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rse lagged $t$ humani. The per-
the world's most critical problen, the population explosion?"

The cold logic of Malthusian arithmetic is of course inescapable. The sheer mass of humanity cannot lons increase at its present rate of a doubling every 40 years. There will bs an inexorable halt to human increase within, at most, a few generations. We can hardly doubt that the quality of life and the odds of peaceful survival are deteriorating under the Impact of that increase lons before we reach the biolozical limit.

As everyone knows, West. ern science and medlcine have contributed to the problem: directly, by perfecting our techniques of preserving life and of remedying infertility, and indirectly, by underpianing the humanitarian outlook that cherishes the value of each individual life.

The tecinsology of contra.
sectiy sate, reliable, cheap and unobtrusive method has still to be developed. Neve:theless, the obstacles to population control can hardily be labeled as technological gaps. Nor could the ecclesiastical dogmas persist as long as they have without reinforcement from some even more primitive, irrational myths. (In any cas:, the crisis in Roman Catholic theology must now reach its own resolution regardless of outside comment.)

AS PROF. GARRETT HARDIN, in an article in Science magazins, and many before him have pointed out, man's heritage reinforces a will to multiply against a now obsolete set of odds of infant death. He goes on to compare the planet to a common pasture, and reviews the economics of a system where a common good is left to the greediest harvesters.
He suggest that voluntry
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$\underset{\text { File }}{\mathrm{O}}$ 0 social consume ma, mercly raise the gencral level of guilty anxiety among the well-intentioned ("Was it morally riont for us to have had those twins?") without achieving practically useful results. He would invoke lewful coercion to achieve the ends of the social consensus. In fact, the main aim of his dis. course is to attack the unlimited "right to breed" which now stands as a basic personal ire adom.
One has to question the merits of such a freedom in a crowded world. Nevertheless, I believe that Prof. Hardin has grossly underestimated the difficulty of actually policing explicit social controls on reproduc. tion without tampling on every other personal freedom.
I would not willingly abandon our cumbersome system of due process that protects the securtty of my person against arbitrary as.
ble minor inequities in the allotment of positive irisentives and rewaids that can achicve the same ends.

THIS MAY seein a fechle answer to the population problem in poor countries, but their basic problem is poverty. Overbreeding is no less a consequence of their poverty than a cause of it, and no amount of gloonsy exhortation or diplomatic pressure will get very far unless accompanied by answers to their desperate problems of economic development.

Knowing Prof. Hardin's background as a biologist, I expected him to insist that action be preceded by niore detailed knowledse of the motivational causes of overbreeding. In middle-class America, they may be intertwined with our dismal fail. ure to solve the problem. epitomized by the title of Simone de Beativoir's "The Second Sex." What other creative role in life do women play after they have dutifully produced exactly two child:en?
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## D. Hardin-

I understood your point about the philosophical necessities
of lawful coercion. But $I$ think you overlook the problems of due process when this takes the form of direct and punitive compulsion. And I am afraid many readers would misunderstood the breadth of your intended usage of "coercion". As for AID, I am quite concerned that the difficulties faced by underdevaloped countries in controlling population growth (as we must encourage them to do) will be used as an excuse to minimize our technological and economic support of their deyelopaent.

