

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION AND EDUCATION

ADDRESS TO THE BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY BUSINESS STUDENTS

MARRINER S. ECCLES

Financier, Business Executive and Author
Salt Lake City, Utah

March 27, 1962

Dean Taylor, members of the faculty, honored guests and students of the Brigham Young University. After that introduction it is possibly a good thing that I decided not to discuss "Monetary Policy and Inflation" since I might not be able to live up to my reputation. I decided on the change after I read an axiom set down by a sixteenth century Florentine Church Official's advice to grandchildren of four hundred years ago: "Do not fear making enemies and displeasing people to such a degree that you fail to fulfill your obligations. Doing your duty brings you reputation, and this more than compensates for the harm done by making a few enemies. In this world you must either be dead or occasionally do things that will offend people."

I have decided to speak on what to me is the most fundamental, the most basic, and the most far-reaching of related subjects: "The Population Explosion and Education." They are very closely related. I am speaking of education throughout the world; and in the United States, especially, I want to talk about the relation of federal aid to education today.

We should recognize that we are living in the most revolutionary period in all history. We are not only in the midst of a scientific revolution but a political, social, and economic revolution as well. We have not yet adjusted our thinking to the realities that exist in the world today. A sizable group of Americans, for example, seem to think that big government is our greatest menace. They like to quote Jefferson, who a century and a half ago said "that government is best which governs least." Enormous changes have taken place since the day of the ox carts. You only need to think for a moment of traffic signals, pure food and drug laws, water pollution, radio regulations, air travel, defense, (you can go down the line indefinitely) and you will readily realize that our survival, not only as individuals and as a state, but as a nation depends upon big government--not bigger than it needs to be I must admit, (and it may well be in certain particulars). But regardless of political party, government is likely to grow bigger.

I do not think that we are going to stop with government. We are beginning to see that we are giving up many things in our national

sovereignty to world organizations--the World Bank, the World Fund, the United Nations, NATO, and so forth.

I am going to talk about education and its relation to federal government. The responsibility for education should not stop at the state level. It is a governmental responsibility. We need to use the greater revenue-collecting ability of the federal government to spread the cost among citizens so that the burden will not fall heavily on any one in any locality. It is just as logical for the federal government to collect funds from the nation as a whole through the tax system and distribute them through the states as it is for the state to collect funds and distribute them to the cities and the counties and the towns.

We are told that the cost of paying for our public schools will double in the next ten years. This will be due partly to the rapid rise in the birth rate and possibly to the rise in cost. To meet the problem great amounts of money are needed. The states would have to greatly increase all of their taxes. For Utah, this especially would be a burden as our taxes for education are already among the highest, if not the highest, in the nation. The federal government is the only other source for us.

One reason for federal aid to education is to equalize its cost in relation to the student population and the wealth of the state, because per capita income is not evenly divided, and the job is a governmental responsibility. I will support this by some figures later. From its beginning government has given limited support, in one way or another, to education, with the budget for the year 1961 \$885,000,000. What is needed is not a new policy but a broader policy.

Federal support to education does not change our philosophy of public education. This philosophy should come from the thinking and actions of the people in the community--the school boards, the superintendents, the supervisors, the principals and teachers and the parents. Federal support to education does not change our national policy--the state and communities are primarily responsible. Federal support for education continues to extend more widely our national policy of sharing the financial burden of education among the resources of all of us, instead of stopping at the state line. In short, federal sharing of financial responsibility for education will help accomplish for the America of today what the founding fathers had in mind when they put into the Constitution these words: "The Congress shall have Power--To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

Now if education is not part of the "general welfare," then I do not know what is. Certainly we all recognize that health is part of federal responsibility. The Public Health Department of the federal government has taken a strong lead in the matter of health. The matter of highways

is a matter of governmental interest. You cannot look around you anywhere without seeing and gladly accepting federal aid and federal activity. We are very willing to have defense establishments placed in our community. We recognize the need of the government's position in the matter of defense. We do not hesitate to accept the FBI in cases of need or emergency. It is the statistics of the government we use to guide us in our economic course. The government is present everywhere.

A country, threatened as we are militarily and by intelligent competition of the Communist nations, must realize that its schools constitute its first line of defense. The tax situation in our country is such that our schools cannot be effective without the assistance of the federal government. Our nation is losing its position of world leadership due largely to the fact that we are not procuring teachers and skilled manpower in sufficient quantities. The government cannot allow this deterioration to continue. In my opinion, the most satisfactory and the safest way for the federal government to support education is by annual grants to the states on a per-pupil basis without strings. The trust, the integrity, the good judgment of the local and state school boards and administrators should be able to handle such funds. The state and the local government would then be free to use these funds for the highest priority needs of the schools in their judgment.

Compare the cost of education to the money spent by the military and on our space programs. Education is the very basis of our system, and not only what the state spends but what the federal government spends on education is a very small item compared to our defense and space programs.

The job of education can not be adequately done, however, until the population problem, in its stark reality, has been faced.

I should think that Utah would be in the front rank of those states which are in favor of federal aid to education for these reasons: Utah leads all states of the nation in ratio of public school enrollment of total population (Now this is public school, it does not take into account parochial schools.), 27.4 per cent, and the nation as a whole 20.8 per cent. Utah, in number of school-age children per 1,000 of working adults between the ages of 21 and 64, has 623; the nation as a whole, 479.

Personal income in Utah, divided by the school enrollment, is \$7,196; the United States as a whole, \$11,179. Now there is an impressive difference. In support of public education, Utah usually ranks first or second among the states in the percentage of personal income expended on public schools. It was first last year. Utah spends 5.45 per cent and the United States as a whole 3.69 per cent of the personal income for education. This is a vast difference. The 1961 public expenditures for schools was 6.27 per cent of personal income in Utah; in the United States as a whole, only 4.20 per cent.

I could go on indefinitely into figures and statistics but I just want to give you one more figure here. In the nation more than 33 per cent of all state and local government expenditures are for education, but in the state of Utah there is 49.9 per cent spent for education. In the state of Utah the public colleges have twenty thousand full-time students. Out of that number there are four thousand from out-of-state, whereas the number of Utahns out-of-state is seventeen hundred, so our state is getting the worst of it. A small part of the cost of support is tuition as you all know. It seems to me that in the case of Utah it should be self-evident that federal aid to education is a necessity and should be sought and not opposed.

I am not referring here to the parochial schools. I feel that parochial, as well as all private schools, should be neutral on this issue of federal aid to education because they have an independent source of income and have never depended on state or federal aid. They do not have a national responsibility for the education of the youth of the country as do the public schools, the state universities and the colleges. And I do not believe that private schools can be very objective. They either want some of the federal aid for themselves or they do not want it or they do not want others to get it.

It seems to me that this is a problem for the public schools, for the people that go to the public schools. It is a problem for them because they have the responsibility of raising the money. I know the arguments that the government will interfere, will dictate, and there will be a centralized curriculum. I believe the private schools are more subject to dictation than are the public schools. Fears that the federal government will dictate if they provide aid seem to me unfounded. For, after all, the lawmaking body consists of Senators and Congressmen from fifty states who are controlled by their constituencies. As far as I am concerned, I would have no objection certainly to federal aid to private schools of all kinds as long as we are getting the educational job done. That is the important thing--to get it done.

As I have said previously, our educational dilemma is not likely to be solved or adequately met until we have dealt with our population problems. In the year 1000 there were 275 million people in the world. Six hundred years later there were 486,000. In the year 1900, three hundred years later, there were 1,600 million. Sixty years after that, or last year at the end of 1960 (These are figures from the United Nations.) there were approximately 3 billion--almost doubled in sixty years. The estimate now is that by the year 2,000 the population of the world will be 6,280 million. That is only forty years from the time it was 3 billion.

Life expectancy has gone up, even in this country since 1850 from 40 years until as of today, life expectancy from birth is 70 years. So you can see what we have done by our scientific progress and advancement.

The dependency rate is growing and growing. In other words, we are growing younger and older at the same time. It is estimated that by 1970 for every 100 workers between the ages of 20 and 65, there will be 91 dependents, whereas, at the present time, it is about 75. With the increased growth in our population and increased longevity, you can see the problem with which we are confronted.

In connection with this population impasse which is so serious, I want to read a statement recently put out by thirty-eight Nobel scholars, together with a great many others. It is a statement of conviction:

Two-thirds of the world's population are now inadequately and under fed. Each day 140,000 people are added to the world's population, and each year 50 million more people are added. Mainly as a result of medical progress, man's life expectancy has been greatly prolonged and is certain to increase further. The spreading impact of technology, spurred on by population growth, is rapidly wasting wide areas of natural beauty and wiping out incalculable numbers of plants and animals that are of basic importance and interest to mankind.

In spite of the technological advances the earth cannot provide much longer enough food and materials for a population that is increasing more than geometrically. Unless a favorable balance of population and resources is achieved with a minimum of delay there is in prospect a dark age of human misery, famine, under education, unrest, which could generate growing panic, exploding into wars fought to appropriate the dwindling means of survival. We believe that widespread, effective, and voluntary use of medically sound and individually acceptable birth control is an essential factor in any human design to raise world living standards and to achieve international peace, as well as social and family stability. Therefore, we support with conviction and urgency the efforts within individual nations to control the birth rate; and we urge the United Nations, dedicated to the service of mankind, to take the lead in establishing and implementing a policy designed to limit population growth the world over, in order that human beings everywhere may grow on a qualitative and not on a quantitative level and in order that they may be assured of an opportunity to develop their highest capabilities and to enjoy individual freedom and the advantages of education, public health, privacy, and so forth.

Sir Julian Huxley made these remarks before an emergency population group, of which body I was a member;

Man's present duty is to hold in trust the resources of the earth and to assess what he will do with the future, how

he will achieve more enjoyment and less suffering, more knowledge and less ignorance. Instead [Sir Julian warned] man is in danger of becoming the cancer of the whole planet. Science cannot find a way of developing an underdeveloped country if it continues to produce more babies than it can feed.

In order to have development there must be capital and if the population continues to grow as it is, available capital will be diverted just to try to maintain the new citizens. The whole world needs a definite population policy.

Ambassador Chaglia, the Indian ambassador, recently made this statement:

My purpose in being here at this particular meeting is to arouse the conscience of the American public. I want to convince the public that over-population is an evil, and it has to be fought with the same zeal with which you fight maladies like malaria, cholera, and the plague. It is indeed ironic to build up military bases and enter into military alliances in defense of democracy, then you allow the barricades to be overrun by the advancing population.

Senator Fullbright, in holding hearings on the foreign aid program and interrogating the State Department (in a most embarrassing manner to the State Department) said, and these are excerpts from his statement:

Nearly all of those afflicted countries are in the worst shape economically. A large part of this has been brought about by your program because you are working on health conditions in these countries. You talk about health. Why do you not talk about population control? If you are going to continue policies which cause this population increase far out of proportion to the economic growth, it concerns me very much. This is fundamental to the success of the foreign aid program. I do not see why the government should be so reluctant about it.

The government is way behind the public. A poll in San Francisco recently on this question revealed there were 65 per cent who said yes to the question of whether the government should provide aid for birth control in foreign countries, 26 per cent said no, and 9 per cent had no opinion. So there is some progress being made.

Mr. Black, head of the World Bank, recently said:

Unless population growth is restrained, we will have to abandon in this generation our hope of economic progress in the

crowded and backward lands of the earth.

In reporting to the American people last year on his conversation with Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Black said:

A small group of disciplined Communists could exploit discontented misery in this country where the average income may be \$60 or \$70 a year and seize control, therefore, of an entire country without Communist troops ever crossing any international frontier. The hope of freedom in these areas in which we see so much poverty and illiteracy, so many families without homes, rests upon the people and their governments. Yet, all this does not mean that our nation and the rest of the free world can sit idly by. On the contrary, we have an historic opportunity to help these countries build their society until they are so strong that only an outside influence or invasion could topple them, and that threat we know we can stop.

All this is true, Mr. Kennedy, yet you have left unsaid something of utmost importance. In this struggle to preserve freedom there is a factor which works to frustrate the purpose of our foreign aid programs, minimizes the historic efforts being made by friendly governments and their citizens, and which if unchecked will turn these people over to the Communist enslavement--that unmentioned factor is the current population explosion.

Mr. Jimmy Reston (of the New York Times), in commenting upon the President's avoiding this issue (and the parochial education issue, in which he did not blame it on the Catholic Church who are responsible, but he blamed it on the Republicans), in connection with this particular population thing, I want to read you an excerpt from what he had to say:

The United States is now embarking on a large, new plan of economic aid to Latin America. But here again, the whole policy is placed in jeopardy before it starts by the population problem; and yet the President is saying that vast outlays of aid to Latin America are essential, but what happens to the population of Latin America is none of our business. He does not take the same attitude about other aspects of Latin-American life. He does tell them what to do with their economies, but he does say that unless they control their economies and use United States aid to lift the standard of life of the people, and not just some of the people, they cannot have that aid. This raises the fundamental question: How can they control their economies or raise their standards of living at all levels of their people if they do not control their populations? This is the root of the problem, and nothing is surer than that there will be a decisive revolt against aid one day if the population problem is not faced. Probably never.

in history has so obvious and significant a fact been so widely avoided or minimized by the governments of men. World population is now increasing at a rate of 50 million a year. It has increased over 25 million since Eisenhower entered the White House. It has increased over a million and a half since Kennedy succeeded him six months ago. In fact, it may be the greatest menace to world peace and decent standards of life is not atomic energy but sexual energy. Immense progress is being made in the field of production, but it is being wiped out by the velocity of reproduction and the problem is not likely to be solved by leaving it to the birds and bees or limiting education.

All governments, apparently, are very hypocritical on this subject. They do not want to face the political problem of churches, particularly, I think, the Catholic Church; and, therefore, they lag behind. Spivak said that the very agency that is most concerned about making a foreign program an effective agency for international development has just sent a memo (It was in the paper the other day.) to all its overseas missions listing seven pharmaceuticals (including oral contraceptives) which are excluded from aid financing under the commercial procurement program. These are called "ineligible commodities," and the aid memorandum says that if through inadvertence any should be listed in business circulars, it should be clear that they are barred. This is a degree of political stupidity, if not chicanery, that does not fit in with an administration that proposes many advanced and even bold programs, such as the Alliance for Progress.

The ICA medical director last year wrote this letter to the president of the International Planned Parenthood Federation of the Western Hemisphere.

Dear Lady Grady:

Your letter of May 15, transmitting a resolution of the Third Regional Conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, has been referred to me to reply.

While we appreciate the views of the foundation, it is the official policy of this government not to provide help on questions relating to population control; and, therefore, the director of ICA is unable to comply with that part of the resolution relating to him.

In our own country our population growth, with automation, is responsible for some unemployment--maybe extensive unemployment in the future. With congestion of our cities, need for urban redevelopment, our commuter problems (What is it going to be like when it doubles in the next forty years?), we are unable now to absorb such a rapidly growing population into our educational system and into our mechanized, complex society. The result is rapidly increasing crime and juvenile delinquency.

I had occasion last year to speak, as did the Indian Ambassador, at a fiftieth anniversary dinner given at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. This was a meeting of a world conference on planned parenthood. I am going to close with somewhat of a summation of what has been said, without statistics, with reference to this vital problem of population.

I shall address my remarks, not only to this audience, but to those who have the power to act effectively in this, the problem of our times--the population explosion. They are our government, our business leaders, our great philanthropic foundations, who bear a special responsibility in this crisis, and the United Nations. Finally, to the great Roman Catholic Church.

Never before has there been such valid reason for fears that beset us. Never before has there been reason to feel that the human race is speeding along the road to possible oblivion, nor is this primarily because of the explosive potential of the atom. The population problem that will confront mankind in the next decade or two will prove to be far more explosive than the bomb itself. This century is witnessing a conflict between two rival ways of life. We belong to the free world which includes 600 million persons, one-fifth of the world's population. Our opponent in this struggle is the Communist world, dominated today by the USSR, perhaps tomorrow by China. In less than fifty years it has grown to a power which controls more than one billion people or one-third of the population of the earth. The great challenge in this conflict is to win the support of peoples of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and particularly at this time, Latin America. It is precisely in these backward, underdeveloped countries that the population growth is the most startling. As we know, education is at a low ebb, and illiteracy exists in the backward countries in a huge majority of the population; and yet we believe in a capitalistic democracy. How can you support, and how can you expect us to make progress for a system of democracy with such illiteracy, and how can you deal with the population explosion?

This situation has largely been brought about by our well-meant interference with the controlling laws of nature. From humanitarian motives, we have drastically lowered the death rate in these countries, but we have neglected to exert a compensating influence on the birth rate. The laws of nature, however cruel, are not usually so illogical. Our policy has been to work for death control without taking the necessary steps to reduce the number of births and so offset the consequent runaway inflation of the people. A continuation of this present combination of low

death rate and high birth rate is a sure prelude to disaster. In the absence of realistic population planning, no conceivable economic aid programs will change the present course. Inevitably, the existence of masses of people subsisting at starvation level invites revolution and Communism. Any foreign aid program is at best a stop-gap unless we deal with the basic cause which is the runaway population. Unimpeded fertility is giving the backward countries exactly what they do not need--more people--and is hindering what they do need--more capital, more skills, and greater productivity.

Two years ago a presidential committee under the leadership of General Draper, co-chairman of the Emergency Population Council, was appointed to examine United States foreign aid programs. This was during Mr. Eisenhower's administration. This committee, which included nine representative citizens, recommended assistance in population planning to friendly nations. This timely and important report is still remembered because of its recommendations.

What has happened since then? Precisely nothing. President Eisenhower has retired to private life, and President Kennedy is in the White House. President Eisenhower side-stepped this whole thing completely and said it was no responsibility of this government--yet foreign aid was. It was the responsibility of the people of the various foreign countries. The continued avoidance of any action on this emergency by our government is certainly not in the public interest. A favorable consideration of the Draper recommendation is the most important piece of unfinished government business. I notice that there is an attempt being made by Draper and some of the church leaders, even trying to get some of the Catholic people in, to hold a White House Conference on this issue to see if there cannot be some conclusion. There has been a great deal done and said about this subject--more possibly in the last twelve months than in the last fifty years. Otherwise the population crisis will dwarf the effects of our economic aid.

To the business community, that has had a profound effect on world progress. I say it should, in its own enlightened self-interest, strongly support this cause both morally and financially. The prevailing notion that surging populations guarantee increasing profits is a fallacy. On the contrary, such populations perpetuate poverty and therefore fall easy victims to the glittering but the never-fulfilled promises of Communism. This in turn destroys democracy and with it capitalism. Capitalism, wherever it may be, cannot expect to survive as an island of abundance in a sea of poverty.

It is essential to emphasize here the special responsibility that philanthropic foundations have. Public health services are promoted throughout the world by many foundations. Diseases which once ravaged whole populations have been eradicated. Health and a longer span of life

have been substituted for sickness and early death. For example, in 1946 the World Health Organization inaugurated a program which eliminated malaria from Ceylon in two years. In the succeeding ten years the death rate was cut in half by this successful program, while the birth rate remained the same. This doubling of the population growth had the effect of changing Ceylon from a prosperous and a politically stable country with a balanced economy to a nation undergoing economic difficulty, having substantial unemployment and political unrest. It is unpardonable irresponsibility in the light of today's knowledge to inaugurate programs to reduce death rates and increase birth rates without any possibility of providing for the generations so created. Misguided idealism must not be allowed to obscure the need for hardheaded realism on this point. While we have adapted the laws of nature to serve our own ends in the realm of the physical sciences, we have chosen to ignore or to neglect such adaptation in the social sciences.

It has been said we live in a universe which stands for no nonsense from anyone and which orders us to play not the fool but the man in solving our problems.

Any discussion of the population problem must take into account the role of the United Nations. A United Nations' report has said, "The world population growth [this was just last year] during the next twenty-five years has an importance which transcends economic and social considerations." It is at the very heart of the problem of our existence, yet the United Nations has done little or nothing to deal with the problem which it has noted with such clarity (I might say here, due to the United States' representatives and their power and no one else.).

Certainly an effective world organization should not hesitate to speak out loud and clear on a subject which is more basic than any other to the welfare of all nations. It is almost unbelievable that concurrent educational and propaganda programs effectively dealing with population control have not been forthcoming from an organization which was created for the benefit of the world.

As a nation, we will always support the freedom of worship, as we do other freedoms. This does not mean, however, that any church should be permitted to so dominate the economy and the social life of a state or a country or a continent as to make it impossible to carry out the measures of population planning which are essential for survival. We all know the power and the influence that the Catholic Church exercises to discourage appropriate steps being taken to deal with this most basic problem, not only in the United States but particularly in the Latin countries.

Few people in public life have the political courage to challenge this opposition; however, unless this barrier is soon overcome and the forces of the democratic world are united in facing the dangers inherent in this

unchecked population surge, the free world will have lost its position to the Communists. The Catholic Church is the greatest single organized power in the anti-Communist world. To it we must look for support, if not leadership, in facing and then dealing with this menace. Because of the rapid population growth, especially in the backward countries, it is impossible to overcome mass poverty and desperation. People in this unhappy state are fertile fields for the Communist appeal of the better life.

The Catholic Church, instead of encouraging population growth by their veto power, should be in the forefront of efforts to contain it. It should, in its own interest, make a reappraisal of its position on this issue in the light of today's world. The present strength of this church is due to its practical and realistical leadership in the past, which has seen it through many crises in the struggle to preserve the ideals of Christian democracy. Never before has the Catholic world been in such jeopardy or in greater need of that brand of courageous and realistic leadership as it is today. Such leadership would bring about the active and the aggressive support of the United States government and with it, the United Nations. Nothing would do as much to foster the well being of humanity as well as the peace of world; and without it, this well-nigh insurmountable problem cannot be solved.

With reference not only to this population question but also to the problem of education as it fits the world today--not only in this state and in this country, but in the world--I want to say this to those in this country: Let the free world arouse itself from its lethargy and recognize that the enemy is at the gate, and let this nation remind itself that its freedom was dearly bought and is guaranteed by no one. We shall remain the land of the free only so long as we are the home of the brave, and let us realize, before time runs out, that the ramparts we watch must always be watched. Let us accept the lesson of history that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Thank you.