**List of factors contributing to population growth disappearing from the world’s agenda:**

**Lower fertility mistaken for “problem solved”**

One explanation for less concern about population growth was the incorrect assumption that falling fertility rates meant falling population. 50 years of population momentum and a 40% increase would occur before fertility rates below 2.1 reverse population growth. Divergent fertility rates mean hundreds of millions of people from poor high-fertility countries want to immigrate to the U.S. (and Europe).

**Population worries morph into immigration polarization**

With 90%+ of current and future U.S.A. population growth from immigration and children of higher birthrate immigrants, concern about population morphed into concern about immigration—poisoning our politics by splitting both parties and enabling Trump’s racist anti-immigrant rants.

**Neo-colonialism, genocide**

Accusations that birth control programs advocated for the Third World represent race genocide are based on erroneous thinking. Those who advocate contraception want to make it available to less privileged members of both more and less developed societies. It is not a neo-colonialist plot against the Third World:, leadership by the U.S. in providing family planning assistance since the 1950s should not be construed as an imperialist plot. No group has the right to impose its preferences on the Third World. https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/neo-colonialism-and-reproductive-health/

**Radical feminazis run amok (hate to agree with Rush)**

After 1920 the birth control movement became gradually transformed into a respectable, nonradical reform cause, the recipient of large grants from big business, with women's rights secondary to an overriding concern with medical health and population control. This transformation was achieved through the professionalization of the birth control movement-that is, its takeover by professional experts, almost all male, in place of the radical amateur women, fighting for their own interests, who initiated it. Doctors made birth control a medical issue, held back the development of popular sex education, and stifled a previously developing feminist approach to women's birth control needs. Eugenicists contributed racism to the birth control movement, helping to transform it into a population control movement with racist and anti-feminist overtones.

**Abortion makes family planning too toxic to mention**

Catholics and Evangelical opponents of legal abortion or “choice” also opposed pre-marital sex and in many cases, use of contraceptives. They lump abortion (“murder of babies”) with decline in morality (sexual promiscuity), family breakdown, and other social ills. A string of popes claim use of modern contraceptives is a serious sin, sex must include the possibility of procreation. So the same act can be serious sin or part of the wonderful sacrament of marriage, depending on contraceptive use.

**Weaponization by Republicans and libertarians**

The sixties sexual revolution was hated by a conservative backlash (was their problem missing out?). It turned out that voters who would ordinarily vote Democratic would turn out to vote Republican based on issues like abortion, gays, and guns. Family planning aid to the third world and abortion rights were collateral damage in this quest for power mainly used to weaken costly environmental regulations and cut billionaire’s taxes. Reagan, Bush II, and Trump all “paid off” the Phyllis Shaffley anti-abortion faction by cutting third world family planning aid.

**Growth is sacred, ending population growth would destroy the economy**

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#:~:text=The%20possible%20impacts%20of%20a,as%20hotels%2C%20restaurants%20and%20shops>.

The possible impacts of a declining population that leads to permanent recession are:

1. **Decline in basic services and infrastructure.** If the GDP of a community declines, there is less demand for basic services such as hotels, restaurants and shops. The employment in these sectors then suffers.[[7]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-7) A falling GDP also implies a falling tax base that would support basic infrastructure such as police, fire and electricity. The government may be forced to abandon some of this infrastructure, like bus and railroad lines, and combine school districts, hospitals and even townships in order to maintain some level of [economies of scale](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economies_of_scale).[[8]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-:3-8)
2. **Rise in dependency ratio.** [Dependency ratio](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dependency_ratio) is the ratio of those not in the [labor force](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labor_force) (the *dependent* part ages 0 to 14 and 65+) and those in the labor force (the *productive* part ages 15 to 64). It is used to measure the pressure on the productive population. Population decline caused by sub-replacement fertility rates means that every generation will be smaller than the one before it. Combined with longer life spans the result can be an increase in the dependency ratio which can put increased economic pressure on the work force. With the exception of Africa, [dependency ratios](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dependency_ratio#Total_dependency_ratio_by_regions) are forecast to increase everywhere in the world by the end of the 21st century.
3. **Crisis in end of life care for the elderly.** A falling population caused by sub-replacement fertility and/or longer life spans means that the growing size of the retired population relative to the size of the labor force, known as [population ageing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Population_ageing), may cause a crisis in end of life care for the elderly because of insufficient caregivers for them.[[9]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-9)
4. **Difficulties in funding entitlement programs.** Population decline can impact the funding for [programs for retirees](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_security) if the ratio of working age population to the retired population declines. For example, in Japan, there were 5.8 workers for every retiree in 1990 vs 2.3 in 2017 and a projected 1.4 in 2050.[[10]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-:4-10) Also, according to new research (2019) China's main state pension fund will run out of money by 2035 as the available workforce shrinks due to effects of that country's one-child policy.[[11]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-11) With the exception of Africa, [this trend prevails](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dependency_ratio#Total_dependency_ratio_by_regions), to a greater or lesser extent, everywhere else in the world.
5. **Decline in military strength.** Big countries, with large populations, assuming technology and other things being equal, tend to have greater military power than small countries with small populations. In addition to lowering working age population, population decline will also lower the military age population, and therefore military power.[[8]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-:3-8)
6. **Decline in innovation.** A falling population also lowers the rate of innovation, since change tends to come from younger workers and entrepreneurs.[[10]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-:4-10)
7. **Strain on mental health.** Population decline may harm a population's mental health (or morale) if it causes permanent recession and a concomitant decline in basic services and infrastructure.[[12]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-12)
8. **Deflation.** A recent (2014) study found substantial deflationary pressures from Japan's ageing population.[[13]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-13)
9. **Unemployment.** A Slovenian study from 2015 found that population ageing leads to higher rates of unemployment and less entrepreneurial activity.[[14]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-14)

But same article reports that:

During the period 2003–2007 Japan (with an old and declining population) had a higher GDP growth per capita than the United States. In the United States, the relationship between population growth and growth per capita has been found to be empirically insignificant.[[15]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_consequences_of_population_decline#cite_note-15) Even when GDP growth is zero or negative, GDP growth per capita can still be positive (by definition) if the population is decreasing faster than the GDP.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-02223-7>
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Abstract: Businesspeople and politicians seem to be afraid that population reduction will be accompanied by economic recession. In this paper we examine the experience of some countries of various sizes in which population has been declining and observe how GDP, GDP per capita, unemployment rate, and labour force participation rate are evolving during the period that population is declining. Using the pooled mean group (PMG) estimation method, we find that population decline can go hand in hand with growing GDP and increasing per capita GDP, and at the same time the labour participation rate may increase and unemployment may fall.

# Opposing Birth Control In the Name of Feminism? Really?

Imagine my surprise to read [a piece coming out of an independent research center in Princeton, New Jersey](http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2011/07/3577) by Helen Alvare saying that this recommendation (for including birth control in health insurance) was “the greatest attack on women’s freedom;” that separating sex from babies “does not in fact favor women’s preferences about sex, dating, or marriage;” and that contraception ‘leads to a market in which sex becomes the price women pay for even casual relationships with men; women are drawn into this market against their preferences, feeling they have no choice.’

Now imagine my outrage.

Where do we begin? Let’s see. Is it that Ms. Alvare thinks the methods that enable us to decide when and whether to have children limit women’s freedom? Is it that her conception of freedom for women means we can only have sex for the purpose of childbearing for the duration of our reproductive lives? Is it that Ms. Alvare thinks that women don’t have sexual desires separate from procreation? Is it that Ms. Alvare’s argument assumes that women who want their sexual relationship tied to marriage and children can’t act on that. Is it – perhaps most outrageously of all – that we can’t think for ourselves in the face of the availability of birth control? And the kicker – that we need Ms. Alvare to step in to keep birth control away from us so as to protect our freedom? That’s not my idea of freedom. Is it yours?

I am deeply offended by the vision of women she presents and the vision she tries to impose on us. I think women are smart enough to make decisions about whether and how to use birth control so as to suit their preferences about sex, dating, or marriage. I don’t believe women are “prisoners” of our sexuality. Rather, women are smart enough not to see the availability of birth control as posing a prisoner’s dilemma. I respect women enough to think that some of us have sexual desire and have no less right than a man to say so and act on it. I respect women enough to think that some of us want sex linked only to marriage and procreation and have every right to live our lives accordingly. In short, I think we can think for ourselves.

I don’t want to go back to the days of my mother – when women couldn’t control their fertility, when women who had sex or desire were derided, when women were supposed to have sex only for the purpose of having children.

The greatest threat to our freedom is not the availability of birth control, but rather of pundits like Ms. Alvare who want to protect us from ourselves. No thanks.