

[Skip to comments.](#)

## Population implosion: Many nations aborting future generations, creating underpopulation crisis

[WORLD ^](#) | 2/15/02 | Gene Edward Veith

Posted on **February 7, 2003 1:37:10 PM PST** by [Caleb1411](#)

The president of Estonia goes on national TV to urge his countrymen to have more children. Russian President Vladimir Putin warns his parliament about "a serious crisis threatening Russia's survival": the nation's low birth rate. The government of Singapore is trying to reverse that country's birth dearth by sponsoring a massive taxpayer-funded matchmaking service.

In 1968, Paul Ehrlich published *The Population Bomb*, panicking the world with dire predictions of a population explosion. By the year 2000, he predicted, the world would be so crowded that hundreds of millions would die of starvation. Although Mr. Ehrlich's prophecies have turned out to be almost comically wrong, PBS has produced a documentary taking him seriously, and philanthropists like Ted Turner still donate millions to combat population growth.

But the problem today is not overpopulation; it's underpopulation. For a population to reproduce itself, the fertility rate must average 2.1 children per woman. (The .1 allows for child mortality.) The fertility rate today among major developed nations is only 1.6.

The United States is rare among its peers in keeping its fertility rate at around the replacement level of 2.1, according to the Population Reference Bureau, which provided the fertility data cited here. Europe, though, is shrinking. Germany's rate is 1.3. Despite the stereotype of large Catholic families, France has a fertility rate of 1.9 and Italy has one of the lowest in Europe, 1.3. At this rate, there will be only about half as many Italians in the next generation. There will also be fewer Russians, whose fertility rate is 1.3.

Even nations that were once notorious for booming populations have drastically slowed down in reproducing themselves. In the last 20 years, India's fertility rate has gone from over four children per woman to about three. Mexico has gone from over four to just under three. China has a fertility rate of 1.8.

African nations continue to have very high fertility rates, up to five or six children per woman, but those lands are ravaged by AIDS, which is decimating their population. Muslim nations, on the other hand, tend to have booming population growth—Yemen's fertility rate is 7.2 children per woman.

Demographers predict that the world's population will level off at 9 billion, reports *The Wall Street Journal*. Then it will start dropping. There may well be nearly 500 million fewer people by 2075.

Isn't this a good thing? Why are so many governments panicking at the drop in their populations?

Although radical environmentalists like Mr. Ehrlich see human beings only as "consumers of the earth's resources," human beings are in fact the most valuable resource of all. Citizens are not just consumers but producers. Having fewer people can wreak havoc on an economy, creating both a labor shortage and a

shortage of buyers. A government with a shrinking population faces a smaller military and fewer taxpayers. Dwindling populations have always signaled cultural decline, with less creativity, energy, and vitality on every level of society.

Already Japan— fertility rate 1.3—is facing the problem of having fewer taxpaying young people to support the burgeoning number of retirees, something that will hit the generous welfare states of Europe especially hard.

Already Europe has had to import large numbers of immigrants to bolster the labor force, most of them from the Middle East. Fewer and fewer native Europeans—along with the dwindling influence of Christianity—and more and more Muslims raise the prospect of the Islamification of Western Europe. One reason "old Europe" is not supporting the United States in a war with Iraq is that politicians in France and Germany fear the reaction among their Muslim voters.

Why the population decline? The worldwide collapse of what are, literally, family values. Thanks to contraceptive technology, sex has become separated from childbearing. With women pursuing careers of their own and men getting sex without the responsibilities of marriage, why bother with children? For many women and men, pregnancy has become an unpleasant side effect, something to prevent with contraceptives or easily treat with a trip to the abortion clinic.

The dirty little secret of the population implosion, one seldom mentioned by demographers, is that the world is aborting its future generations. China has shrunk its fertility rate by its cruel policy of forced abortion. (The website of the International Planned Parenthood Federation has only good things to say about China and does not even mention how the government coerces women to have abortions. So much for "choice.")

In the United States, abortion ends between one-third and one-fifth of all pregnancies, and the U.S. abortion rate is relatively low. In Russia, the average woman may have as many as four abortions in her lifetime. There are two abortions for every live birth. That is to say, Russians kill two-thirds of their children before they are born. That, Mr. Putin, is the "serious crisis threatening Russia's survival."

---

**TOPICS:** [Culture/Society](#); [Editorial](#); [Foreign Affairs](#)

**KEYWORDS:** [abortion](#); [abortionlist](#); [fashionukraine](#); [nhs](#); [populationcontrol](#); [prolife](#); [un](#); [unitednations](#)

---

**Navigation:** use the links below to view more comments.

[first 1-50](#), [51-76](#) [next](#) [last](#)

---

1 posted on **February 7, 2003 1:37:10 PM PST** by **Caleb1411**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **BibChr**; **logos**; **MHGinTN**; **\*Abortion\_list**; **\*Pro\_Life**; **frogsong**; **tatterdemalion**; **The Big Econ**

BUMP

2 posted on **February 7, 2003 1:51:52 PM PST** by **Caleb1411**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

I'm just waiting for the idiot who will say, "Yeah, hyuck, hyuck, but think of how many more jobs will be available without all those people!" much like those who think that the economy would be better if all non-English speaking, non-white, immigrants were to be suddenly removed from the U.S.. "Yep," they blithely say. "If all them people was gone jess think how much more money and jobs and stuff they'd be to go aroun to *real* 'Mericans!"

3 posted on **February 7, 2003 1:56:30 PM PST** by **aruanan**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Another good argument against abortion (as if another one were needed).

4 posted on **February 7, 2003 2:07:24 PM PST** by **expatpat**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

[Russian Depopulation Is a Lesson for the West](#), by Herbert I. London of the Hudson Institute, January 28, 2003.

5 posted on **February 7, 2003 2:10:53 PM PST** by **toenail**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 2](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Sorry, the world IS overpopulated.

6 posted on **February 7, 2003 2:24:16 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

We are not underpopulation in any real or meaningful sense unless by underpopulated you mean- not enough people to prop up the welfare pyramid state. With unemployment at 11% in Germany and a social policy which delays the entry of students into the workforce until their 30's, there is no sense that Germany is in need of guest workers. The same goes for any western country. The only kind of population increase Europe 'needs' is a large population spike to keep the welfare system going one more turn, at which point Europe will have been overwhelmed by immigrants from hostile countries.

7 posted on **February 7, 2003 2:30:13 PM PST** by **Dialup Llama**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

>There are two abortions for every live birth. That is to say, Russians kill two-thirds of their children before they are born. That, Mr. Putin, is the "serious crisis threatening Russia's survival."

The message to Putin and leaders of all western democratic-welfare states.... stop placing burdens on your citizens and making their lives difficult and they will start having the 'proper' number of babies.

**8** posted on **February 7, 2003 2:32:50 PM PST** by **Dialup Llama**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

*One reason "old Europe" is not supporting the United States in a war with Iraq is that politicians in France and Germany fear the reaction among their Muslim voters.*

The scalpel of the abortionist is the sword of Islam.

**9** posted on **February 7, 2003 3:05:28 PM PST** by **Loyalist**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Dialup Llama**

I agree. Basically, we have a "crisis" that was created by overtaxation, and, like Atlas, we are shrugging, and saying "We refuse to commit our children to be slaves to your welfare state." Slaves often thwart their masters by failing to reproduce, I've heard. Let people keep more of their money, and maybe then Mom can stay home and take care of the kids. Stop stealing the bread from our mouths, and maybe we'll breed.

For the foreseeable future, though, I have no plans to reproduce. I work really, really hard to make a good living, and I need my leisure time. I probably wouldn't have to work as hard if my tax burden were reduced, but I won't hold my breath on it being reduced, so Granny and Gramps will just have to get by on fewer little drones to pay for the welfare benefits that they desire.

Thanks for letting me rant.

**10** posted on **February 7, 2003 3:07:10 PM PST** by **Henrietta**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 7](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

Overpopulated by the wrong people. Poor, stupid, totalitarians with evil on their minds.

Underpopulated by others.

**11** posted on **February 7, 2003 4:55:11 PM PST** by **ScholarWarrior**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 6](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Earth's population is well over 6 billion and rising fast. What's this underpopulation crisis?

**12** posted on **February 7, 2003 4:56:43 PM PST** by **RightWhale**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

WRONG!

With only present day agricultural technology, the world could support more than 70 billion people.

And the world's entire present population could live in the state of Texas, and it would be about as crowded as the city of San Francisco with parks and high rise apartments. It would take only ten fully cultivated American states to feed that population.

Human beings live on less than 1% of the earth's surface.

So, upon what criteria do you base your assertion that the earth is overpopulated? Just that it seems like there are too many people in your opinion? Good. Then do us all a favor...

**13** posted on **February 7, 2003 5:19:36 PM PST** by **Thorondir**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 6](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Thorondir**

*With only present day agricultural technology, the world could support more than 70 billion people.*

If you have to resort to agriculture to feed people, then the world is overpopulated.

*And the world's entire present population could live in the state of Texas.*

They could take up even less room if we pack them like they did at Alcatraz--funny how we equate crowding with a loss of freedom and punishment.

*Human beings live on less than 1% of the earth's surface.*

Then why do we have to pay for real estate if there is so much of it?

*So, upon what criteria do you base your assertion that the earth is overpopulated?*

Upon freedom.

*Just that it seems like there are too many people in your opinion? Good. Then do us all a favor...*

There, there, there . . . in a crowded world, you must learn to be tolerant of people having ideas different from yours.

**14** posted on **February 7, 2003 6:37:17 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 13](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ScholarWarrior**

*Overpopulated by the wrong people. Poor, stupid, totalitarians with evil on their minds.*

Totalitarianism thrives in crowded conditions--just look at how cities are governed.

More crowding, more laws.

**15** posted on **February 7, 2003 6:41:42 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 11](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Why are we so willing to kill others and our future??

**16** posted on **February 7, 2003 8:26:23 PM PST** by **victim soul**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 2](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **\*Population Control**

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/involved?group=285>

**17** posted on **February 7, 2003 9:15:34 PM PST** by **Coleus** (RU 486 Kills Babies)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

*Already Europe has had to import large numbers of immigrants to bolster the labor force, most of them from the Middle East.*

How many of those immigrants are living on welfare and aren't working at all? Probably quite a few are coming for the good life but not to work. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait actually have to import workers even from the US and especially the Phillipines so this argument doesn't make that much sense. It's the prosperity and often the dole that draw immigrants, not lack of population.

**18** posted on **February 7, 2003 9:25:12 PM PST** by **FITZ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Culture of Death bump! Economic prosperity is impossible in a nation with a declining birthrate.

"If you do not believe in your own stock enough to see the stock kept up, then you are not good Americans, you are not patriots, and ... I for one shall not mourn your extinction; and in such event I shall welcome the advent of a new race that will take your place, because you will have shown that you are not fit to cumber the ground." --Teddy Roosevelt, speaking to a group of liberal pastors.

**19** posted on **February 7, 2003 9:42:10 PM PST** by **Antoninus** (In hoc signo, vinces †)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

*If you have to resort to agriculture to feed people, than the world is overpopulated.*

What? Are you joking? Agriculture is how we are fed. What are you, a hunter-gatherer? What are you trying to say?

*They could take up even less room if we pack them like they did at Alcatraz--funny how we equate crowding with a loss of freedom and punishment.*

Who equates crowding with a loss of freedom and punishment? People increasingly group into cities. They do it because they like it and it is both beneficial and efficient. Besides, many people think San Fransisco is

a beautiful place to live. Too bad the commielibs have made it a haven for filthy bums.

But, hey! I heard you cannot get lost in San Fransisco--they have aides on every corner. Nyuk, nyuk!

20 posted on February 7, 2003 10:15:38 PM PST by Thorondir  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 14](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

To: Age of Reason; Caleb1411; aruanan; expatpat; toenail; Dialup Llama; Loyalist; RightWhale; ...

*Sorry, the world IS overpopulated*

Sorry, your asseveration that it is *isn't* proof positive. A few statistics and citations would help make your case.

Speaking of which, Michael Fumento is less than sanguine about the specter of overpopulation in his article [The Myth of Too Many](#), in which he cites statistics and facts provided by the likes of Nobel Laureate Norman Borlaug:

**...You can't estimate population growth with a calculator because simple mathematical formulas don't take into account underlying circumstances such as fertility rates. But we do know that in almost every nation women are having fewer children, with those in about 60 nations already giving birth at a rate far less than the replacement rate.**

**Want some numbers? While world population has more than doubled since 1950 to the current 6.3 billion, according to the United Nations, the population will top out between 2050 and 2075. Demographer and American Enterprise Institute scholar Nicholas Eberstadt says it's likely to come on the earlier end of that estimate, when the world hits 8 billion by 2050. "I think it's perfectly plausible that world population could peak by 2050 or even sooner and perhaps at a level below 8 billion," says Eberstadt, noting the past 35 years of declining fertility rates.**

**Thus the world in the next half century will have fewer additional people to take care of than it did in the last half century. In percentage terms, while it handled 100 percent more people in the last 50 years, it will only have to deal with 27 percent more in the next 50. Granted, that's still a lot of people. But it's a long way from apocalyptic.**

**It's true that parts of the world tend to be pretty crowded. (Ehrlich has admitted the impetus for the book came when he found himself in the crush of humanity in a large city in India.) But while "overcrowding" may sound frightening, it's a misleading term because it's defined by individual and cultural lifestyles and circumstances — which have little to do with the scientific definition of "overpopulation." People in India were crammed together not because there were too many for the land to hold, but because like people the world over, they prefer urban centers to rural areas. That's why some Manhattan high-rises practically house more people than South Dakota. Overcrowding may be a problem, but it's not overpopulation.**

**Ehrlich's other prophecies of doom haven't proven any more reliable. The Population Bomb initially focused on the prospect of famine, with Ehrlich predicting, "In the 1970s the world will undergo famines . . . [and] hundreds of millions of people [including Americans] are going to starve to death." As it happened, he was off by, oh, hundreds of millions.**

**In Ehrlich's 1990 sequel, *The Population Explosion*, he claimed that world grain production peaked in 1986. Wrong. In 1986 about 1.8 million metric tons of cereals (the most important grain) were produced, an increase over previous years, according to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nation. By 2001, that number had increased to 20.7 million metric tons.**

**"Global food production per person peaked earlier, in 1984," Ehrlich further claimed, "and has slid downward since then." His fellow doomsayer, founder and president of the Worldwatch Institute Lester Brown (along with Ehrlich, another winner of the MacArthur Foundation "genius award") wrote in 1981, "The period of global food security is over."**

**Wrong and wrong again. From 1981 to 1989, grain production per person increased by more than 5 percent. Since then, it's increased another 4 percent more per person. Yet we haven't had to plow under the face of the earth to get this extra food. In 2001, 304 million acres were used to grow the world's cereals, slightly less than in 1968 when Ehrlich's bombastic bomb book appeared and far less than the 330 million acres used in the peak year of 1991.**

**The figure that counts the most, however, is that calories available per person reached an all-time high of 2,800 by 1999, up from 2,371 in 1968. We are finally growing enough calories per person to keep the world's population well fed — if those calories were evenly distributed.**

**Unfortunately, far too many are sustaining the American obesity epidemic and still too few are going to the underdeveloped world. (Though, as the World Health Organization recently reported, obesity is now a problem even in many of the poorest nations.)**

**Eating one fewer Big Mac a day will help us stay healthier, but it won't do Africans or Indians any good. Talk about "equitable distribution of food" is just that, talk. What's needed is a rising tide to raise all boats. Neo-Marxist groups like Greenpeace insist that all we have to do is to evenly divide up the world's food; but that's no more likely than dividing up the world's wealth. (Which they would also love to do.) Just as increasing wealth among the poorest requires increasing wealth generally, so too must we continue to increase the amount of food available for all to help those with the greatest need. This is even more important because lesser-developed countries are acquiring a taste for more meat, which requires far more crops than eating the crops directly would. The question is, are we up to the task of providing all those calories?**

**Norman Borlaug should know. He's a Nobel Peace Prize winner and "father of the Green Revolution," which brought dramatic increases in cereal-grain yields in many developing countries beginning in the late 1960s, due largely to use of genetically improved varieties. In his chapter in the just-released book *Global Warming and Other Myths*, he claims that "the world has the technology — either available or well-advanced in the research pipeline — to feed a population of 10 billion people." More specifically, "Even without using advances in plant biotechnology, yields can be increased by 50 to 70 percent in much of the Indian subcontinent, Latin America, the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and by 100 to 150 percent in sub-Saharan Africa."**

**There also are tremendous advances in biotechnology that make the scenario even brighter.**

**Consider a single crop: rice. Swiss researchers have added genes from daffodils to so-called "Golden Rice" to give it Vitamin A, the lack of which causes about 2 million deaths annually. (It's also the leading cause of preventable blindness in anywhere from 250,000 to 500,000 children.) Then they**

added a gene from a fungus that creates an enzyme allowing the human digestive system to break down the iron in rice that's otherwise unavailable to us. Still other researchers are adding genes to rice crops that increase yields by 20 to 40 percent.

Of course, the ability to feed mankind is not our sole worry in terms of whether we can sustain a growing population. Yet time and again, we've stubbornly refused to run out of things that were supposed to have been depleted long ago.

Ehrlich in his 1974 book *The End of Affluence* declared that, "Before 1985 mankind will enter a genuine age of scarcity . . . in which the accessible supplies of many key minerals will be facing depletion." He was hardly alone; a group called the Club of Rome issued a much-publicized report in 1972 that had us running out of virtually everything by now but sand and cockroaches.

Yet no minerals — "key" or otherwise — are today in danger of being depleted. Price over the long run (as opposed to temporary gyrations) is a direct indicator of scarcity. But the International Monetary Fund's price index for metals is now the lowest it has ever been.

Similarly, while the Department of the Interior originally predicted that oil would run out in 1954 and later moved that back to 1964 because of technology breakthroughs improving the discovery and extraction of oil, reserves are more numerous than ever.

Still, there is one vital resource in which we may develop a shortage in the next few decades: us.

That's because the world's population won't just conveniently level off after it peaks; more likely it will drop like a stone.

According to U.N. Population Division Director Joseph Chamie, current population projections assume the earth is moving toward an average fertility level of 1.85 children per woman. Considering that a 2.1 level is needed to sustain a population, the planet's population would peak at 7.5 billion by 2050 and fall to 5.3 billion by 2150.

And that has interesting political implications, since the decline will not be evenly distributed among nations. The populations of several Soviet-bloc nations already are falling because of declining birth rates and emigration. Japan is expecting its population to peak in 2006 and then drop by 14 percent (almost 20 million people) by 2050. Germany expects a similar decline, while Italy and Hungary may lose 25 percent of their populations and Russia a third. These nations already are becoming giant "leisure worlds," with Depends outselling Pampers.

Still, there's one thing that as the population shrinks we simply won't be able to make up for.

Of all the population prophets, the one whose predictions got the least recognition was also the most accurate. That was the late University of Maryland economist Julian Simon. He saw humanity not as a plague of locusts but rather as what he called "the ultimate resource" in a 1981 book by the same name. "The standard of living has risen along with the size of the world's population since the beginning of recorded time," Simon observed in that book. "And with increases in income and population have come less severe shortages, lower costs, and an increased availability of resources." True, he wrote, "Adding more people will cause [temporary] problems, but at the same time there will be more people to solve these problems."

**To Simon, the cry of a little baby represented not just one more mouth to feed, but perhaps the next Pascal, the next Kepler, the next Michelangelo, the next Bach.**

**We don't know how many of these won't be born. But we'll grieve their loss just the same**

**21** posted on **February 8, 2003 4:04:58 AM PST** by **rhema**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 6](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **aruanan**

If you want to fix most of the problem, cut taxes by 90% and welfare by 100\$. Then more of the better and less of the worst will be born.

**22** posted on **February 8, 2003 4:14:12 AM PST** by **Trickyguy**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **victim soul; Antoninus; FITZ; Coleus**

BUMP to #21.

**23** posted on **February 8, 2003 4:14:16 AM PST** by **rhema**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 21](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

*Sorry, the world IS overpopulated.*

Why is it that someone whose screen name is "Age of Reason" doesn't employ any of it but merely makes an assertion? "Overpopulation" isn't a number but a condition. By almost all objective means, the world is less overpopulated now that it was 20 years ago or 50 years ago.

**24** posted on **February 8, 2003 5:02:01 AM PST** by **aruanan**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 6](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Antoninus**

*Economic prosperity is impossible in a nation with a declining birthrate.*

Has that ever been proven? The reverse certainly isn't true ---countries like Mexico with it's very high birth rate aren't prosperous for most of the people especially the ones with the high birth rates. Same for Middle Eastern countries --they aren't prosperous and yet Europe with a lower birth rate is.

I think it matters more which type of people are increasing --if you have a growing middle class population, that is good, but it can't be good when the middle class is shrinking and the handout class is growing.

**25** posted on **February 8, 2003 7:43:30 AM PST** by **FITZ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 19](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Thorondir**

*Who equates crowding with a loss of freedom and punishment?*

I do. I've seen apartments here which were meant for one small family filled with over 20 mostly unrelated people living in them, sleeping in chairs and on the floor. I've seen 3 families living in one single-wide trailer with kids also sleeping on the floor. I think conditions like that will bring problems.

**26** posted on **February 8, 2003 7:51:43 AM PST** by **FITZ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 20](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **FITZ**

Europe, particularly Italy, and Japan are dying. Americans should be encouraged to breed, not like vermin with 8 children per family, but encouraged to have 2-3.

It is their duty to our nation and the world.

**27** posted on **February 8, 2003 8:26:30 AM PST** by **ScholarWarrior**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 25](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ScholarWarrior**

I do believe middle class Americans should have more kids ---8 is a good number but it seems our growth is mostly in the welfare classes. Where I live 1 out of 3 "families" is now receiving some kind of welfare and it's a high population growth area, but the middle class is leaving the area ---population growth of the wrong kind isn't any kind of benefit.

**28** posted on **February 8, 2003 8:41:33 AM PST** by **FITZ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 27](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ScholarWarrior**

*not like vermin with 8 children per family*

They just took 6 kids away from a 22 year old mother here (from Mexico) because she wasn't feeding them and letting them run wild, her own mother wasn't helping her raise the kids because she's in prison. Hopefully the kids will do okay in foster care ---there's a big difference between that population growth -- which we have more of now because of high single teenage mothers having most of the babies --and middle class families who will work and take care of their kids.

**29** posted on **February 8, 2003 8:48:56 AM PST** by **FITZ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 27](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **rhema**

And as the birth rate drops, the god-like scientists will perfect cannibalization of the embryonic aged individual humans they (the scientists) may conceive under controlled conditions, to cure disease and improve our pleasure and longevity ... until, until? We'll be fine, as long as the masses agree to cannibalization our own species, didn't you know?

**30** posted on **February 8, 2003 8:54:34 AM PST** by **MHGinTN** (If you can read this, you've had life support from someone. Promote Life Support for others.)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 23](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Thorondir**

*Agriculture is how we are fed. What are you, a hunter-gatherer?*

Then it is strange that we enjoy hunting, hiking, camping, fishing, swimming, and canoeing so much that we pay for the privilege to do those things on our vacations.

In comparison, how many people pay to plow fields on their vacations?

If we were meant to sit behind a desk or to follow a plow all day, nature would have endowed us with a greater love for doing such things.

I can't recall seeing a healthy animal starving--and animals don't farm (except for certain ants--and they are designed to "like" it).

Why should humans require the back-breaking drudgery of agriculture to survive, if not because there are too many people for nature to easily supply them?

*many people think San Fransisco is a beautiful place to live. Too bad the commielibs have made it a haven for filthy bums.*

You confuse cause and effect.

More crowding *requires* more laws and less freedom.

**31** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:13:17 AM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 20](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **aruanan; Caleb1411; expatpat; toenail; Dialup Llama; Loyalist; RightWhale**

Overpopulation isn't about how much you have.

**Overpopulation is about how you must behave to obtain what you will have.**

Tell that to those "experts" of yours.

**32** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:19:11 AM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 24](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **rhema**

My post, #32, right above.

**33** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:25:14 AM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 21](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ScholarWarrior**

*Americans should be encouraged to breed, not like vermin with 8 children per family, but encouraged to*

*have 2-3.*

And what business is it of anyone to *encourage* how many children other people should have?

Perhaps we should outlaw large families?

OK, more laws mean more government and less freedom--let's just encourage them by shunning and calling them vermin instead.

How unconsciously the pressures of overpopulation and its inclination to tyranny seep into our thinking!

**34** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:36:02 AM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 27](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason; Caleb1411; expatpat; toenail; Dialup Llama; Loyalist; RightWhale**

*Overpopulation is about how you must behave to obtain what you will have.*

Gee, then armed robbery is overpopulation; if one argues that "crime" is caused by overpopulation (as some in error do), then at all times and places the world has been overpopulated because at all times and places there has been crime. But then, by your definition, *anything* that one does or *any* manner in which one must behave to obtain what he wants is "overpopulation". If all types of behavior are "overpopulation" then one guy alone on an island trying to get up a coconut tree is overpopulation; and two guys on an island cooperating to scale the coconut tree is overpopulation; and three guys on the island deciding to work together to maximize coconut acquisition and then dividing the product among them is overpopulation; and two families on an island, one of them coconut gatherers, the other fishermen, deciding to exchange their specialties is overpopulation; and more than two families deciding to apportion available food to the total population is overpopulation; and more than two families deciding to increase food production beyond what simply happens to wash up on the beach so that they'll have more than they at present need is overpopulation. By your definition, "overpopulation" is still a noun without referent.

**35** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:41:25 AM PST** by **aruanan**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 32](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

Interesting thing I've seen recently. According to projections, India is expected to pass China as the most populous nation in the world, some time around 2025.

**36** posted on **February 8, 2003 10:46:44 AM PST** by **Celtjew Libertarian**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

I know a lot of farmers. They really LIKE farming.

I like gardening. What's the big horrible deal about agriculture? Man, that's really wierd! Do you live in the woods? Do you live in a teepee? Without the stable life provided by agriculture, you would never have the technology to sit there and type on your computer.

**37** posted on **February 8, 2003 11:38:17 AM PST** by **Thorondir**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 31](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason; aruanan**

*Overpopulation isn't about how much you have.*

*Overpopulation is about how you must behave to obtain what you will have.*

*Tell that to those "experts" of yours.*

Poor benighted souls that they are, those experts are all using a conventional definition of overpopulation. Evidently none of them have graduated from the Casey Stengel College of Circumlocution, where they would have picked up the latest deconstructionist, postmodernist denotation of the word.

**38** posted on **February 8, 2003 12:09:33 PM PST** by **rhema**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 32](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

Face the fact that Europe, Russia and Japan will depopulate before you get on your high horse. In 50 years this Muslim problem will be much worse if we have no troops.

**39** posted on **February 8, 2003 3:08:14 PM PST** by **ScholarWarrior**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 34](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Thorondir**

*I know a lot of farmers. They really LIKE farming.*

And some people like to be tied up and whipped.

The human mind is capable of perversion.

**40** posted on **February 8, 2003 6:19:21 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 37](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **aruanan**

I with you, I personally would like to see 10 or 20 million more illegal aliens immigrate into America. I could only help our economy !

**41** posted on **February 8, 2003 6:23:11 PM PST** by **Joe Hadenuf**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Thorondir**

*Without the stable life provided by agriculture, you would never have the technology to sit there and type on your computer.*

You think this is a good thing? LOL.

Needing a computer is, like agriculture, another insult to human happiness forced upon us by overpopulation.

**42** posted on **February 8, 2003 6:24:38 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 37](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **aruanan**

*more than two families deciding to increase food production beyond what simply happens to wash up on the beach so that they'll have more than they at present need is overpopulation.*

If not for overpopulation, why should anyone bother about increasing food production beyond what is needed?

You make the same mistake European explorers did when they judged certain peoples as imprudent for not stowing food for a rainy day.

Those Europeans had no understanding that before overpopulation, there was no need to store for a rainy day, because those people they encountered had never known a time when nature failed to provide them.

All of their surrounding world was their natural larder.

Why bother about storing stuff which can spoil and sicken you--or which you must worry over to prevent raiding by animals and insects?

So long have you worn the albatross of civilization and overpopulation around your neck, that you make the unconscious assumption that things made a necessity by overpopulation, were things that always were.

**43** posted on **February 8, 2003 6:39:39 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 35](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **FITZ**

well, It doesn't change from one day to the next. If you look at Europe where in the 70's they started paying families a monthly income to produce offspring (currently in Germany \$300 per child), the birthrate is still declining. The phenomenon is that all that happened during the best economic period ever. That in itself was the death knell of their ever expanding social system. They were not able to manage prosperity. People became lazy, living on a generous subsistence which is now higher than having to go to work. "La Dolce vita" caught up to them. Now they are too lazy to breed. The population is aging and not enough workers to pay taxes into the system to pay for the promises of life long pensions. They have to import workers from the only race that is still procreating, the Muslims. They will lose their identity in the next generation. We are fortunate in the U.S.. While other countries experience a decline in population, we are projected to increase ours through various means. The European situation is causing Political and economic unrest. It is getting worse by the day. The Government is trying to change things on a short term basis. Trying to find long range solutions are forgotten. It is almost like sitting in a leaky boat with a spoon to bail out the water. The future is grim.

**44** posted on **February 8, 2003 6:49:43 PM PST** by **americanbychoice**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 25](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Age of Reason**

No, the overpopulation "crisis" has been exposed as a fallacy. Much has been written about the overpopulation myth and here is just one source:

<http://www.rense.com/politics6/overpop.htm>

**45** posted on **February 8, 2003 7:03:25 PM PST** by **eleni121**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 6](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Caleb1411**

The problem is this: western nations, which are secular and materialistic, view childrearing as an expensive hobby. The only reason that folks throughout the west have any children at all is to satisfy the nurturing, maternal instinct that exists in most women. Problem is, this instinct can be satiated by one child, or two at most.

But in order to have a healthy, growing population, the average woman must have 2-3 kids...not 1-2. The individualistic view of childbearing just doesn't cut it...it doesn't give any motivation to women to have enough kids.

Only religious conviction, compounded by a cultural expectation of having large families to continue the existence of a cultural/tribal group, can provide adequate incentive to women to have more babies.

To the extent that govt policy can influence this (which is debatable), I would suggest that we pass a law that any married couple who has more than 4 biological children is permanently exempted from paying income tax. This would provide an incentive to those who have significant incomes to have kids, without also stimulating increased fertility amongst those who can't afford to raise kids to begin with.

**46** posted on **February 8, 2003 7:21:11 PM PST** by **quebecois**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **aruanan**

The US has the most generous immigration policy in the world, as we ought. However, floods of illegals will destabilize, stress and overwhelm. Illegals are also a reproach to the legal immigrants who came here the hard way.

**47** posted on **February 8, 2003 7:28:24 PM PST** by **Mamzelle**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **eleni121**

Read my other posts on this thread.

Overpopulation is not about how much you have.

Overpopulation is about what you must do to obtain what you will have.

**48** posted on **February 8, 2003 9:26:06 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 45](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Mamzelle**

*The US has the most generous immigration policy in the world, as we ought.*

As we ought? Why is that?

**49** posted on **February 8, 2003 9:26:50 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 47](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **eleni121**

Why, fitting the world's population in Texas is a waste of space.

If you pack them like Alcatraz and Sing Sing did, you could fit the world's population in Rhode Island with room to spare.

How silly that prisons equate crowding with punishment and loss of freedom.

**50** posted on **February 8, 2003 9:39:39 PM PST** by **Age of Reason**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 45](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

**Navigation:** use the links below to view more comments.

[first 1-50](#), [51-76 next last](#)

---

**Disclaimer:** Opinions posted on Free Republic are those of the individual posters and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Free Republic or its management. All materials posted herein are protected by copyright law and the exemption for fair use of copyrighted works.

[Free Republic](#)  
[Browse](#) · [Search](#)

[News/Activism](#)  
[Topics](#) · [Post Article](#)

[FreeRepublic, LLC, PO BOX 9771, FRESNO, CA 93794](#)

FreeRepublic.com is powered by software copyright 2000-2008 John Robinson