d's richest nuch food. you? Let's take it a little further. me farmers 35 million

Otherwise,

rould have

prices fall.

duction in

en some of

Said a top

culture (as

that there

some coun-

market for

grown for

terms? It

e Stanislaus

dab in the

become an

'hat's what

n thousands

id not have

le fields of

d was stuff-

on faced by

f the UN's on (FAO), he looming the underpoints out,

ed popula-Experts are

d may accu-

e San Fran-

), even pre-

res, "There

next 10 to

e underfed

prediction.

remark than

not people

. is a differ-

k of food.

tted Canada

e American

s of tons of

e; while as

d the world

tries, a list composed of hungry people on four continents? There are several countries that Vietnam and North Korea. Over a fifth of the two.

Hunger is not a lack of food. Hunger is a lack of money.

world's people live in these nations. All have had socialist revolutions within the last 25 years.

The people there are no longer starving. If you find that difficult to believe, check out the sources listed at the end of this booklet. They offer recent information on the food production and other economic aspects of these nations.

So our list takes on a new meaning. The two billion hungry people of the world live in areas that were colonized by the Western countries and are still closely bound to them, or live with- of big landlords. in the Western countries themselves. Hunger is a "Free World" phenomenon.

is not the real cause of hunger. Does this surprise interesting comparison: China, Brazil and the United States are more or less equal in size. Remember the list of "overpopulated" coun- China has 700 million people, the United States has 200 million, and Brazil has 90 million.

would have been on that list 25 years ago, but overpopulation means starvation, then China aren't there now. They are China, Cuba, North should be incomparably worse than the other

> But instead, Brazil has 40 million hungry people, America has 30 million, and China has virtually none!

A closer look at Brazil will show why so many people of the "Free World" are hungry. Brazil has, according to Latin American scholar John Gerassi, "more arable land than all of Europe." But most of this land is controlled by a tiny elite and by wealthy corporations from America and other Western nations. What do these landowners grow on their enormous plantations? nigh.

Brazil's largest export is coffee. There is no food value in coffee, but there's a lot of profit in it. Unfortunately, the profit all goes to a handful

The situation is the same for the rest of the Third World. While landless people starve, the What does this tell us now about overpopula- immense plantations and foreign-owned estates

It should be clear, then, that "overpopulation" cion and hunger? We can learn much from an occupy the most fertile land and produce and one or two cash-crops for export.

Land that could produce basic foods goes to grow cotton and tea in India, coffee and cotton in Guatemala, bananas and coffee in Honduras. If lots of people means overpopulation, and if rubber in Indonesia, sugar, coffee and cotton in Mexico . . . the list could go on and on.

All this tells us why there is hunger in a world with so much food.

It tells us that most food production in the "Free World" is seen from a capitalist standpoint: it's supposed to make money for the farmer. If you can't afford it, then you can't have it. That's why in India big farmers sometimes let their wheat harvests rot in the silo when they can't get a good price, even though whole provinces are starving. It's why in America, with 30 million underfed people, the government holds down the harvest to keep prices

Overpopulation is a hoax. Hunger in these "Free World" countries is not due to the limits of Nature. The people are poor and hungry because too often the great resources of their land are gobbled up for the benefit of a wealthy few.

Their hunger is not a matter of too many people. It is a matter of too much theft.

GETTING OUT FROM UNDER

"We may have to announce that we will no longer ship food to countries unwilling or unable to bring their population increases under control."

"The relevant question is not, 'If you have all those babies, how will you care for them?' but 'Why can't we get enough to care for our children?"

The above quotations deal with the problem of hunger. The first was taken from The Popula- help means being able to grow much more food. a white, middle-class rofessor from Stanford no smaller than Third World farm families University. It assumes that hunger is due to over- today. population. Cut down the number of people now, it says, and there will be less hunger later.

The second quotation comes from the Black Panther Party newspaper, which is published by an organization of militant black people who were raised in the slums of the city. There is food enough for the poor, it asserts. But our bellies will never be full until we get it.

One viewpoint says hunger can be defeated through control of people. The other says it can be defeated through control by people.

Which viewpoint is correct?

The term "population control" is being tossed around a lot these days. Newspapers write reason why population control is no solution for stories about it, government officials discuss it, hunger: hunger is not caused by overpopulation. "advisory panels" recommend it.

What they are saying is this: "Population control is the only way Third World countries can raise their standard of living." How is population

necessary chemicals into the food we ship abroad that will sterilize people. Some of them even say that the "developed" countries of the world (the wealthy countries) should get together and decide how

many people the underdeveloped (poor) nations ought to have. And some want to have these same policies right here at home.

But there's a problem with their approach. These experts assume that people are poor and come-this is the real question. hungry because they have large families. If that kids, as brutal as it sounds, would be the way to of their own land. improve their situation. Only, it's not true.

In the first place, the overwhelming majority of Third World people make their living from the land. This means that large families are actually an advantage, because when you've got to farm by hand, having more people around to

Hunger is caused

by exploitation

There's a second reason why people in underdeveloped countries have many kids: few of them survive to adulthood. This is important for parents, not only because they love their families, but also because grown-up children will be their only support when they get old.

Beyond all these things, though, is the basic It's caused by theft; theft of land, theft of resources, theft of real control from the people themselves. Hunger is caused by exploitation.

People are not poor because there isn't enough to be controlled? Mass birth control if possible, wealth to go around. They are poor because they reply, or sterilization and starvation if wealth is unequally distributed, throughout the world and within a country. And population And they mean it. They recommend putting control will do nothing to change that inequality-if anything, it will preserve it. Forcing population control on underdeveloped countries will only ensure that they remain underdeveloped.

Population control will only condemn the peoples of these lands to their present misery Preventing more miserable people doesn't make people less miserable.

How can poverty, and thus hunger, be over-

The solution for Third World nations is that was true, then forcing people to have few or no the people control the economy and resources

This is an extremely important point. In most of the underdeveloped countries, the richest resources-the best farmland, the mines, the oilfields-are owned by foreign businesses or a tiny native elite. These powerful overlords cooperate with each other. They use these resources for their own benefit, and not for the benefit of the tion Bomb, a best-seller written by Paul Ehrlich, American farm families in the 19th century were great masses of the people. This is why so many remain poor, and underdeveloped, and hungrythey are prevented from developing! They are exploited.



Ending exploitation makes development possible for people. It allows them to plan the use of their resources for everyone, and to use them well. Farms can be run scientifically, using machines and even chemicals, using them carefully to help and not hurt people-or the land. Industries can be developed that will make products people really need. All of this leads to something else: population growth that is slower because people no longer find it necessary to have large families to produce enough food to live. And they can make the choice themselves to limit the size of their families.

These things have actually happened in poor countries which were exploited and did something about it. China, Cuba, north Vietnam, and