

Chapter 14

IS THE POPULATION EXPLODING?

No, Don't Fear the Fear-mongers

The public school system is constantly drilling into our children the idea of a “population explosion.” One of the main reasons humanists give for promoting birth control, homosexuality, abortion, infanticide, suicide and euthanasia is that they believe that unless the population is reduced, or at least controlled, the Earth will rapidly become overpopulated and everyone will starve to death. People who espouse this population explosion idea are called Neo-Malthusians.

Neo-Malthusianism

Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) was an English economist and demographer who theorized that population always tends to increase faster than production. This was—and still remains—an unproven theory. Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection was based on his belief in Malthusianism. In the mid-1800s, socialists used Malthus' theory as a basis to advocate birth-control for the poor. They founded the



Thomas Robert Malthus

Malthusian League in 1877, and called themselves Neo-Malthusians. At least some of these people believed that the non-white races evolved separately from the white race and are not really human. They advocated birth-control (forced if necessary) for these races, which they considered inferior. Such ideas were, in fact, quite popular among humanists in both the United States and Europe right up until Hitler put them in practice in Germany by exterminating Jews.

Margaret Sanger was a Neo-Malthusian, as are almost all Humanists. In her old age, Margaret Sanger said the following in an interview given to Lloyd Shearer of *Parade Magazine*:

Fifty years ago I realized what was coming—the population explosion we hear so much about today, women having more and more babies until there's neither food nor room for them on earth. And I tried to do something about it. Now I have thousands of people all over the world aware of that problem and its only possible solutions—family limitation and planned parenthood.³⁰¹

This alarmist idea—that the earth is going to overpopulate and we are all going to starve to death if we don't use birth-control—is one of the most fundamental doctrines of humanism. In virtually every issue of *The Humanist* magazine there is a full-column ad encouraging people to contact and help the following seven population control

organizations: International Planned Parenthood Federation—Western Hemisphere; Pathfinder Fund; Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception; The Population Institute; Population Communications International; Imagine a World of Wanted Children; and Zero Population Growth. And there are other humanist population control organizations besides these. Take serious note: the Humanists are expending great energy and huge amounts of money to convince the American people that America and the world are in a terrible population crisis. Birth control is not a Christian idea; it is a humanist idea designed to undermine Christianity.

³⁰¹ Chesler, *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America*, 462.

The Humanist Neo-Malthusian Agenda

Since Humanists make such a big deal out of needing to control the population, it is important that we understand just how they intend to control it. I could not help but get a little emotional when I read the following materials which were taught to my son as part of a required college course he took at Oklahoma City University in the Fall of 1992. This material is from the book *Living In the Environment* by G. Tyler Miller, Jr. Promotional material for the book reveals that since 1975 Miller's books have been the most widely used textbooks for environmental science in the United States and throughout the world. They had already been used by more than 2 million students at that time. *Living In the Environment* reveals where humanism plans to take us:

APPROACHES TO POPULATION CONTROL

Basic Voluntary Family Planning

Strictly speaking, basic family planning is not a population control policy, because its goal is to help parents have the number of children they want when they want them.

Extended Voluntary Family Planning

1. Open access to contraceptive information, devices, and counseling, regardless of age, marital status, or economic situation.
2. Open access to voluntary abortion and sterilization.
3. Intensive education campaigns using schools and media to alter cultural values and to inform and convince people to practice contraception, to have fewer children, to see reproduction (not the sex act) as having important social and ecological consequences, and to avoid migration from rural to urban areas where jobs are not available.
4. Changes in school institutions by increasing the choices open to people. Goals include elimination of narrow stereotyped roles (especially of women as mother and of male machismo or virility), instituting women's rights and unbiased work opportunities, encouraging women to work, encouraging changes in family structure that would reduce the number of children desired, and promoting later marriages.

Economic Motivation: Incentives and Deterrents

1. Further extension of voluntary programs by using economic inducements or penalties to increase an individual's motivation for reducing fertility.
2. Possible incentives include direct cash payments, tax breaks, savings certificates, transistor radios (an incentive used in India), and providing free or low-cost contraceptives, abortion, sterilization, maternity care, and child care. Other methods include health plans, old-age pensions, and education for individuals or couples who agree to use contraceptives, to delay marriage or childbearing, to limit their number of children, to become sterilized, or to move from crowded urban areas to rural areas.
3. Possible deterrents include elimination of income tax deductions for some or all children; elimination of welfare, health, and maternity benefits after two children; limitations on government housing, scholarships, and loans for families with more than the allowed number of children; and taxes on marriage, children, and child-related goods and services.

Involuntary Population Control

1. Limiting couples to one or two children.
2. Licenses or certificate, which can be sold, that allocate the number of children a couple can have.

3. Compulsory reversible sterilization for all. A time capsule contraceptive could be implanted at birth or after a couple had the allotted number of children, or reversible sterilants could be added in the drinking water or to staple foods. Sterilization could be reversed by physicians so that couples could have their allotment of children.

4. Compulsory abortion for women exceeding the allotted number of children.

5. Reducing or eliminating immigration.

6. Limiting food rations so that a family can eat adequately with three or four members but not with five or more.

7. Banning, restriction, or forcing movement within a country in order to obtain a more favorable population distribution.

8. Death control by euthanasia (mercy killing) and infanticide.

Political, Scientific, and Administrative Support for all Methods

1. Population stabilization as an official national and world goal.

2. Private and governmental population planning and control agencies at local, national, and world levels.

3. Population control as a condition for foreign aid.

4. Improvement of health standards so that parents need fewer children to aid them in their old age.

5. Expanded basic research in human reproduction and applied research to improve contraceptive methods.

6. Increased social and psychological research on the relation of population to other problems; on the consequences of various population control policies; and on methods to increase the motivation to have fewer children, to move from urban areas, and to adjust to a society with a stabilized population.³⁰²

Now the above ideas are downright wicked and scary! Even if there really were a population explosion all true Christians should and would oppose such tyranny. But in spite of all the hype from the humanists, **THERE IS NO POPULATION EXPLOSION!** The whole idea is a hoax. As is their standard working procedure, humanist alarmists are simply trying to scare us with tales of doom so that they can persuade us to allow them to implement their radical, anti-God, social experiments. Humanists have made a science out of scaring people out of their way so they can get on with their dirty deeds.

Proofs There Is No Population Explosion

The only reason the public has swallowed the population explosion lie is because they have been passively accepting instead of actively observing.

The Proof of Empty Space

If a person does any traveling at all, all he has to do is open his eyes as he drives along to see that the vast majority of this Earth is virtually empty of human life.

Recently, I made a 2,000 mile trip from Oklahoma City to Cincinnati to western Kentucky back to Cincinnati to Chicago to Sioux Falls, South Dakota to Kansas City to Oklahoma City. Except while passing through these cities, I hardly saw any people at all—few people walking, few houses, not even very many animals.

Even more recently, two of my sons and I drove to Albuquerque, New Mexico and back—1,100 miles round trip. This trip was even more barren than the one mentioned above. Outside of ducks returning to the north, and a few cows, we saw no native animate life. The only people we saw were in cars. We hardly even

³⁰² G. Tyler Miller, Jr., *Living in the Environment: Problems, Connections and Solutions* (Stamford, Connecticut: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1994), 144–51.

saw any houses. Most of the few farm houses we did see were vacant and caving in. We even saw a small ghost town. The people have all moved to easier life in some city. And this brings up another point: if dense population is so bad, and country life so wonderful, why aren't people flocking to these desolate areas? No one is making them stay in the cities. People in the USA are free to live where they want. So how come country youth all flock to those awful cities?

Indonesia is often cited as a country with a serious over-population problem. Indeed, the island of Java has one of the densest populations in the world. But that is not true of the other islands of Indonesia, and Indonesia has 17,508 islands! Of these 17,508 islands, only about 6,000 are inhabited! I have traveled to many of Indonesia's larger islands, and except for Java they are sparsely populated. As just stated, most of the smaller islands have no population at all. Why is this? Because everyone who can moves to Java. Why? Because life is generally easier and better there and more opportunity exists to improve financially. The larger number of people on Java means that the provision of daily needs can be divided and specialized, which means a higher standard of living for everybody. More people also means a greater market for the goods of entrepreneurs. Large populations are not bad; they are good.

The Proof of Census Data

It takes a True Fertility Rate (TFR) of 2.1 to maintain a constant population size. In other words, the average woman must bear 2.1 children just to keep the population constant. The .1 is to compensate for the barrenness of some women and for infant mortality. The TFR in the United States has been below 2.1 since 1951, and was 1.84 in 1986. For over 40 years now the parents in this country have not produced enough children to maintain the population.

If two parents (on average) don't bear and raise two children to reproductive age, then—over a period of time and with all other things being equal—a population will decline. Two parents must be replaced by two children. That is not my law. It is (depending on your preference) God's law, a law of nature, or a law of arithmetic. Two must yield two, whether you are a believer or an atheist.³⁰³ In 1790 the TFR in the USA was about 7.0. In 1988 the TFR was 1.93. That is a drop of 360 percent! The United States is not experiencing a population explosion, but a population implosion—a birth dearth of horrendous consequences.

Demography, at its mathematical root, is a science that deals with multiplying and dividing more than with adding and subtracting. It deals with geometric progressions rather than arithmetic progressions. That point was made early on by the patron saint of doomsayers, Thomas Malthus.

The idea is obvious on a small scale. Consider: If two parents have four children, they have doubled their number in a single generation. Then suppose each of the children, in turn, takes a spouse and each new couple continues to beget four children. At that rate, after only nine generations, there will be 1,024 offspring!

That is geometric growth; we don't add, we multiply. And so, demographers, thinking geometrically, often talk of the "doubling" time of a population. Such calculations can yield big numbers quickly and the big numbers lend themselves easily to horrific metaphors like "population explosion" or "population bomb."

Now, however, there is talk in the demographic community of "halving" times. A population trend that is losing numbers because of a below-replacement fertility also proceeds geometrically, not arithmetically. Suppose we choose a model that (for simplicity's sake) deals with two parents who produce only one child. That population has been halved in a single generation. Work that backward. Start with 1,024 adults, divided into 512 couples. After nine generation, with the TFR at 1.0 (not that far away from the present West German rate), the population of 1024 people is reduced to two people! On the Malthusian downside, we don't subtract, we divide.

The moral of this particular demographic tale is clear: Once they get started, things can move very quickly. In our current Birth Dearth situation, the "momentum" effect... will begin to change direction, yielding, at least in theory, not a geometric population explosion, but a geometric population implosion... Western population will drop, with growing speed, by about 200 million souls if present fertility continues through the next century. In abstract theory if one turns the crank for another few centuries, you could end up with hardly any people at all—yielding not ZPG (Zero Population Growth), but ZP (Zero Population).³⁰⁴

³⁰³ Ben J. Wattenberg, *The Birth Dearth* (New York: Pharos Books, 1987), 21. This book is one of the most important books written in the last 50 years. In the first edition of this book Wattenberg correctly predicted the fall of the Soviet Union based on census information. Every American should read his predictions for the USA.

³⁰⁴ Wattenberg, *The Birth Dearth*, 37–38.

Conflict With Evolution Theory

Either the Population Explosion theory is wrong or the Theory of Evolution is wrong; or both theories are wrong (as I maintain). But it is not possible for both of them to be right, for they are contradictory.

When my son brought home the “APPROACHES TO POPULATION CONTROL” material quoted above, I gave him a math assignment. “Take the birth rate information they use to figure the population explosion,” I told him, “but figure backward in time, instead of forward, to see how long it has been since Adam and Eve.” Now my son’s major was math, so this was no problem for him to do. Using the fertility rate of 2 percent given by his humanist teacher, and starting with today’s world population of approximately 5 billion people, my son calculated that the first human couple lived only 1,092.8 years ago! How interesting. That means that evolution—which requires literally billions of years—could not possibly have happened. Either that, or else this whole population explosion business is a big fraud. In fact, both theories are frauds. The Bible indicates that the world was created from nothing—and Adam and Eve lived—about 6,000 years ago.

When my son challenged his teacher with this the next day, his teacher said that fertility rates were once much lower than they are today. To that I answer, Wow! If that be the case, then the best path to population control would be for the world to quit using all these modern contraceptives and abortion methods so that the fertility rate might go back to its previous snail-slow pace. After all, without birth- control and abortion it took multiplied millions of years for earth’s population to reach its present level, according the humanist’s root doctrine—the theory of evolution.

Here is the paper and calculations my son handed his teacher:

- P = population at any given time.
- P_n = population n years later.
- r = proportional annual increase in population.
- n = time.

Given the annual increase of 2% in the population and that we now have approximately 5 billion people on earth, how long ago was it when there were only 2 people on earth?

$$P_n = P(1+r)^n$$

$$P_n/P = (1+r)^n$$

$$\ln(P_n/P) = n * \ln(1+r)$$

$$\ln(P_n/P) / \ln(1+r) = n$$

$$n = 1,092.8 \text{ years}$$

According to the Bible, after the flood there were only 8 people (they were in the ark and so didn’t drown). This was about 4,000 years ago. What is the rate of annual increase according to the Bible?

$$P_n = P(1+r)$$

$$P_n/P = (1+r)^n$$

$$\ln(P_n/P) = n * \ln(1+r)$$

$$1/n * \ln(P_n/P) = \ln(1+r)$$

$$\ln(P_n/P) / n = \ln(1+r)$$

$$(P_n/P) / n = 1+r$$

$$(P_n/P) / n - 1 = r$$

$$r = .0051$$

That is a MUCH slower growth rate than the .02 rate my son’s teacher claimed. Nevertheless, using even this much lower rate of annual increase, how long will it be before there are 50 billion people on the earth? My son’s paper continues:

$$\ln((5 * 10^{10}) / (5 * 10^9)) / \ln(1+.0051) = n$$

$$n = 455 \text{ years.}$$

Are you sure the human species has been around for 200,000 years as it says in our textbook (*Science Matters*, p.257)?

Of course, humanists don't believe in absolutes, so they aren't absolutely sure about anything, except that they don't believe in absolutes.

The Bitter Fruits of Birth Control

The command to be "fruitful and multiply" (Gen 1.27) was God's first commandment to humankind. It is foolish for men to believe that they can violate this commandment without suffering dire consequences. Humans do not know better than God, although many of them think that they do. Demographer Ben Wattenberg's book, *The Birth Dearth*, explains what the effects of birth control are going to be upon the USA. Most of the following is summarized from his book.

The US Economy Will Decline

Less people means smaller market. Smaller market means less profit. This should be obvious, for if there were no population there would be no market and zero profit.

Unemployment Will Increase

Population growth produces more new jobs, while population decline produces unemployment. This also should be obvious, for if the population declined to zero there would be no jobs left at all.

Humanists of course say that we have unemployment now. According to them, we don't have enough jobs for the workers we already have. Therefore, they say, fewer workers in the years to come, will mean less unemployment. Of course they are right. If there were zero population there would be no unemployment at all. Nor would there be any employment.

The Percentage of Old People Will Go Up

If the present trend continues, the median age in the USA will increase from 28 in 1970 to 42 in 2025³⁰⁵ Now I have nothing against the elderly. I am becoming elderly myself. But as people get older their health begins to break down, and eventually they can no longer work. They retire and take pensions. They cannot support others, but rather become dependent upon others.

The Percentage of Young People Will Go Down

Babies must be born for a country to replenish its supply of young people, for young people turn into old people with age.

In 1985, there were 145 million people for 29 million elderly. That's a ratio of five producers for one retiree. But in 2035, as the Baby Boomers retire and the Baby Busters fill the labor force, the ratio will be only two-and-a-half producers to one retiree.³⁰⁶

The Social Security Administration Will Go Broke

Social Security is socialism, and like all socialist programs will not work for the long run. Socialism is built on greed: wanting something for nothing; and "there ain't no such thing as a free lunch."

There is a popular conception among Americans that our federal Social Security pensions are paid for by our very own contributions that have been put into an earmarked fund that is just waiting for us when we reach retirement age. Wrong. That is not how government pay-as-you-go social security programs typically work.

Let this be understood clearly: *Typically, we don't put money into the Social Security program for our own pensions. We put in babies.*

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 67.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

Thus, as a rule, most of our money doesn't pay for our own pension with our own dollars. It pays for our *parent's* pensions and our *grandparents'* pensions. But who will pay for our pensions if we don't have children, or more precisely if we as a population have ever-fewer children?³⁰⁷

Baby Boomers, aged 29-49 in 1994, especially should be asking that question, as they see a much smaller sized generation coming up behind them.

Socialism is always unfair. Socialism always takes from the good and diligent and gives to the greedy and lazy. Social Security is no exception.

The dollars young and middle-aged workers put in to Social Security go to their parents and grandparents or people in those generations. The money we receive when we are at retirement age comes from our children and our grandchildren—or from someone else's. Such is the nature of "pay as you go" social security plans.

Consequently, people who have no children, or perhaps only one child, are in a sense, cheating the system. They are "free riders." They end up drawing full pensions paid for by children who were raised and reared—at a large expense—by other people.

That's not fair. Couples without children have extra discretionary income while they are young, which they can invest for their retirement. That is not the case for many couples rearing young children at a time when schooling and housing are felt to be particularly costly. Yet childless people get full Social Security benefits when they are older, paid for by other people's children, raised by parents who were almost always short of money.³⁰⁸

Of course, in the end socialism brings total destruction. "Sooner or later, under a 1.8 or a 1.6 TFR, Social Security 'goes broke' unless something changes."³⁰⁹ The grandchildren of those on Social Security pensions today will most likely receive no pensions. Perhaps that is what some older people are drawing attention to when they put bumper stickers on their cars stating: WE ARE SPENDING OUR GRANDCHILDREN'S INHERITANCE. Or perhaps they are bragging about their greed and lack of concern for their offspring.

People Will Be Alone In Old Age

Even now there are thousands of elderly people in state run nursing homes, who are immensely lonely because they failed to have any children. No one ever visits them. They are totally dependent upon the state, even though they may have been highly opposed to welfare in their younger years.

Our Culture Will Continue to Degenerate

There is something basically wrong with a husband or wife who does not love his or her mate enough to want to see him or her reproduced. A person is materialistic indeed if he doesn't want to share his life and resources with children. A person certainly lacks valid priorities if he or she considers a new car or corporate status more valuable than children.

The degeneration in our culture will further erode our economy.

In considering economies, then, we must consider spirit and culture as well. This relationship can be seen by looking around the world; one culture produces wealth, another poverty. Spirit and culture drive economies. Even some economists understand this. An innovative, optimistic, forward-looking society will likely be a prosperous one. Those are typically the features of youth.

The Birth Dearth circumstance, by definition, yields us an ever-aging society. What kind of spirit is there in a society that doesn't even have the gumption or interest to reproduce itself?³¹⁰

Our National IQ will Go Down

The birth control movement in the USA is actually serving as a selective breeding program in which only the poor and ignorant reproduce. Assuming that the more educated and more wealthy are more apt to also be more intelligent, the conclusion is unavoidable: birth control is lowering our national IQ. Why do I say this? Because

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 67.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 154.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 68.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 75.

the age-adjusted estimated CPS data show Americans with less than \$10,000 family income had a 2.2 TFR. Americans earning between \$20-25,000 have a TFR of 1.7. And Americans with incomes over \$35,000 have a TFR of 1.3. That's the West German rate, too—the lowest in the world. Accordingly, let it be noted, *the Birth Dearth is due to low fertility among the middle and upper class*.³¹¹ [Emphasis original]

The hard working, intelligent people are thinning themselves right out of existence, while the people lacking character and ambition are encouraged to reproduce so as to get larger handouts from our socialist welfare system. Generally these people are not even married, and therefore have no business giving birth to children at all.

Our Military Will Become Weaker

The enemy does not have to shoot soldiers that are never born. And numbers do make a difference in military strength. Ben J. Wattenberg, the demographer I have been quoting throughout this chapter, puts it like this:

Question: Would the United States be a world power, the “leader of the free world,” if our current population were still 4 million people, as it was in 1790? Or 62 million, as it was in 1890? We shall come to an answer: No.³¹²

Humanists Anne and Paul Ehrlich, writing in *The AMICUS JOURNAL* (Winter/'88), criticize Wattenberg as follows:

Besides the obvious questions today—how many able-bodied, healthy young men are required to push a few buttons?—Wattenberg apparently has failed to notice that, in modern armies and navies, only 10 percent of the personnel are combat troops and that women increasingly have joined men in virtually all other roles. Moreover, most jobs performed by members of the armed services these days could be done just as easily, if not better, by people over 35. The personnel needs of modern, technologically sophisticated armed forces are more different from those of World War II than the latter's were from the army of Julius Caesar. What counts today is quality (in training and ability to understand and use modern weapons), not quantity.³¹³

To those arguments, Wattenberg points out the obvious:

The Ehrlichs reveal a stunning ignorance of modern warfare when they ask, “How many able-bodied, healthy young men are required to push a few buttons?”

What buttons? Buttons to fire anti-aircraft missiles from an aircraft carrier? But how many people, how large a tax base, does it take to build a dozen aircraft carrier battle groups? Or what kind of large specialized economy does it take to build thousands of tanks, smart missiles, and indeed, nuclear warheads?

The answers are: lots of people in big modern economies.³¹⁴

Without “lots of people” we will become weak, and weak nations fall prey to the strong.

Not only is birth control weakening our military by keeping soldiers from being born, but also by polluting our morals. The most effective birth control method of all is homosexuality, which humanists are teaching to our public school children with a zeal. Homosexuality not only keeps soldiers from being born, but effectively kills (by means of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases) at an early age what few are born. Homosexuality also demoralizes the troops which are trying to live upright, moral lives.

So, once again we see how humanism is actually treason, for it seeks to destroy our nation's ability and will to defend itself.

Some Very Personal Conclusions

You say you are a conservative, that you love our Christian heritage, that you believe in God and marriage and family values. Do you really? Do you love your heritage enough to raise a large family—trusting God to know how large—, thereby preserving that heritage and multiplying what you believe in your children. There is a way we can free ourselves from the present humanist tyranny. We can become more and mightier than our adversaries. Read Exodus chapter 1 for an inspiring example of a nation freed from tyranny because they obeyed God's command to “be fruitful and multiply.” It's what you do in the privacy of your bedroom that shows how much you really believe what you say you believe, and that proves what you really

³¹¹ Ibid., 77.

³¹² Ibid., 79.

³¹³ Ibid., 181.

³¹⁴ Ibid.

are. As Wattenberg wisely points out, sex is a very private act, but it has very public consequences. The choices you make in the bedroom are going to affect the whole world for the rest of eternity.

UPDATE: The Threat of Radical Islam

The atheism and birth control of humanism have so paralyzed America that the prospect of her defeat by radical Islam is very real. The brutal fact is that Muslims are willing to have babies to promote what they believe, but humanism-influenced Christians are too materialistic and selfish to do so. While the populations of western countries are rapidly decreasing, Muslims are having as many babies as possible.

Which brings us to the threat of radical Islam. "You are decadent and hedonistic. We on the other hand are willing to die for what we believe, and we are a billion strong. You cannot kill all of us, so you will have to accede to what we demand." That, in a nutshell, constitutes the Islamist challenge to the West.

Neither the demographic shift toward Muslim immigrants nor meretricious self-interest explains Western Europe's appeasement of Islam, but rather the terrifying logic of the numbers. That is why President Bush has thrown his prestige behind the rickety prospect of an Israeli-Palestinian peace. And that is why Islamism has only lost a battle in Iraq, but well might win the war.

Not a single Western strategist has proposed an ideological response to the religious challenge of Islam. On the contrary: the Vatican, the guardian-of-last-resort of the Western heritage, has placed itself squarely in the camp of appeasement. Except for a few born-again Christians in the United States, no Western voice is raised in criticism of Islam itself. The trouble is that Islam believes in its divine mission, while the United States has only a fuzzy recollection of what it once believed, and therefore has neither the aptitude nor the inclination for ideological warfare.¹⁵

A hedonist is one who regards pleasure as the chief good. A hedonist lives just for himself, and so is not willing to sacrifice or suffer for the good of others or for the glory of God. Humanism makes people into hedonists. That is why humanists are against the war against Islamist terrorists. They are living just for pleasure. War disrupts that pleasure. They would rather just submit to Islam and start having fun with four wives. Of course, it wouldn't be quite that simple for them, but they are too caught up in pleasures of sin to think that far ahead. Since they are using birth control to prevent being bothered with children, they aren't concerned about preserving the freedoms they enjoy for their decedents (since there aren't any), or what few there are are "mistakes" (the birth control method the hedonists used didn't work) which they wish hadn't happened. Sodomy is so popular with humanists because it is "only for pleasure," and as a birth control method always works.

Perhaps the most unbelievable election in the history of mankind took place in Spain only a few days after al-Qaeda terrorists bombed the train station and trains in Madrid. After hundreds of people being killed or wounded, it was expected that the people of Spain would take up arms in mass to fight Muslims. But that is not what happened. Instead, they voted out the government that had sent troops to Iraq to aid the U.S.A. fight al Qaeda, and voted in a pro-Islamic government! It was insane, and the Bush administration was stunned. Why would the people of Spain do something so crazy?

The answer is very simple. Spain has the lowest fertility rate in the world—only 1.12 live births per female. Without muslim immigrants paying into Spain's pension system, it would soon go bankrupt. The choice was, Would you rather be Christian or have a pension? Spain chose a pension.

By 2050 Spain will have lost a quarter of its population. ... Half a millennium after the Reconquista, when Spanish Catholicism expelled the country's Muslims and Jews, Spain has no choice but to ask the Muslims to return and take possession of its land by stages.

Every Spanish worker in 2050 will support one pensioner, which is to say that the pension system will be bankrupt. According to one academic study, 5 million additional immigrants must be working in Spain in 2050 to save the pension system, out of a projected population of 37 million - and that assumes an immediate recovery in the fertility rate to 1.5. At this point, it hardly matters what future fertility rate Spanish demographers might project. The demographic catastrophe of the past 30 years puts the pension system on a crash course toward bankruptcy, unless Spain attracts an army of immigrants.

Except for a trickle of immigrants from Latin America, North Africa provides most of Spain's immigrants at present. Two hundred thousand Muslims now reside in Spain, and they have built 100 new mosques in the past 10 years. Unless Spain were, most improbably, to attempt a recolonization from Latin America, it cannot do without more Muslims.

Socialist voters may not have worked out the arithmetic; Jose Zapatero's supporter in the street simply does not want to be burdened with America's distant wars, especially if they draw fire at home. It all amounts to the same thing. Countries too lazy to produce their next generation will not fight. Who will lay down his life for future generations when the future generations simply will not be there?

¹⁵ Spengler, "Why Radical Islam Might Defeat the West," *Asian Times Online*, 1909 July 2003, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/EG08Ak02.html.

Like other former strongholds of Catholicism, Spain has made an abrupt and terrible shift away from traditional family life toward egregious hedonism.³¹⁶

Guess what? The severely negative effect of birth control on our pension system is exactly why humanist politicians want to let illegal aliens become citizens of the USA; that is the only way to cover up their failure to address the horrendous problems they know are coming upon our Social Security system. Due to our lax immigration policy, Islam has grown by leaps and bounds in the USA, and there is abundant evidence that Barak Obama is a Muslim. Much of his family is Muslim. He was schooled in a radical Muslim school in Indonesia. The humanist church where he is a member praises Louis Farrakhan, the leader of the Nation of Islam, as being a great spiritual leader. A page on the Nation of Islam website shows that they support Obama for president.³¹⁷ Is America about to follow Spain into submission to Islam? Let us hope not. But frankly it looks like it might happen.



“Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate” Psalms 127:3-5. Humanists believe this verse is a lie. Do you?

³¹⁶ Spengler, “Spain’s Elections Show Why Radical Islam Can Win,” *Asia Times Online*, 1916 March 2004, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front_Page/FC16Aa01.html.

³¹⁷ http://www.finalcall.com/artman/publish/article_4285.shtml