

November 1967

Abortion: Part VII

Paul V. Harrington

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Harrington, Paul V. (1967) "Abortion: Part VII," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 34 : No. 4 , Article 5.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol34/iss4/5>

Abortion

Part VII

RT. REV. MSGR. PAUL V. HARRINGTON, J.C.L.

POPULATION PROBLEM

The final indication for legalized abortion is the "critical problem" caused by the tremendous "population explosion." Notice the emotion-charged term which has been chosen to describe the matter — "explosion." In the present campaign for liberalization of abortion laws, the proponents merely mention the magic words "population explosion" and, without any discussion or further commentary, the initial and immediate reaction is directed towards a wholesale and large scale population limitation. The obvious conclusion is set forth that unless we wish to commit race suicide by continued increased reproduction, we must adopt a program — not of birth control but of birth prevention — and when contraceptives fail, abortion must be prescribed as the effective antidote!

In the present writings, there is much myth, fancy, error, false presentation of facts and intentional hysteria.

POPULATION MYTHS AND PREDICTIONS

Since Thomas Malthus wrote his famous essay in 1798 on the population problem of his time, the human race has been beseiged by the prophets of doom, of race suicide and of destruction of the human race. We have been told constantly throughout the intervening 168

years that, if the population continued to increase at present rates, there would not be enough room on the earth to hold everyone, the food supply would be insufficient and the ultimate starvation and ensuing death would be the end of the human race.

Thomas Malthus, in his theory of growth of population by geometric ratio and the growth of food supply by arithmetic ratio, made the same mistake that is being made right now. He projected the increase of population into the unknown future but considered the supplying of that population increase only by the known methods of his time, which, according to his estimate, would remain static and unchanged. He did not realize that the new persons to be born in the future would not only be consumers but that they also would be producers. He did not take into account the fact that industries would be expanded to meet the needs of the continuing population increase and he certainly did not consider the dramatic change in the life of industry that would be brought about by the industrial revolution of the later nineteenth century. We cannot criticize Thomas Malthus for not foreseeing the industrial revolution but the fact remains that this revolution invalidated all of his predictions and rendered them completely useless and without foundation.

The same thing has happened to all the hysterical prophecies made over the past 168 years. While the demise and death of the human race has been predicted for the past century and a half, the human race has never been so large, has never been so vital, viable, dynamic and alive, has never been so prosperous and affluent, has never been more interested in reproducing itself.

The only logical conclusion to be drawn is that it is impossible for even the most astute student of demography to peer into the future and prophesy accurately concerning the welfare of the human race. While it is possible to project population increase with some precision, it is not possible to predict accurately how the expanded population will be able to care for its needs, since the life of the future is still a mystery to everyone but God. The demographers, economists, social scientists, anthropologists of today are in no better position than was Thomas Malthus to predict what will be the revolution of the future.

We must keep in mind that the number of people on earth at any one time is not important, as long as the earth's surface will contain them. What is of importance is the ability of the people to satisfy their necessities and desires and what the future holds for this is what is unknown. This is why the pessimistic and hysterical predictions of the present writers must not be taken at face value. Full confidence cannot be placed in warnings for the future until the individual prophet can convince the reader that he has

a full grasp of what will be the technological, industrial, economic and agricultural picture of the decade or the century for which he is projecting his conclusions.

Relative to the difficulty of predicting with accuracy the future trends of population, Doctor George F. Carter of Johns Hopkins University, said recently: "The problem of what the future population of the world is likely to be is a difficult matter. Without getting deeply involved, I would like to point out that population trends are tricky things. Ireland a little more than 100 years ago had 8 million people; today, it has about 4 million. Who could have predicted *that* during the preceding century when its population was 'exploding?' Japan's population was exploding, but within the past decade they cut their birthrate in half. My only point is that it occurred and was not predicted."¹

Doctor Herbert Ratner declared: "The phrase 'population explosion' is poetic, not scientific. It is qualitative, not quantitative. Its lack of precision permits it to be used indiscriminately and applied to all countries experiencing a population increase. To apply it equally to the United States and India, to industrial and non-industrial countries, to the overdeveloped and underdeveloped, to the stabilized and non-stabilized, to the West and to the East, is bad poetry and worse science. It can only mislead the reader and hearer and is propaganda in the worst sense of the word because it brainwashes away necessary distinctions."²

A few examples of the hysterical, emotional, cynical and pessimistic forecasts for the future might be in order at the present just to indicate and prove that such are published:

Doctor Roger Revelle, Director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University, has predicted that "in 650 years there could be one person for every square foot of land area, that is, 25 million persons per square mile. The density of Harlem today is 25,000 per square mile so this would be 1000 times as dense."³

Referring to the "scaremongering of doctrinaire family planners and population pessimists," Father McCormack, a pastoral sociologist, considered the famous memorandum signed by 150 distinguished people, including 39 Nobel prize winners, which was sent to the United Nations in November, 1960. "It warned that unless a favorable balance of population and resources was achieved with the *minimum of delay*, a Dark Age of human misery, famine, undereducation and unrest was in prospect, which could generate growing panic, exploding into wars fought to appropriate the dwindling means of survival. I happen to know that real demographic experts of the U.N. were intensely annoyed by this incursion into their field by scientists of other disciplines."⁴

John D. Rockefeller, III, states: "Our natural resources are dwindling too. Americans, with our high standards of living, expend resources and energy at a prodigious rate.

Minerals and most sources of energy are nonrenewable. When we spend them, we spend capital, not income; when they are gone, they are gone forever. Even our water supply is a worry in many areas. More than 1000 American communities have been forced to curtail water service."

"At present rates of growth, America's population will double in less than 50 years. Think of the impact of this growth on your hometown. Imagine what it will mean to our schools to have twice as many pupils in the lifetime of our children—and four times as many in the lifetime of our grandchildren. Imagine what will happen to our libraries, museums, all our cultural and recreational institutions, as well as to our hospitals, welfare agencies, penal institutions and other public services. In innumerable communities, budgets are already strained or in deficit. Many communities are approaching financial crisis—and the outlook as population grows is for crisis doubled and redoubled."⁵

All the literature indicates that world population reached one billion in the mid-nineteenth century; the second billion in the 1930's; the third billion in the 1960's and, unless controlled, the population will increase to four billion by 1975. These are facts that have been verified and the projection over the next decade is short-term enough so that it probably has accuracy. But, the important matter is not the numbers but what the numbers signify and indicate.

AVAILABLE LAND AND SPACE

Is there danger that the numbers of people will exceed the space available on earth? Is there a danger of absolute overpopulation? Is there danger of a more critical poverty and starvation than what has been known in recent times? Are the mineral resources about to run out? Is the human race in any danger, immediate or remote, possible or probable of extinction by too much reproduction? These are the important and relevant questions. Let us consider them:

Rev. William J. Gibbons, S.J., a sociologist and economist with a specialty in population problems, stated: "Absolute overpopulation would only be present where you would have no more living space or where you would not have adequate resources, despite any advance in technology. Such a situation is obviously quite a way off. According to estimates of good economists on the capacity of the world at a reasonable level of living, it's anywhere between 10 and 20, or even more, times the present population."⁶

Father McCormack notes that we are not faced with global overpopulation: "The population of the world is at present about 55 per square mile. Even allowing for Arctic wastes, forests, deserts, mountains, etc., the number of people per square mile is less than 80. Most of the prosperous countries of the West and Japan (but not, of course, the United States) have population densities nearly ten times that figure. There are, however, large tracts of land, even in the developing countries, that are sparsely populated."⁷

Doctor George Carter remarks: "It does seem that there has been some misunderstanding of the nature and magnitude of the problem. We may profitably re-examine some of the ideas about the magnitude of the human population now on earth, trends in use of the earth, and the probable future in terms of resources."

"The population situation is often presented in such alarming fashion that people get the impression that we are on the verge of running out of standing room on the earth. A little arithmetic will demonstrate that this is a gross exaggeration. If we allow a space 2 feet by 2½ feet as ample for standing room, and take the world population as 3 billion, then we need 15 billion square feet in which to stand all of mankind. Figuring 5,280 feet per mile, 27,878,400 square feet per square mile and 750 square miles in Baltimore County, Maryland, one finds that there are 20,898,800,000 square feet in Baltimore County. This would hold all of mankind on a 4 billion level of world population. If one county in one of the smallest states in the United States could hold all of mankind, then the problem of mankind and space is put in a somewhat different perspective than that portrayed by those who would have us about to run out of standing room."⁷

Doctor Carter continues by pointing out "that more than standing room is necessary; there must be sufficient space for the production of the necessary foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials, and for housing and recreation, and so forth."⁷

DENSITY OF POPULATION

The current literature would give the impression that every country in the world is beset by a population crisis but the facts prove the contrary: Japan, by reason of its legalized abortion and network of contraceptive clinics, certainly has no population problem at the present time. In 1965, there were 1.8 million babies born, which represents a 6% increase over 1964 but the growth rate has stabilized at 1.04% a year between 1960 and 1964 as compared with 1.9% growth rate for the entire world.⁸ India has only half the density of population that Great Britain has. "In the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, populations are falling in the face of labor shortage, and no lack of space or raw materials. Poland's birth rate has fallen from 20 per thousand to 5 per thousand, Bulgaria's is 8.2, Czechoslovakia's is 7.3 and Romania's is 7.1 and East Germany has the fourth lowest in the world of 4.8. Hungary with the lowest has a forecast of a population decrease from 10 million to 7 million by the year 2000, just 35 years away.⁶

Castellino, an economist in India, stated: "The density of population in the so-called over-populated countries of Africa and Asia, is less than the average density in the whole world. Strangely, the highest density of population is shown by the most advanced region in the world, namely Central Europe. Again, contrary to general belief, the annual growth of population in countries, shamefully labeled as backward, is 2.3% in Asia and

2.4% in Africa against the world's average of 2.1%, and Central America's 2.9%. The latest trend in population statistics shows that India's growth has stabilized around 2.1%, that is, no bigger than the world's figure."⁹

Some areas of the world are underpopulated. Rev. Frederick McGuire, C.M., Director of the Mission Secretariat, Washington, D. C., quoting an official of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, reports that the big problem hampering development in Brazil is underpopulation.¹⁰ Rev. Jacques G. Denis, S.J., Professor of Social Geography at the University at Bujumbura, Burundi, Africa, in setting forth that Africa, south of the Sahara, suffers from underpopulation, declared: "Demographic pressure often is at the beginning of economic improvement. In Africa, one of the greatest obstacles to development is the lower population density. Wherever the population density is enough, you can move."¹¹

Father McCormack has pointed out:

Africa has a population density of less than 20 per square mile; Borneo, New Guinea and most of the lands of Indonesia have an *underpopulation* problem; and there are large areas of South America, apart from uninhabitable parts, that are virtually empty. Canada and Australia are largely empty lands, in spite of dense growth in some places. A country such as Colombia is more likely to be poor because of its small number of people (28 per square mile) than because of its high rate of natural increase; for it has not enough people to yield the taxes necessary for economic development. Its great poverty is certainly not due to the population explosion."¹²

Outer Mongolia wants a population explosion—and in a hurry. They are anxious because they have only a million people occupying an area over a quarter the size of their southern neighbor and former overlord, China. Mongolians do not want their fast-developing republic to appear a vacuum to China's 700 millions."¹³

In Israel, the planned parenthood organization is trying to promote larger families and cut down on the number of abortions. It is searching for the special causes of sterility in parents and is sponsoring laws to give financial aid to large families where parents are healthy. An important reason for this promotion of larger Jewish families is the disproportion in the birth rate between Israel's Arab and Jewish populations. The average birth rate among the Arabs is 49 per 1000 persons; among the Jews it is only 22.¹⁴

A recent editorial draws attention to the problems in Japan and Canada: "In Japan, where the birth rate has been reduced to one of the world's lowest, experts note that the present rate of slightly more than two children per married couple is scarcely adequate to sustain a stable population. That nation is already encountering a labor scarcity and a variety of sociological problems as a result of its dwindling birth rate. . . . This week, we note that our neighbor to the North, Canada, views a dip in its birth rate with growing alarm. Official estimates, published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, reveal that there is an annual population growth of less than two percent."¹⁴

Concerning the population problem, Castellino again avers: "*IF*—

and it is a big *IF*—the world is overpopulated, if there is surplus labor, if each new baby is a threat to the stability of the worker, how is it that all the world over, even in this so-called poor, famine-stricken overpopulated land of ours (i.e., India), so much urgency is attached to mechanization in the industrial and agricultural fields? *IF* there is a superabundance of workers, present and potential, how is it that wages everywhere continue to show an upward curve? *IF* there is excess of population, why is so much ingenuity devoted to labor-saving devices in trade and industry, why so much energy used in devising and introducing computers and calculators and electronic controls, why such worship of the whole scheme of automation as a science?"¹⁴

Referring to a restriction on production in Europe, Japan and the United States because of a chronic labor shortage, Castellino continues: "Labor in West Germany is pressing for automation of industry. Unwilling to work longer hours and realizing that imported labor, now 4.5% of the total work force and one million strong, cannot be continually increased, German workmen see in greater automation the only means for industry to fulfill its mounting orders and keep prosperity at its high level. . . . In West Germany there appears to be no hope of obtaining enough workers in this generation."¹⁵

Commenting on the importation of foreign labor, Castellino remarks: "Central Europe and Great Britain

are painfully dependent on colored labor. Witness the peculiar two-way traffic in technical and economic aid: India borrows millions of marks, pounds and dollars and imports hundreds of highly qualified and technical personnel, and yet — poor, starved, illiterate as we are supposed to be — we export semi-skilled labor in thousands to Great Britain and Canada, and in hundreds to France, Italy and Germany. Why this two-way traffic? Surely if planned parenthood is such a panacea for all our ills, why has Europe been reduced to this state of poverty? Today, the hewer of wood and the drawer of water, today the coolie who carries the white man's burden, is supplied by India and Africa; tomorrow, where will there be surplus labor? Doubtless, it will come from the Moon!"¹⁶

During a debate in the United Nations General Assembly Economic Committee, Sean O'Heideain, speaking for Ireland, said that there are "throughout the world vast, empty, underpopulated areas. If instead of devoting the limited resources of the United Nations general budget to technical assistance and development programs . . . we permit some of these resources, as well as time and attention, to be diverted to artificial birth control in the form of government sponsored campaigns of contraception, abortion or sterilization, then not only is the dignity of the human person degraded, but the economic progress of the area concerned is retarded."¹⁷

It is obvious from the above citations that many countries do not

suffer from a population explosion; in fact, many countries are stymied in their program for economic development precisely because of underpopulation.

POPULATION AND FOOD PRODUCTION

What about land and its cultivation? Castellino reports: "The land surface measures 131 million square kilometres, of which 77 million is good temperate farm land, even ignoring the Swedish and Finnish experiments which have shown that another 14 million square kilometres in Alaska, Canada and Soviet Russia, hitherto regarded as unsuitable for agricultural cultivation, can be made to yield good satisfactory harvests. The significance of this figure, according to a noted authority, is that it can support, at the level of the Dutch who are probably the healthiest and best-fed among peoples, a world population of 28 billion, nearly nine times the size of today's numbers. And the noted economist goes on to say that if we care to contemplate a predominantly cereal diet, and we calculate on Japanese standards of production and consumption, the agricultural resources of the world can support a population of 92 billion. Today we are only 3 billion!"¹⁸

Carter has remarked that there has been throughout the world a universal trend of moving from the farm or rural area into the urban centers. This is evident in the United States, Australia, Brazil, Europe, India and elsewhere, and is accounted for, in part, by a mechanization of farming with a result-

ing reduction of the number of men needed for farm labor. This move is not brought about by a reduction of acreage. This shift in population is constantly opening up more and more open space.¹⁹

It is important not merely to study the availability of land and space but also to consider how much productive land there is to supply mankind with his needs regardless of where he lives. Carter indicates that while 50% of the land surface may be unfit for agriculture, we are currently using only about 10% and the evident fact is that we are not using more and more of this potentially useful land but less and less of it.²⁰

With the mechanization of agriculture, there is also a "biological and chemical revolution" which accounts "for better crops, of higher yield, more disease resistant and better suited for mechanical handling. . . . The consequences of these revolutions are that we can produce more and more on less and less ground. . . . The increases now underway in the United States and the other advanced nations will expectably spread to the other nations as their educational and governmental growths allow them to utilize the know-how already available. . . . One estimate states that with modern usages 25 square yards of land could provide all of a man's needs."²¹

In considering and attempting to evaluate the knowledge explosion and scientific advances and how these will affect the future, Carter

says: "At the end of the Civil War, who could have predicted the automobile, the miracle drugs, the airplane, radio and television, rocketry reaching out into space, computers that solve in seconds problems that men would require months to work through — or a population many times as great as the United States supported at that time, mostly by living on a scale of well being that only a tiny minority of the most wealthy could then hope to attain. . . . We, the descendants of the first farmers, live in vast wealth and comfort by the millions, in the lands where a few thousand simple hunting and gathering ancestors of ours lived in privation."²²

Carter declares that the reports of shortage of minerals "seems to have been overstated. Perhaps I am allergic to such statements because thirty years ago, I was solemnly taught that within a decade we would run out of petroleum. Instead, thirty years later, we are in a world wide glut with major new fields still being found. Meanwhile, atomic energy looms on the energy horizon and threatens to make obsolete the whole coal and oil industry. . . . It is not wise of us to cry 'shortage' when there is no shortage."²³

From the positive point of view, we are told that iron, which is used and re-used, is in plentiful quantities in the earth's crust; aluminum and magnesium are available in unlimited supply; plastics are replacing metals; the ability to substitute one basic resource for another is virtually unlimited; as for the fer-

tilizer minerals—calcium, as derived from limestone, is plentiful; nitrogen is available in the air and technology can extract it; potash is readily available and phosphorous is found in limited supplies; as for raw materials, there is ample and much to spare, if present supplies are used with a minimum of care; with desalinization of sea water to be made possible by the projected atomic plant in San Diego, at a cost under the national price for fresh water, there will be ample supplies of water.²⁴

Carter concludes by saying: "These are not then population problems. We have adequate space for living and for recreation. We have adequate materials for supplying the present, and almost any foreseeable, human population. . . . Further, as long as the present trend toward concentrating mankind in great urban centers continues, we will have more and more open space, not less and less. Beyond that, the land is capable of producing feed for vastly greater numbers of people than we now have. The mineral resources of the earth when viewed as largely reusable and as highly substitutable, must be considered to be virtually inexhaustible. The mineral fuels which are exhaustible will be substituted for by atomic energy. . . . In any overall view of the population problem of the world, we should not be stampeded by alarmists who insist that we are about to run out of space or of resources, or even of wilderness areas for recreation for those who wish to retire from the urban concentrations that characterize our day. The earth and

its resources are ample for any realistically foreseeable future population."²⁴

PROBLEMS OF POVERTY

Despite the above, we do have in the world pockets of poverty, deprived areas, underprivileged peoples and large numbers of our population who are poorly nourished and hungry and many who are close to starvation. In these regions, the medical care, personal hygiene, educational opportunities, professional and business advantages are far below the standard enjoyed by a great number of the citizens of the world.

The perplexing question is "Why?" Is it because we have too many peoples in the world or is it because we have too many peoples in relation to the ability of the world to provide adequately for these peoples? If one listens to the propagandists, one would tend to think that the sole cause of all the ills and problems in the world is large numbers of peoples and overpopulation. This is why the propaganda campaign is constantly striving to sell the world on birth control, birth prevention, contraception and abortion.

However, the problem is not as simple as the propagandists present it and the solution is not easy. It is true that, while the birth rate may be stabilized or even decreased, there are more persons living simply because the death rate has been decreased and more people are living longer. Also there are more people marrying and having children, even though the families are smaller. Previously, in underdeveloped na-

tions and areas, only a small number of children lived to or beyond the fifth year. Now, with improved medical care more of the children are living beyond adolescence and into adult life. This also means that there are more persons alive to marry and bring their children into the world.

Numbers of people and our large population do not cause the poverty, hunger and starvation that we find in underprivileged areas. It is a fallacy and an error to say that, if there were fewer people to eat the food, to impose on the medical facilities, to seek employment opportunities and to look for the advantages of a higher education, the pockets of poverty would disappear from the world and the incidence of hunger and starvation would only be a memory. And yet that is the message of the present-day propagandist. Let there be a full-scale curbing of the population by any and all means — contraception, sterilization and abortion.

It is obvious that, if the numbers of children to be born or the numbers of people who are alive, are not the cause of the poverty and the hunger, then the population can be diminished constantly and permanently without any appreciable effect upon the economic status of the people who are allowed to be born and are permitted to live.

If the cause of poverty is strictly and solely economic — underdevelopment, poor distribution, shortage of skilled labor, inefficiency, lack of technological up-dating, etc. — then only a change in the eco-

nomic approach can solve the hunger and starvation of the people of the world. The economic system must be strengthened and this is where the emphasis should be placed and where the thrust must be directed.

Let us see what the professionals and the specialists say!

In addition to hunger, the term "underdevelopment" means many things to Father McCormack. "The misery and degradation of acute poverty include many more human problems. Among the most pressing of these are lack of medical services, of basic education, and of adequate housing and clothing. People's inability to practice the simple rules of hygiene is another. Again, there are industrial underdevelopment, lack of employment or concealed unemployment, and lack of the capital and savings to allow a breakthrough of the vicious circle of poverty breeding poverty. Finally, lack of opportunities for improvement and even absence of the desire to improve, caused by decades of malnutrition and disease, complete the picture."²⁵

But this type of poverty is not new. Father McCormack states: "Such poverty has always existed; indeed, in the past it has been worse than it is now. It has not been caused, as some imply, by this century's population explosion, nor will it be cured even by the most effective birth control campaigns. What is new, as Mr. Nehru has said, is not poverty and misery. The new thing is that people are now aware of their plight, and of the affluence of others, and are determined to correct the situation."²⁶

Referring to the availability of land and the density of the population, Father McCormack declares: "A country such as Colombia is more likely to be poor because of its small number of people. Its great poverty is certainly not due to the population explosion. It is important to realize that numbers are neutral. We are facing a situation of world poverty, *complicated* but not *caused* by population pressures. For poverty has certain definite causes. These are: backward agriculture, low economic productivity, instability of primary commodity prices in the world market, unstable political conditions, political corruption, social and religious customs (such as protect, for example, the 175 million sacred cows in India, which, in a country desperately short of protein, can cause havoc to farms but cannot be eaten) and finally the apathy and fatalism that kill even the desire to emerge from a miserable plight. These are the causes of poverty that need to be tackled everywhere in the poorer half of the world."²⁷

Since the causes of poverty have been set forth — and overpopulation is not one of them — it would seem that the only sane, wise, prudent and intelligent way to reverse the poverty is to embark on a very positive, dynamic, specific, long-range and far-sighted economic program that will simultaneously attack each of the many causes of poverty and bring about a type of life that is decent and filled with the advantages and opportunities that each citizen of the world has a right to enjoy.

Commenting on the world-wide campaign to control births, Father McCormack indicates very clearly that a birth control program is not feasible and will not succeed in under-privileged countries and, birth control being essentially negative in character, will accomplish nothing in terms of economic improvement and in the relief of poverty, hunger and starvation: "A little reflection would show that a drastic reduction in fertility, as a solution for poverty, is an unsophisticated reading of the situation. There is as yet no evidence that a less developed country can make a rapid success — indeed any kind of success — of a birth control program. (India provides an example: in the three Five Year Plans, which began in 1951, and are due to end in 1966, \$64 million were allotted to family planning. Yet between 1953 and 1957, the annual rate of increase was 1.3 per cent, or just over 5 million; in 1959, it was 1.7 per cent, or 8 million per year; in March 1961 it was 2.2 per cent, or 10 million)."²⁸

Again, Father McCormack emphasizes that if one wishes to eradicate poverty, then the causes of poverty must be directly attacked and since overpopulation is not one of the causes of the poverty, emphasis on population curbing solely and exclusively to the complete neglect of offering solutions to the real causes of the hunger and starvation will effect nothing as regards more opportunity and advantages and will produce no beneficial results. He continues: "And we must

always remember that birth control is a negative thing. It does not do anything; it does not create anything; it does not solve anything of itself."²⁹

Father McCormack answers the constantly recurring charge that excessive population increase nullifies any economic progress that is made: "Eugene Black went on record with a statement supporting this view. As former Director of the World Bank he should surely know that this is only one of the factors, and not the most important. India is often quoted as a country where this kind of huge increase of population swallows up all efforts to advance economically. But one of the reasons for the failure of the second Five Year Plan of India to reach its targets was the fact that the world depression of 1957-1958 caused a loss to India of \$2 billion—the total amount of all the World Bank loans to India over six years at 6 per cent—due to the drop in the prices of India's products on world markets. P. T. Bauer, professor of underdevelopment in London University, has shown that there were many other causes unconnected with population growth for India's failure to advance as quickly as she might have done. And in spite of the population growth, India is feeding her people better than she did ten years ago."³⁰

Father McCormack refers to many economists and declares: "Most leading demographers in England and the United States who have had economic training admit that no birth control campaign will have much effect on world poverty

in the next ten or fifteen years. Prof. D. V. Glass, one of England's leading demographers, who believes strongly in birth control, said at the British Association meeting in England in 1960: 'A very realistic program for international action in the field of development would need to allow for the continued increase of world population for a sizable period at the rate of 1.7 per cent or higher.' On the other hand, most economists and scientists say that the problem of world hunger and world poverty, even allowing for the foreseeable population increase, is a *manageable* problem, indeed that poverty could be wiped off the face of the earth in this century, provided there is increased effort. Paul Hoffman, director of the U.N. Special Fund and architect of the Marshall Plan, says in his book *World Without Want*: 'It will obviously take a long time for any serious impact to be made on the problem of excessively high rates of population increase. This makes all the more urgent the job of accelerating economic growth and social advancement in the underdeveloped world.'³¹

Father McCormack concludes this particular section of his article by setting his remarks in proper focus and perspective: "What I have written here does not mean that I favor ignoring the grave population situation, but merely that I believe we should avoid confusing issues by giving it an overriding importance that at present it does not have."³²

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

In considering the very important relationship between food and popu-

lation, Castellino, states: "In the intellectual vacuum in which the politician operates, there is ample opportunity for sowing the seed of suspicion, for confusing the issue, and ultimately for sabotaging principle, for the sake of expediency. 'Hungry, are you?' Homeless? And poor too? Then — here is an easy and simple remedy. The prior question as to why you are hungry, landless and poor is dismissed as irrelevant; a solution is found for the symptoms, not the disease!"³³

He states that only one-third of the world's cultivable land is used today, fully and effectively, for the growth of food and that immense areas of the world lie uncultivated. He points to the situation in the United States where the "government has been compelled to enact legislation that guarantees both a fair price to the farmer as well as the purchase of unsold stocks of wheat" and to the problem the Common Market finds itself in because of DeGaulle's insistence on a minimum price for the agricultural products of France by reason of large harvests and superabundant crops.³⁴

Referring to his own land of India, which is supposed to be facing starvation, "there was a report that the Madras government has had to guarantee a minimum price for paddy. And 'support prices' have been promised for rice by the Maharashtra Government. This is nothing new: during the past decade there has been a steady diversion in agricultural activity from

food crops to cash crops, proof again that there is no shortage of food!"³⁵

He continues by saying that there are five surplus states in India "which refuse to release their excess stocks, because the prices offered by the deficit-states are unremunerative. In the face of such evidence, how can anyone in his senses raise the bogey of famine? If anything, the world suffers not from want but from plenty! There is no scarcity, only a scare! To complete the picture, India annually produces 80 million tons of food grains; and when the harvests are poor, imports account for another 3 to 4 million. Hence the justification for the Government's argument that the food shortage is only temporary and marginal. In other words, if there be a crisis, it is entirely man-made! It is not a case of under-production; it is a case of uneven distribution."³⁶

It would appear that this is the problem — not overpopulation or underproduction — but uneven distribution and the solution for improper methods of distribution is to be found within the science of economics not in the curbing of births or world-wide campaigns to control births by contraception, sterilization or abortion!

Castellino is an Indian, on the scene, knowing the country, its peoples and its problems, evaluating the current situation; he is not an outsider who, from brief contact with the country or only with an acquaintance of the literature, tries to analyze and solve problems with which he is not too familiar. He

insists that the above are "unchallengeable facts, not political speculations, not economic fantasies, not statistical absurdities."³⁷ He declares: "there is an unfortunate tendency, in most discussions of the economics of food-production and population growth, to ignore a very important fact, demonstrated at every stage of our history on earth, that the increase in education, the hope of a brighter future, and the impact of better living, have always tended to reduce the birth-rate. . . . Equally inexplicable is the ostrich-like attitude of the prophets of doom who forget the lesson of history that every pressure of population has acted as a spur to economic progress. . . . This is amply supported by the well-known phenomenon of a tremendous upsurge of productivity, which is increasing at a rate sufficient to double our output in 30 years."³⁸

Castellino refers to remarks made by Colin Clark, the Director of the Agricultural Research Institute at Oxford: "It is clear, from all this, that our duty towards our descendants both immediate and remote, is NOT to devise means of effectively preventing their existence. . . ."³⁹

While admitting that in India there are surplus states and deficit states, Castellino concludes: "But famine, as a world-phenomenon, is only existent in the minds of family planners, sterilization advocates and abortionists! . . . The bogey of famine and overpopulation is being raised to the degradation of the highest values of life and to the eternal shame of man. . . ."⁴⁰

Castellino, considering the impact of population restriction on a country refers to "Marshall's pathetic plea on France's shameful capitulation to Germany. With tears in his voice, he cried 'too few sons, too few arms.' That was 1940. In 1954, at the World Population Conference, Prof. Sauvy, the leader of the French delegation, made a quite unanswerable statement when he said that if population-restriction were the key to economic progress, France by now, after a century and a half of it, should have become one of the richest countries in the world! It is one of the poorest in Europe!"⁴¹

In conclusion, Castellino makes a comparison of standards between the present and the ancient past. "At the flowering of Hellenic culture, Socrates was condemned to death and forced to drink the hemlock because he was held guilty of corrupting youth. Today, high honors are bestowed on people who preach that morality does not enter into business and politics, that the end justifies the means, that the greatest good is the sabotage of the womb!"⁴²

CONTROL OF BIRTHS

Father McCormack has viewed the exaggerated emphasis on "over-population" and the world-wide campaign for birth control in these words: "The population explosion has loomed so large in studies of world poverty that in some quarters it has been stressed as the main cause of low standards of living. Birth control on a world-wide scale and with immoral means has been

proposed as the only real remedy. It has been pictured as a veritable panacea, all other remedies being regarded as mere palliatives."⁴³

In view of the above, it would be the height of folly, it would be unwise and short-sighted to try to cure the economic ills of the world merely by a crash program of curbing the population. Particularly would this be true when one considers that it was the following of a short-sighted program in the past that caused much of the population problem that presently exists. The easy, ready-made, right-at-hand solution is not always the best or the wisest, the most effective or the most beneficial. In this regard, Carter says:

We have erred tragically in going into these areas (i.e. underdeveloped areas) with medical programs that upset the population balance by lowering the death rate and thus set off rapid growth without simultaneously initiating a comparable economic and political growth. Partly, of course, this reflects the fact that it is much easier to spray an area with DDT and rid it of mosquitoes and hence malaria than it is to simultaneously infect the whole population with the drive to produce in the manner that characterized nineteenth Century America or 20th Century Japan, or West Germany. Hence, in many areas of the earth, we created an immense problem due to the imbalance that we caused with our well meaning, but short sighted programs.

Now, crash programs are proposed to change all of this. We are to rush in and stop these destructive population growths. I wonder if this is at all wise? Perhaps we will be throwing these nations into a labor shortage in the immediate future? The eastern Europeans seem to be committing auto-genocide. Theoretically, they will reverse this trend, but as Ireland

shows this need not be true. What happens to nations with stable or declining population? Has anyone refuted Colin Clark's data that seems to show that stagnation and decline in population accompanies stagnation and decline in intellectual and economic growth? Would it be a favor to the nations with expanding populations to let this growth provide the driving force to compel them to develop themselves?⁴⁴

In November, 1966, the eleventh International Congress of Catholic Doctors was held at Manila. One hundred and fifty delegates represented twenty-six countries. The delegates resolved that the solution to world-wide population problems "should be sought fundamentally in education and in the application of social justice and an equitable distribution of wealth in all spheres, aided by other efforts in the medical, psychological, cultural and other fields."⁴⁵

The congress condemned abortion as a direct attack on human life.

President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines told the delegates that his country has one of the highest birth rates in the world and that his government has to care for 300,000 laborers and 500,000 school children each year. He clearly stated that his country will continue to stress agricultural production as the basis of its industrial development to feed its population. The President concluded his remarks by saying: "The government and people of the Philippines consider the utilization of artificial prevention or contraceptives as unacceptable and they will meet the problem of population not by reducing the number of births

but by increasing the food of the people."⁴⁶

On a world-wide basis, it has been established that there is no problem of overpopulation, that there is plenty of acreage left on the earth not merely to hold the present population but also to accommodate a vast increase of population, that there are unlimited minerals and energy to care for the needs of all persons to be born, that advanced knowledge, techniques and mechanization of agriculture can produce ample supplies for an increased number of peoples. Because this is so, the world-wide campaign to solve the economic ills of the world merely by birth control and curbing of population, to be achieved by contraception, sterilization and abortion, must be considered to be imprudent, unwise, unimaginative, short-sighted and irresponsible.

In this connection, we can contrast the hysteria of Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, with the faith of Pope Paul VI, the Universal Father of mankind. Margaret Mead asserts: "We must recognize that the time to limit the size of our families is *now*, that the living must take precedence over the unborn *now*, if future generations are to be born into a livable world."⁴⁷

In his Christmas message of 1963, Pope Paul VI stated: "One who studies this unforgettable and threatening problem (i.e. poverty) is sometimes tempted to have recourse to remedies which must be regarded as worse than the problem itself, if they consist in attacking

the very fecundity of life. . . means which human and Christian ethics must condemn as illicit."

"Instead of increasing the supply of bread on the dining table of this hunger-ridden world as modern techniques of production can do today, some are thinking in terms of diminishing, by illicit means, the number of those who eat with them." This is unworthy of civilization. It cannot be admitted that the solution to this problem consists in the use of methods contrary to divine law and to the sacred respect that is due both to marriage and to new-born life."⁴⁸

What we have said in general about the world situation is true also of the United States, which is our prime focal interest.

GENERAL SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Briefly, there is more than ample free space in the United States for the present population and for any foreseeable future increase. With the move into the cities and urban communities, much free land remains. Carter mentions in particular the Appalachian region, upper New England and the Northern Plains. He also indicates that many areas, previously considered not conducive to habitation, should not be overlooked or neglected, e.g., deserts can be attractive, as witness Palm Springs' success; mountains can be inhabited as the Swiss testify and are very desirable as Aspen, Colorado, demonstrates.⁴⁹

Our ability to provide agricultural products in great abundance is not a matter of speculation but is a

proven fact. Because of great advances in knowledge, techniques and mechanization, smaller and smaller tracts of land are producing greater and greater yields. Everyone is aware that for several decades it has been the policy of the United States Government to restrict the amount of acreage that is to be developed and to buy the surplus stocks from the farmer so that the lowered prices, that would prevail if there were the normal interaction of supply and demand would not result to the detriment of the farm income. Government subsidy is necessary because of the superabundance of our agricultural output. However, as in India, we have deficit areas in our country and some of our populace have poor nutritional habits and hunger — not because of under-production but because of an imbalance in distribution.

Our mineral supplies are more than ample and our reliance on solar and atomic energy gives us unlimited possibilities for economic growth and expansion through industrialization.

As to population and numbers of people, Doctor Diamond places the situation in proper perspective: "We are not an under-industrialized economy. We are not an overpopulated country. We have added fifty million people to our population since 1945, a 25 per cent increase. During the same period, we have added \$400 billion to our gross national product, our per capita income has doubled and our unem-

ployment has dropped to below 5 per cent. We have two billion acres of land in the United States, and only 6 per cent of it is used for residential purposes."⁵⁰

In considering the relationship between poverty and population, Father Gibbons relates that: "Poverty is not the unique result of either population size or rates of growth. The United States, during much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as the consequence of immigration, grew at a rate of 3 to 3½ per cent a year and, meanwhile, expanded the economy and raised the levels of living."⁵¹

BIRTH RATE AND POPULATION GROWTH IN AMERICA

What is the present population picture in the United States? In the City of Boston, Massachusetts, while there was an increase in marriages in 1965, there was a decline in births as compared with the immediately preceding years. In 1963, there were 23,331 births; in 1964, there were 22,960 and in 1965, there were 21,482. This same reduction in births is reflected in other regions throughout the country: Chicago is off 16,000 births per year since 1961; St. Louis has dropped 4,000 births per year during the same period; San Diego, which is one of the fastest growing and developing areas, has 2,000 less births per year.⁵² The number of births recorded for Pennsylvania in 1965 was the lowest for twenty years.⁵³ On a national basis, there were 4 million births in the United States in 1964 and this represented the

third consecutive annual decrease and was the smallest number of births in the country since 1955. The birth rate for this particular year was 21.2 per 1000 population and this rate has declined continuously since 1957.⁵⁴

In 1965, while the number of marriages was the highest since 1948, the number of births dropped to 3,767,000, which was the lowest number since 1951 and this was the first year since 1953 that the number of births dropped below 4 million. The birth rate in 1965 was 19.4 per 1000 population, which is the lowest recorded since 1938.⁵⁵

In December, 1966, Donald J. Bogue, Director of the University of Chicago's Community and Family Center, addressing a family planning conference in Chicago, which was organized by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, stated: "The population explosion is now part of our recent past." He indicated that the birth rate per thousand in 1910 was 30.1 per cent and this steadily declined during the 1920's and 1930's until it reached 18.3 per cent in 1933 at the very depth of the depression. In 1946, the year of the baby boom, the rates rose rapidly from 20.4 per cent to 25.5 per cent. In 1966, twenty years later, the rate was 18.5 per cent or just a little above the lowest birth rate we have had in the last 56 years. Mr. Bogue remarked that the average family consisted of two or three children; that families with five children are becoming less and less common and that a family of seven or eight children is a rarity.⁵⁶

A ten per cent drop in the birth rate was expected because there is a whole generation of people still fertile but most are in the later years of their reproductive lives. It has been determined, however, that the decrease is actually twenty per cent and this tremendous decline came as a distinct shock to demographers.⁵⁷ This is a perfect example of how inaccurate are even the most scholarly and pains-taking speculations, prophecies and predictions.

Doctor Norman B. Ryder of the University of Wisconsin, and Doctor Charles F. Westoff of Princeton University, have voiced concern over the fact that since 1957 the birth rate of the United States has fallen by more than twenty per cent.⁵⁸

Doctor Roger Revelle recently declared: "In the United States, the problem over the next 50 years is not one of limiting numbers, but of preparing for them. 'It looks to me that the country could support and provide a good life for any number of people we will have over the next 50 years. However, in order to do this, we have to be prepared to pay the costs, and the costs are to make a major effort to reduce air pollution, to provide outdoor recreational areas, to provide decent urban transportation and to eliminate slums in the cities.'"⁵⁹

In short, what is needed in these United States is an imaginative, positive, dynamic program, that will create — not an easy, sterile, destructive program, that kills.

Doctor Revelle also stated with reference to population control: "I don't think abortion is a very satis-

factory means of birth control, but it's something we need as a back-up."⁶⁰ What an admission of defeat and what a surrender to expediency!

At the White House Conference on Health, held in November, 1965, Frank Notestein, President of the Population Council in New York, and Theodore H. Schultz, Chairman of the Economics Department at the University of Chicago, likened reproduction rates among the poor of the United States to those in the Far East and conceded that the United States does not in fact face a "crisis in growth" and that this country has the resources to deal with foreseeable population increases.⁶¹

This is certainly very clear, definite and specific testimony by the demographers and the experts that we do *not* face any population problem or crisis in these United States. Thus, the term "Population Explosion" as signifying and implying a growth that our country cannot accommodate is an empty catch-phrase, a myth, a false rumor, a scare tactic, an alarmist slogan.

The United States would be well advised not to tamper with its population level lest it might experience the same difficulties and problems as other nations which have embarked on crash population control plans. At the present time, the number of unemployed in this country is the lowest in our recent history. With the number of births and the birth rate at an all-time low and with the annual growth below that of the world, a definite

labor shortage could result if a plan to restrict population were to be advanced and if an economic expansion were to be initiated. Also, with a serious limitation on births, the United States could easily face, as did France, a situation where it could not defend itself against outside aggression. Some hostile nations are purposely increasing their population and, if it were known that the United States were intentionally planning a decrease in its number of citizens, we would be a prime target for attack.

The greatness of this country was not achieved by accident but rather by dint of hard work and much sacrifice. Our forefathers had tremendous foresight, firmly-rooted faith and prided themselves in not being afraid of a challenge. Our President re-echoed this thought recently when he said that a country ceases to be a country when it ceases to create heroes. We are at the cross-roads of modern civilization; we can choose to go in either direction. We can elect the easier path and choose to bring our population into harmony with our economic structure by limiting the size and growth of our population through the use of contraception, sterilization or abortion. On the other hand, we can choose the more difficult, the more challenging, the more far-sighted and the more intelligent path and elect to develop and expand our economic structure so that it will accommodate the needs of as many people as God wishes to bless our nation with and as many as our citizens wish to bring into this world. In this way,

we will accept the challenge of Pope Paul VI—not to decrease the guests we invite to our table but to increase the food with which to feed them.

POPULATION CONTROL AND LABOR SHORTAGE

A concerted national program to reduce births and to limit population could have a serious, deleterious effect upon this country's economy by creating a serious labor shortage, which would make it impossible to expand the economy further.

In November, 1966, the Employment Service for the State of Massachusetts reported that, for the previous month, total employment was at an all-time high and that unemployment for this period, at 3½ per cent, was lower than any period since September, 1957. Action for Boston Community Development revealed that 20,000 positions of all types and in all income brackets were vacant because no one applied. The Industrial Affairs Committee of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce announced that, of 27 companies interviewed, 25 companies have a severe labor shortage and, as a result, the Chamber will sponsor a Job Conference for the first time in its history in order to gain recruits for industry from the local high schools and colleges.⁶²

On the national scene, the Labor Department in Washington announced "that more Americans held jobs in November, 1966, than in any November in history. Total employment climbed to 75 million

while the nation's jobless rate edged back to a 13-year low of 2.7 per cent. Assistant Commissioner Harold Goldstein, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics said that the November (i.e., 1966) job figures indicated renewed pressures on the nation's tight labor supply. Labor shortages cause some economists to worry about increased inflationary pressures because they tend to bid up wages, and thus prices. Goldstein added there were solid job vacancies in virtually every area of industry except construction."⁶³ This problem of a serious labor shortage is widespread and is evident in the larger cities and industrial centers throughout the United States.

Build constructively! Expand and develop a dynamic economy that will allow this great nation to grow in proportion to its needs and to retain its primatial place among the nations of the world. Following a negative, destructive program of curbing, controlling, limiting and killing can only lead us to greater compromise of principles, further restriction of inalienable rights and increased moral decay and softness.

MORAL IMPLICATIONS IN POPULATION CONTROL

Doctor Ratner has some poignant observations to make concerning the population situation:

Those who can best afford to have children, to nurture, nourish and educate them according to modern standards, continue to have the least, while the economically deprived have the most. The fact must be faced as to why the higher economic group is most receptive personally to the theme "population explosion." One should be curious about the complex motivation that makes this group passionately

organize to impose their norms on those less favored materially.

We live in a period of world crisis with the outcome of civilization as we know it at stake. We are bearers of the western civilization with its tradition of freedom, democracy and Judaeo-Christianity. We believe these values to have universal application to mankind. We have been blessed with riches. If our vocation is to share this tradition with the rest of the world through the exchange of students, scientists, and teachers through the Peace Corps, through religious missions, do we not have a special obligation to maintain our numbers proportionately, so as to maintain these traditions in a hostile world through the production of our greatest wealth and through the export of our most spiritual resources?

Starvation in many countries has always been with us independent of numbers. Population reduction *per se* cannot solve this problem. Countries that are now facing starvation with a larger population faced starvation with a smaller population. If we exported food technology and surpluses with the energy with which we have exported public health and drugs we would make a direct contribution to the immediate problem of starvation. This, in contrast to the reduction of population through birth reduction, would be doing something for the living and set the pattern for the future.

Surely the whole question of ends and purposes, motivation and intention, and values, is involved in the determination of the circumstances, which make it wise or unwise to effect birth reduction in individual families or groups of families. The history of mankind records how frequently we suffer when we pit our dated knowledge and thinking against nature's tried and tested wisdom or against God's providential order. When we have deviated from nature's norms, we have experienced nature's capacity to strike back.⁶⁴

Doctor Eugene F. Diamond has pointed to the moral deterioration that has resulted from abandoning the norms of true Christian virtue

and from surrendering to the demands of expediency: "We have seen a breakdown in our value systems. We have seen a devaluation of the child, and an overvaluation of his education. We have lost the sense of the child as a reward for sex, in favor of the view of the child as a penalty for sex. We are anxious about the population explosion but unconcerned about the copulation explosion at all levels of immaturity. In short, we have a crucial moral dilemma."⁶⁵

Father Gibbons was asked what would be the effects and results were the United States to encourage a country to initiate a large-scale campaign of birth control by artificial means, and he replied: "First, limiting the births will not necessarily even level off population, let alone reduce it. It will merely slow up the rates of increase. Then, on the political level, the United States should not in any aggressive fashion be telling anyone what to do in their sovereign nation. It's up to the people themselves to work out programs in line with their own interests and their own conscientious convictions, and that is the first principle we should bear in mind. Also, an attempt on the part of the United States, or any group therein, to impose particular methods against the conscientious convictions of people could be very demoralizing indeed, and might well result in worse social conditions than existed previously, even though the number of children born might be fewer."⁶⁶

Considering the position of those who advocate abortion and contra-

ception as the best and only remedies for our urgent pressing problem of poverty, Bishop Thomas J. Riley, Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, Massachusetts, has stated:

It is evident that there are long-range solutions of problems which are of immediate urgency. It is true at the same time that the remedy looked for in the spread of contraceptive practices is apparent and deceptive, not real and naturally sound. However serious the immediate effects of overpopulation, it is not a constructive approach to the problem to advocate immediate remedies which are bound to be disastrous over a long period of time. It is not easy to persuade people that long-range remedies for immediately pressing social problems will be more effective than remedies which attack the problem in its immediate manifestations. History shows, however, that remedies which have been most effective in dealing with social problems are those which have attacked the problems at their roots. . . . Those who control the destinies of nations are morally bound to serve the best interests of their fellow human beings. It is morally wrong, as well as sociologically short-sighted, to meet the problems of overpopulation today by means that are bound to lead to evil in the future. Politicians easily fall into the practice of treating symptoms of social disease. It is the quality of true statesmen, however, to look for the diseases themselves, and to discover remedies for them in the laws of human nature established by Him who created man before all ages of recorded human history.⁶⁷

SUMMARY

In summary, the evidence clearly establishes that there is no population crisis and certainly no real "explosion" either in the world in general or in the United States in particular. There is ample land to accommodate all of the people and to provide adequately for conservation and agricultural development.

The earth's minerals are in sufficient supply for all the foreseeable needs. Solar and atomic energy are inexhaustible. There is no causal nexus between numbers of people and hunger, starvation and poverty. The answer to the economic ills of the world must be found in the science of economics itself. Population limitation not only will not solve these, but will, in fact, aggravate them and will make the necessary economic expansion and development difficult or impossible.

With the United States presently having less than four million births a year, with a birth rate of only 18.5% in 1966 and with an annual growth of less than 2%, it just cannot be said that this country has a population problem or crisis. An "explosion" just does not exist! Attempts to "manufacture" a crisis are dishonest and such attempts are being used for propaganda purposes in order to sell contraception on a large scale and to present abortion as a remedy for contraceptive failures.

REFERENCES

1. What about the Population Explosion? What About Pennsylvania's Family Planning Program?, Ad Hoc Committee on Family Planning and Public Assistance in Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, June 29, 1966.
2. Marriage and Overpopulation, *The Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 2, May 1962.
3. *Boston Globe*, October 6, 1964.
4. Population Explosion, *America*, April 4, 1964.
5. The Hidden Crisis, *Look Magazine*, February 9, 1965.

6. The Birth Control Issue — What Both Sides Say, *United States News and World Report*, Dec. 21, 1959.
7. *Ibidem*.
8. *Boston Pilot*, Feb. 26, 1966.
9. An Economic Appraisal of Food and Population, *Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1, February 1966.
10. *Boston Pilot*, Dec. 4, 1965.
11. *Boston Pilot*, October 2, 1965.
12. *Boston Sunday Globe*, August 21, 1966.
13. NCWC News Report, *Boston Pilot*, July 23, 1966.
14. *Catholic News*, New York, August 11, 1966.
- 15, 16. *Ibidem*.
- 17, 18. NCWC News Report, *Boston Pilot*, Jan. 1, 1966.
- 19-24. Carter, *Ibidem*, ref. 6.
25. Population Explosion, *America*, April 4, 1964.
- 26-32. *Ibidem*.
33. Castellino, An Economic Appraisal of Food and Population, *Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1, February 1966.
- 34-42. *Ibidem*.
43. Population Explosion, *America*, April 4, 1964.
44. What About the Population Explosion?, *Ibidem*.
45. NCWC News Report, *Boston Pilot*, Nov. 19, 1966.
46. *Ibidem*.
47. The Hidden Crisis, *Look Magazine*, February 9, 1965.
48. *Ibidem*.
49. *Boston Globe*, Dec. 25, 1963.
50. Oral Progestins and the Catholic Physician, *Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 2, May 1966.
51. *Ibidem*, ref. 6.
52. *Boston Globe*, Jan. 1, 1966.
53. *Boston Traveler*, Feb. 3, 1966.
54. *Ibidem*, ref. 6 (Carter).
55. *Boston Globe*, July 7, 1965.
56. NCWC News Report, *Boston Pilot*, Jan. 15 and March 5, 1966.
57. *Boston Globe*, Dec. 16, 1966.
58. *Boston Traveler*, Feb. 3, 1966.
59. *Boston Globe*, Sept. 10, 1966.
60. *Boston Globe*, May 30, 1966.
61. NCWC News Report, *Boston Pilot*, Nov. 13, 1965.
62. *Boston Globe*, Nov. 24 and Dec. 16, 1966.
63. *Boston Globe*, Dec. 3, 1966.
- 64-65. Marriage and Overpopulation, *Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 2, May 1962.
66. *Ibidem*, ref. 6.
67. *Boston Pilot*, March 10, 1962.

Monsignor Harrington is Vice-Officialis for the Archdiocese of Boston.