

## Re: The Passing of a Mathematician

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2003-10/1832.html>

---

**From:** cymelbird (*chskiscim\_at\_earthlink.net*)

**Date:** 10/16/03

Date: 16 Oct 2003 09:22:03 -0700

Mxsmanic <mxsmanic@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
news:<h2ssovoks77lgfguub16s3ubd42mjile13@4ax.com>...

> *Tanu R. writes:*

>

> > *"George Cox" wrote*

> >

> > > *There is no need for more food. People go hungry not because there is  
> > > not enough food, but because they do not have enough money to buy the  
> > > food of which there is plenty.*

It really has nothing to do with money. Famines are caused due to lack of the political infrastructure needed to distribute the food. A few years ago, a Nobel prize in Economics was awarded for research in this area – there has never been a famine in a democratic country, independent of monetary considerations.

> >

> > *Countries like USA keep the price of food high to protect their own  
> > agriculture. If the price of food was lower, the less developed countries  
> > would be able to compete on the market and thus produce more food also for  
> > their own people.*

That's somewhat true. The USA pays more for sugar than any other nation owing to our tariffs. Your implication is that developing nations somehow need to compete on the agricultural world market. That's less of a concern than producing what their nation requires. Keep in mind that the private organizations (e.g., CARE) export raw agricultural products to developing nations so they can monetize the aid. That is, some country might receive tons of soybeans so they can resell it on the open market for hard cash.

>

> *Food does not reach people who need it for logistic reasons, not because  
> of any lack of money or any conspiracy on the part of developed nations.  
> The nations that have the fastest growing populations also tend to have  
> the least advanced agriculture.*

I am unaware of any evidence suggesting that the fastest growing populations are the least advanced in terms of agriculture. What are some examples and what implications do you intend to draw from this assertion?

>

> *The solution is not to produce and distribute ever increasing amounts of  
> food; it is to instead reduce overpopulation. The world population*

sci.crypt: Re: The Passing of a Mathematician

- > *cannot increase infinitely, and the larger it gets, the lower the*
- > *standard of living will be for everyone. It makes more sense to*
- > *maintain smaller populations with higher standards of living. Developed*
- > *nations tend naturally in this direction, in most cases. Developing*
- > *nations tend to have unacceptably natural rates of increase, and so they*
- > *tend to have periodic famines and very low standards of living.*

You seem to view the world as some finite set of resources ever taxed by a growing population. Yet we continue to discover new resources – not necessarily agricultural or natural (i.e., oil), but more tailored to the present economy. The economic history of the US for example, exhibits an increasing standard of living despite its increasing population.

Can you reasonably say that 100 years ago, the US had a better standard of living than we have today? The population was lower after all.