

position are (a) there is nothing in the gospels or their immediate sources which was written by an eyewitness; (b) anything with specifically Jewish flavor or (c) Christian tendencies must be secondary. McArthur notes a number of studies which argue for eyewitness accounts in Matthew and/or John and for accounts deriving from Peter in Mark's gospel. Among them are T. W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 28-45, 65-87; Donald Guthrie, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth and Content* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965); M. C. Tenney, *The New Testament: A Survey* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953); E. J. Goodspeed, *Matthew: Apostle and Evangelist* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1959); R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961).

⁵(New York: Macmillan, 1961). This is a reprint of a translation done in 1910 by W. Montgomery from the first German edition (1906) of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*.

⁶Even though Schweitzer displayed penetrating criticism in dealing with earlier lives of Jesus, his own reconstruction was very artificial: the best portrait of the Jesus of history derives from a combination of Mark's gospel and chapters 10 and 11 from Matthew's gospel.

⁷William Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew* (2 vols., 1959); *The Gospel of Mark* (second edition, 1956); *The Gospel of Luke* (1956); *The Gospel of John* (2 volumes, second edition, 1956). The Daily Study Bible is published by Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

⁸Aubrey Wm. Argyle, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (1963); Charles F. D. Moule, *The Gospel According to Mark* (1965); Ernest John Tinsley, *The Gospel According to Luke* (1965); Archibald M. Hunter, *The Gospel According to John* (1965).

⁹John C. Fenton, *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (1963); Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St. Mark* (1963); George B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (fourth reprint, 1972); John Marsh, *The Gospel of St. John* (1968).

¹⁰William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1971). This volume is one in the Anchor Bible series of commentaries.

¹¹(Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971). This work is part of the New International Critical Commentary on the New Testament and is based on the 1901 translation of the American Standard Version.

¹²(Two volumes, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966 and 1970). Like Albright's book, Brown's work forms part of the Anchor Bible series of commentaries.

¹³(Two volumes, New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879).

¹⁴(Two volumes, Albany, N.Y.: R. Wendel, 1875; the second edition appeared in one volume, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1893.)

¹⁵(Two volumes, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962). Edersheim's work was originally printed in 1883.

¹⁶The major flaw of Edersheim's study concerns his rather free use of Rabbinical materials from a period much later than Jesus for illuminating Jewish life in the first century A.D.

Living Room: A Personal Review/Essay

GARTH N. JONES

In scholarly terms I cannot improve on Kenneth E. Boulding's superb review of *Population Resources and the Future* (*Dialogue*, 8 [Autumn/Winter 1973], 159-163). However, I feel that I can face the issue more squarely and with more deep concern than he could. I am a born Mormon. I doubt that I would have been a Mormon otherwise, but nevertheless I've never renounced my faith nor do I intend to do so. I am proud of my Mormon heritage, but this does not preclude my questioning within my cultural upbringing about the world, or worlds, in which I live.

I wish that I could accept the basic premises advanced by the editors and writers of *Population Resources* that the world is not faced with a serious population question, that there is no need to curtail population growth, that the major need is to change only living styles and establish new distribution patterns. I admire the faith expressed in the first paragraph of the Introduction—that man, through continual processes of enlightenment, can control his future. That is much like the faith I held back in 1956 when I went abroad, as one of several thousand Americans, to par-

ticipate in translating the great idealism of President Truman's Point Four program into reality. After years of mostly failures in this line of thought and work, my idealism weakened, but I was not yet willing to accept defeat. Perhaps, I thought, I had absorbed too much of the Asian philosophy of fatalism (of which, incidentally, there is a strong infusion in Mormon thought as well). I took stock of the situation in 1969 as a Senior Scholar at the Institute of Advanced Projects located at the East-West Center in Hawaii. A year of quiet reading and study, a marvelous intellectual tonic, renewed my faith in man's ability to cope and control his destiny, and off I went again for another "crack" at the impossible. To me, the American Dream still remained a World Dream.

I was greatly alarmed at that time, as well as now, about the accelerating deterioration of the world environment, and especially the growing food-population gap. I was critical of the United States' foreign assistance policy, which in an article I caustically summed up as "If you cannot feed them, you kill them." In other words, the simplistic approach of increasing food production through the means of so-called miracle seeds (popularly and appropriately called the Green Revolution) and population control through the means of so-called miracle birth control technologies (pills and IUD's), popularly and appropriately called family planning, was doomed to failure—and fail it did. (See my "Failure in Technical Assistance Abroad in Public Administration," *Journal of Comparative Administration*, 2 [May 1970], 3-51.)

I decided that the best way to get at the world problem of food shortages was by working on the food production and not the population reduction side. I believed—and I still do—that the management of water was the key to increased food production. My renewed faith, however, was very short-lived, three years at the most. What shattered my faith in this approach was a trip around the world in 1970, one of many, but this one was different because I saw more starvation than I ever want to see again. There were just too many people, increasing at too rapid a rate. I need not recount here the stupendous data to this effect except to note that the sum total of new mouths each year is in the neighborhood of seventy or seventy-five million.

I came to the conclusion then that population control, at least to the extent of controlling the alarming rate of population growth, is urgently needed if we are to avoid human disaster beyond anything yet experienced in history. As if by a call from the "High and Mighty," I was invited in October 1972 to head a high-level team to study the population problem and particularly to prepare background papers on the administration of population/family planning programs for the forthcoming United Nations World Population Conference, to be held in August 1974 at Bucharest, Romania. This was being hailed as the first authentic international conference ever held on the population question and as an event to mark the climax of the World Population Year. The hope was that this world forum would examine honestly and openly the population question and come up with realistic solutions. But by December 1973 it was clear that there would be no room for discussions or solutions—only for confrontations.

The Conference produced nothing more than a spectacular display of verbal fireworks. The representatives from the two countries with the world's largest populations, India and China, made it abundantly clear that they had no intention of curbing their population growth. They claimed that neo-Malthusian thinking was nothing more than a clandestine plot of a few affluent (namely Western) countries to preserve their position of economic advantage. Taking a line similar to that of the

editors of *Population Resources and the Future*, they insisted that the basic problem was simply redistribution of wealth and opportunities.

One-third of the world is now either Chinese or Indian. At the turn of the century it could be one-half. The world may soon be caught in a major racial struggle for survival.

Since January 1974, I have withdrawn entirely from any effort associated with international development programs. I regard it as a hopeless activity. I am taking seriously the admonition of Church leaders to store one or more year's supply of foodstuffs. Over two-thirds of the world is now hungry, and this proportion will steadily, if not dramatically, increase. I accept the often-quoted statistic that the world's food supplies are now adequate for less than thirty days. We have been warned by our prophets that famine will soon appear at our doors and that we should be prepared. I strongly believe in their warnings.

This makes it all the more difficult for me to understand or accept the emphasis on breeding to the limit which is so often encountered in the Church. I find it rather perplexing, if not ironic, that much of the Mormon rationale—so skilfully articulated in this book—for large families is similar to that expressed consciously or unconsciously in those regions of the world now suffering the most from unbridled population growth. In times of socio-economic uncertainty, the family, and particularly the large extended-type family, may be the best social means for individual survival, but paradoxically it is also this institution which stifles economic development (a subject too complex to discuss here). Knowing this, my only consolation in reading this book is that there are only three million or so Mormons in the world and their social performance in producing large families does not contribute very much to the total problem.

Nevertheless, there still remains a moral question, as Professor Boulding pointed out in his review. He noted, although not in these words, that what is good for an individual is not necessarily good for a group and what is good for a group is not necessarily good for a society. Mormons, in this age of declining resources, gain group advantages at the expense of the larger society. Boulding so states and I so believe.

To Professors Bahr, Chadwick, and Thomas, along with the contributors to their book, I issue this challenge: put your philosophy and theories to work in your own backyard. The small valleys nestled along the Wasatch Front represent a microcosm of the problem at hand. Each time I return to Utah (and I've been doing this for nigh on to twenty years now), I grow more distressed about the future of the good life in these lovely valleys. I feel confident that Brigham Young would weep if he could see the desecration taking place in the "Land of Zion." Where have gone the lovely fruit orchards, the undulating grass lands, the clean air, and the lovely compact hamlets? The ugly urban sprawl has erased much that was unique and beautiful in pioneer Zion. Greedy subdividers are busily at work carving out little quarter-acre ranchettes for single-dwelling families with three or more children. My concern is where will the next generation get their ranchettes? Traditionally, Utah has solved its population problems through out-migration. The educated young, much like the proverbial lemmings, march off to new lands, and in the past this has usually meant Southern California. But such opportunities are now being rapidly closed off. These lands are also largely filled up. What will happen when the Wasatch Front population is redoubled and then redoubled again?

In response some say that the day of the single dwelling on its own plot of land is over. I tend to agree, and so do the editors of this book, I believe. But can we agree