

really believe we in Colorado will do things differently from the way they have been done in Southern California?

TSC

REFERENCES

Bartlett, A.A. (1969) "The Highway Explosion," *Civil Engineering*, December 1969, pp.71-72  
 Bartlett, A.A. (1973) "The Highway Explosion," *Environment*, Vol. 15, April 1973, pp.43-44  
 Bartlett, A.A. (1978) "Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis," *American Journal of Physics*, Vol. 46, September 1978, pp.876-888  
 Bartlett, A.A. (1994) "Reflections on Sustainability,

Population Growth, and the Environment," *Population and Environment*, Vol. 16, September 1994, pp.5-35  
 Bartlett, A.A. (1998) "Reflections on Sustainability, Population Growth, and the Environment — Revisited," *Renewable Resources Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 4, Winter 1997-1998, pp.6-23  
 Moyers, Bill (1980) *A World of Ideas*, Doubleday, New York City, p.276  
 Severeid, Eric (1970) CBS News, December 29, 1970, quoted in T.L. Martin, *Malice in Blunderland*, (McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City, 1973)  
 Turner, Ted (1998) *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, September 12, 1998

# 'Smart Growth' Ignores Many Harsh Truths

*Pretty fixes won't solve problems of growth*

by B. Meredith Burke

Recently the President's Council on Sustainable Development sponsored a National Town Meeting for a Sustainable America. Organizers expected 3,000 people — business leaders, environmentalists, concerned citizens — to show up in Detroit. Thousands more participated through satellite links, the internet, and local community events.

The event was designed to publicize the best resource-conserving practices of businesses nationwide. Implied is the message that using "best practice" design and technology the United States can support a growing economy and a growing population indefinitely at a non-deteriorating quality of life.

*B. Meredith Burke, Ph.D., a demographer who has worked here and abroad, is Population Policy Advisor to the Ecology Center of Southern California.*

This echoes the recent well-orchestrated "smart growth" campaign. From Vice President Al Gore's endorsement, to a Sierra Club "Challenge to Sprawl" campaign, to *Time* magazine's featured story last month, "smart growth" is hailed as the panacea for our urban land use ills.

Smart (aka "managed") growth will preserve open space and reduce commutes by recycling abandoned industrial sites and inner-city buildings, intermingling housing and small businesses, and increasing housing densities.

I am terrified by smart growth apologists. They slickly but falsely reassure the polity

that their piecemeal solutions represent a coherent, comprehensive policy that will deliver our land endowment unscathed to generations to come.

Thirty brief years ago M.I.T. professor Jay Forrester imparted an essential lesson in his books, *System Dynamics* and *Urban Dynamics*. Approaching a complex systemic problem piecemeal guarantees (a)

Today's sustainable growth community excludes as either symptom or cause the ultimate force: population growth.

confusing a symptom with the cause, and therefore, (b) prescribing futile — or worse, counterproductive — solutions.

Today's sustainable growth community excludes as either symptom or cause the ultimate force: population growth.

Consider that the Los Angeles of 1950 had about two million residents; today Los Angeles (all five counties of it) exceeds 15 million. Phoenix's population grew ten-fold between 1950 and 1990.

How could smart growth have arrested sprawl

---

***“Pretty solutions are socially and politically cost-free. They enable us to do business (pretty much) as usual...”***

---

while retaining the density, housing options, and recreational and wilderness access local residents desired? How could “sustained development” have prevented increased energy demands, waste production, accretions to global warming, and preserved natural habitats from human encroachment?

In a finite world, the smart use of resources and insistence upon recycling are admirable. But these sidestep ecologist Garrett Hardin's question, “and then what?” Strictly enforced, greenbelt boundaries in the face of incessant population growth will result in mini-Manhattans inside and a new wave of out-migration (and loss of farmland and wilderness) by persons who want to see blue sky, not high-rises. Smart growth avoids tabulating the overall eco-system demands created by human beings regardless of where they are housed.

We first Earth Day activists of the 1970's accepted that long-term sustainability would exact psychological as well as physical costs of Americans. Clearly, mankind's wresting control of epidemiological forces had irrevocably altered demographic and technological reality. This changed reality obligated us to reevaluate cherished ideals, jettisoning some now ill-adapted to healthy survival

while elevating others.

We never doubted that we had the power to craft this future.

The 1972 President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future understood that managing growth was secondary to the more fundamental question, what should be the country's optimum population? By 1970 the U.S. population had soared to 200 million from 1940's 130 million. The commission urgently recommended stabilization — not on ecological grounds but on ideological: it could identify no American value furthered by population growth. The study noted that reproductive health and immigration policies had to respect this reality.

Congress rejected both a national population policy and demographic accountability. Now Congress straightfacedly maintains that the ensuing 70 million population gain “just happened.” More culpably, it ignores population as a factor affecting our future options.

I cautioned my circa-1970 college students about the understandable but craven preference for “pretty solutions.” Pretty solutions are socially and politically cost-free. They enable us to do business (pretty much) as usual, avoid making drastic and permanent lifestyle changes, and steer clear of the costs of crafting policy in an arena unaccepting of political compromises.

Smart growth is the ultimate pretty solution. Indeed, its adherents blindly protest there are NO solutions where they merely cannot see a pretty one.

Ecologists David and Marcia Pimentel of Cornell University and Paul and Anne Ehrlich of Stanford are among the many who assert that the U.S.'s sustainable population is below 150 million.

From a resource consumption and global warming view the entire world would arguably be better off with a smaller American population.

Yet neither smart growth advocates nor Congress will confront those interest groups reflecting either the frontiersman's mentality that more is better, or the unrealistic belief we best benefit the world by remaining a demographic pressure valve. Until they accept the existence of limits, “sustainable development” adherents do not merely dwell in a Never-Never Land. They imperil both our country's and the globe's survival. **TSC**

# Population Growth Dilutes Our Nation's Democracy

## *How about 8,700 seats in the nation's House?*

by **M. Boyd Wilcox**

**T**wenty-seven years ago, on March 27, 1972, this nation was given the benefit of a thorough and compassionate effort that would greatly assist progress toward long-term security and sustainability. Tragically, the advice offered was ignored, and we are still paying for this avoidance.

What were those words of wisdom?

They said in part that, "no substantial benefits will result from further growth of the nation's population ... we have not found any convincing economic argument for continued population growth ... the health of our country does not depend upon it ... nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person ... and that the gradual stabilization of our population would contribute significantly to the nation's ability to solve its problems."

This report of the Commission on Population and the American

---

*M. Boyd Wilcox of Corvallis, Oregon is a citizen who actively campaigns for a national population policy. This op-ed is reprinted with permission from the Corvallis Gazette-Times. Wilcox can be reached by e-mail at wilcoxmb@peak.org.*

Future was issued by its chairman, John D. Rockefeller III. We are now 27 years and over 60 million people beyond its uttering, and what are we to make of the state of our Union? Have we indeed made progress in solving our most serious problems? What are our most serious problems and how do they relate to overall population pressure?

Environmental and natural resource issues are constantly in the news. Progress made seems to be counterbalanced by reports of additional discoveries, such as endocrine disrupters in water; the loss of farmland and urban sprawl; the continuous, seemingly intractable conflicts over saving tiny remnants of ancient forests; and ongoing efforts to prevent the loss of threatened/endangered species. The struggle persists to define a truly sustainable relationship with the natural world.

What about man-made resources; the social-psychological-political glue that holds a nation and society together and allows it to cope? What about our most cherished operational myth, the one of Democracy ... the one we depend upon to assist in solving our most difficult dilemmas?

Alienation from the political process is at an all-time high. Voting in national elections has plummeted from around 80 percent

at the turn of the century to less than 50 percent nowadays. A well-written letter to one's representative in Congress elicits a computerized form-letter reply designed for that category of issue, with little personal attachment or acknowledgment of specific questions or ideas expressed by the constituent.

One can e-mail the President only to receive back an auto-responder reply, thanking you for using this wonderful technology and mentioning "this is the only reply you will get regardless of how many messages you send today." Computers talking to computers and, once again, the individual is left with no effective relationship with his/her representative. But can we blame the Members of Congress? What would you do to manage the concerns of and correspondence of 600,000 constituents in your district?

The original ratio was 1-to-30,000. Not only has our nation's population increased over 270 times since the founding of the Republic, but the ratio in each district has increased 20 times. It would take 8,700 members of the U.S. House to restore that original ratio ( 20 times 435 = 8,700). Can you imagine 8,700 seats in the House? Most people agree that "only" 435 is too many already.