Castillo F, Graves A, Hall TJ, May JF, Perlman D, Potts M, Speidel JJ, Walsh J, Wehner MF, Zulu EM (2014) Population and climate change: who will the grand convergence leave behind? *Lancet* 2: e253-e254. Available at: [https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/langlo/PIIS2214-109X\(14\)70021-X.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/langlo/PIIS2214-109X(14)70021-X.pdf)
- Doubek J (2017) Breitbart editor's event canceled as protests turn violent at UC Berkeley. The Two Way, National Public Radio, February 2. Available at: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/02/02/512992000/breitbart-editors-event-canceled-as-protests-turn-violent-at-uc-berkeley>
- Editors (2017) Cowardice at Berkeley. *The National Review*. April 26. Available at: <https://www.nationalreview.com/2017/04/ann-coulter-berkeley-mob-wins-threats-violence/>
- Ehrlich PR (2008) Demography and policy: a view from outside the discipline. *Popul Dev Rev* 34:103-113
- Grant L (1994) The timid crusade. *The NPG Forum*, Negative Population Growth Inc, Teaneck NJ. January 1994, 12 pp.
- Hardin G (1989) There is no global population problem. *The Humanist* 49(4):11-13.
- Harding R (2018) A proposal for a United Nations Framework Convention on Population Growth. *RewildingEarth*, May 24, 2018. Available at: <https://rewilding.org/a-proposal-for-a-united->

nations-framework-convention-on-population-growth/

- Hickey C, Rieder TN, Earl J (2016) Population engineering and the fight against climate change. *Social Theory and Practice* 42:845-870.
- Hook B (2017) Scripps community awarded for equity, diversity, and inclusion. News article, May 10, 1997, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, La Jolla CA. Available at: <https://scripps.ucsd.edu/news/scripps-community-awarded-equity-diversity-and-inclusion>
- Hull D (2011) Many environmental scientists are wayward or cowed when faced with an irrefutable truth: too many people destroy natural resources. *Soc Contract* 21(3):3-4.
- Hull D (2018) Saying ‘ho-hum’ to nasty ‘three-year olds’ in the slander sandbox. *Soc Contract* 28(4):42-43.
- Hurlbert SH (1997) Functional importance vs keystone-ness: reformulating some questions in theoretical biocenology. *Aust J Ecol* 22:369-382.
- Hurlbert SH (2000) The globalist copout. *Soc Contract* 10:193-194.
- Hurlbert SH (2011a) *Frontiers*, immigration and political censorship. *Soc Contract* 21(3):16-20.
- Hurlbert SH (2011b) Wives of the Bishop of Worcester: the ESA and global copoutism. *Soc Contract* 21(3):7-13
- Hurlbert SH (2011c) Pacific salmon, immigration and censors: unreliability of the cowed technocrat. *Soc Contract* 21(3):42-46.
- Hurlbert SH (2011d) Is the AAAS oblivious to U.S. overpopulation and its consequences? Or is it just another censor? *Soc Contract* 22(1):67-71.
- Hurlbert SH (2012) Population camel gets its nose into ecologists’ tent: hope is high that rest will follow. *Soc Contract* 23(1): 68-76.
- Hurlbert SH (2014) Outing the 800 pound immigration reform gorilla. Population Press, Blue Planet United, January 29, 2014. Available at: <http://populationpress.org/2014/01/29/the-immigration-reform-800-pound-gorilla-by-stuart-h-hurlbert>
- Hurlbert SH (2016a) AAAS wields the censor’s hammer on U.S. population issues. Californians for Population Stabilization, CAPS Blog, February 11, 2016. Available at: <http://www.bio.sdsu.edu/pub/stuart/Hurlbert2016AAASCensorsHammerCAPSBB.pdf>
- Hurlbert SH (2016b) Pew projection for U.S. population in 2065: a challenge to Clinton and Trump. CAPS Blog, Californians for Population Stabilization, September 19, 2016. Available at: <http://www.capsweb.org/blog/pew-projection-us-population-2065-challenge-clinton-and-trump>
- Hurlbert SH (2017) Three U.S. national commissions calling for immigration reductions and U.S. population stabilization. Californians for Population Stabilization, CAPS Blog, August 6, 2017. Available at: <https://www.capsweb.org/blog/three-us-national-commissions-calling-immigration-reductions-and-us-population-stabilization>
- Kolankiewicz L (2011) Environmental scientists as censors: an introduction. *Soc Contract* 21(3):5.
- Krikorian M (2017) The real immigration debate: who to let in and why. *Wall Street Journal*, March 24, 2017. Available at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-limit-immigration-1490366475>
- Maher TM (1997) How and why journalists avoid the population-environment connection. *Popul Envir* 16:339-372.
- McArdle M (2017) Hey Hollywood, smugness isn’t a political strategy. *Bloomberg View*, January 11, 2017. Available at: <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-01-11/hey-hollywood-smugness-isn-t-a-political-strategy>
- Meyerson FAB (2004) Immigration, population policy, and the Sierra Club. *Popul Environ* 26:61-69
- O’Neill BC, Dalton M, Fuchs R, Jiang L, Pachai S, Zigova K (2010) Global demographic trends and future carbon emissions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107:17521-17526
- PAI (2012) Why population matters to climate change. Population Action International. Available at: https://pai.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/PAI-1293-Climate-Change_compressed.pdf
- Plautz J (2014) The climate-change solution no one will talk about. *The Atlantic*, November 1, 2014. Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/11/the-climate-change-solution-no-one-will-talk-about/382197/>
- Palfrey S (2017) Curbing population growth and climate change. *Huffpost*, March 3, 2017. Available at: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/curbing-population-growth-and-climate-change-us_58d06fede4b0e0d348b34710
- Pew Research Center (2015) Modern immigration wave brings 59 million to U.S., driving population growth and change through 2065. Pew Research Center, Washington DC. 127 pp. Available at: <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/28/modern-immigration-wave-brings-59-million-to-u-s-driving-population-growth-and-change-through-2065/>
- POPIN (United Nations Population Information Network) (1994) Report of the International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 5-13 September 1994), Chapter 1: Preamble. Available at: <http://www.un.org/popin/icpd/conference/offeng/poa.html>
- Ripple WJ, Wolf C, Newsome TM, Galetti, Alamgir M, Crist E, Mahmoud MI, Laurance WF (2017) World scientists’ warning to humanity: a second notice. *Bioscience* 67:1026-1028.
- Ryerson W (2012) How do we solve the population problem? Chapter 20 (pp. 240-254) in: Cafaro P, Crist E (eds) (2012) *Life on the brink: Environmentalists confront overpopulation*. University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.
- Saul S (2017) Dozens of Middlebury students are

disciplined for Charles Murray protest. The New York Times, May 24, 2017. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/24/us/middlebury-college-charles-murray-bell-curve.html>

- Schindler D, Weld M, Hurlbert SH (2012) American Association for the Advancement of Science (on national population policies) muffles 'obnoxious' Canadians too. *Soc Contract* 22(2):11-25.
- Stephenson, J, Newman K, Mayhew S (2010) Population dynamics and climate change: what are the links? *J Public Health (Oxf)* 32(2):150-156.
- Thomas J (ed) (2017) Chapter celebrates award winners at annual gala. Sierra Club San Diego Chapter newsletter, *HiSierran* 76(3):2, 4.

July/August/September 2017. Available at: <http://sandiegosierraclub.org/wp-content/uploads/HS/HSJulSep17.pdf>

- Walker B (2011) The Sierra Club's profitable descent into leftism. *Soc Contract* 21(3):47-49.
- Weiss KR (2010) An idea to ease global warming by taming global population. *Los Angeles Times*, October 12, p. B8.
- Weld M (2012) Deconstructing the dangerous dogma of denial: the feminist-environmental justice movement and its flight from overpopulation. *Ethics Sci Environ Polit* 12:53-58.
-