

lords who exact as many rupees in rent as they can squeeze out of their tenants.

But China, which thirty years ago was equated with India in population growth, in famine recurrence, in deepest poverty, is now launching one of the greatest programs for family planning the world has ever seen. It can succeed because it has abolished landlords, ended feudal relationships, introduced cooperative agriculture, reduced the number of individual farms to a small percentage of the whole, and tied hundreds of petty principalities into a central government that can launch and carry out plans for the whole of China.

It is also able to do on a massive scale what the pathetically few birth control workers of India tried to do in the villages — wipe out those ancient prejudices against small families with the mighty aid of universal education. The Chinese peasant, unlike his Indian brother, *does* have social security.

Yet China, as far as industrial development goes, is still classed as an underdeveloped country, which indicates that it is not industrial advancement alone that can bring about a change in social mores.

World population cannot and will not be controlled by any amount of literature warning of the horrors of a future world so crowded that every human being will be confined to six square feet of living room, or, as some fanciful pseudo-scientists have put it: our great-grandchildren will be standing on each others' shoulders!

Among the thousands of books, magazine articles, TV specials and luncheon lectures that have assailed us in the past fifteen years — all warning of a race to oblivion in the near future — some solutions to end the dilemma of "people, people, everywhere" can only be described as grotesque.

Richard Bowers, the founder of Zero Population Growth, proposed the following law:

FAMILY LIMITATION MODEL PENAL CODE

Sec. 1 Any male whose sperm causes the birth of more than two children shall, unless within one month after knowing that his sperm has fertilized a human egg files a written signed statement giving his approval for an abortion with police authorities, be fined an amount not to exceed \$50.00 on the first offense, not to exceed

\$1,000.00 on the second offense, and shall be sterilized on the third offense.

Sec. 2 Any female who gives birth to more than two children be fined an amount not to exceed \$50.00 on the first offense, not to exceed \$1,000.00 on the second offense, and shall be sterilized on the third offense.²

Others have suggested that U.S. policy "must be cruel only to be kind." "How will it help to feed the starving millions of India, Africa and other crowded areas when keeping them alive will only aggravate the problem even more? They will continue to reproduce and demand even more food. Isn't it better to let them starve, so that we in the advanced countries of the world can continue to live in the manner to which we have become accustomed?" (They do not mention the fact that bombs can do the job even quicker than slow starvation, but that dark thought lurks hauntingly behind their reasoning.)

Equating poverty and population on a one to one basis is patently absurd. When the earth contained one-tenth as many people as it does today there was abysmal poverty side by side with colossal wealth. If the populations of India, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were all cut down to one-tenth of their present level, the same lack of material needs would still be there, unless social relationships were drastically changed at the same time. The exodus of 20 million people from America's rural Southland, in the two decades after the Second World War did not lessen the poverty of those who remained behind. Many primitive hunting tribes were overpopulated if they numbered more than one person per 5 square miles.

What appears to be overpopulation is in reality *concentration* of population in some areas and sparsity in others. India's cities where thousands live, sleep and die in the streets, are offset by vast, nearly empty jungles, mountains, and man-made deserts; Rio de Janeiro's slums spread out into the surrounding hills, while the interior of Brazil is virtually unpopulated; greater New York and its surrounding towns hold more than 20 million people, while much of New York State is still in wilderness.

The world's population may double, triple or even decline in