

CSS 2012

Q.2. Write a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title. (20+5=25)

One of the most ominous and discreditable symptoms of the want of candour in present-day sociology is the ^{conspicuous} deliberate neglect of the population question. It is, or should be, transparently clear that, if the state is resolved, on humanitarian grounds, to inhibit the operation of natural selection, some rational regulation of population, both as regards quality and quantity, is imperatively necessary. There is no self-acting adjustment, apart from starvation, of numbers to the means of ^{continuance} subsistence. If all natural checks are removed, a population in advance of the optimum number will be produced and maintained at the cost of a reduction in the standard of living. When this pressure begins to be felt, that section of the population which is capable of reflection and which has a standard of living which may be lost will voluntarily restrict its numbers, even to the point of failing to replace death by an equivalent number of new births; while the underworld, which always exists in every civilized society ^{unfettered} The failure and misfits and ^{defects} moral and physical will exercise no restraint and will be a constantly increasing drain upon the national resources. The population will thus be recruited in a very undue proportion by those strata of society which do not possess the qualities of useful citizens.

The importance of the problem would seem to be sufficiently obvious: But politicians know that the subject is unpopular. The urban have no votes. Employers are like a surplus of labour, which can be drawn upon when trade is good. Militarists want as much food for powder as they can get. Revolutionists instinctively ^{oppose} any real remedy for social evils; they know that every unwanted child is a potential ^{rebel} insurgent. All three can appeal to a Quasi-Religious prejudice, resting apparently on the ancient theory of natural rights which were supposed to include the right of unlimited procreation. This objection is now chiefly urged by celibate or childless priests; but it is held with such ^{enthusiasm} fanatical ^{violence} vehemence that the fear of losing the votes which they control is a welcome excuse for the ^{foundational} baser sort of politicians to shelve the subject as inopportune. The socialist calculation is probably ^{mistaken} erroneous; for experience has shown that it is aspiration, not desperation, that makes revolutions. ^{etc.}

Précis:

First Draft

The question is a victim of studied neglect on the

The issue of population explosion is being negated continuously by the sociologists which is posing threat to the natural resources. It will be at the cost of living standards, if population is not controlled.

There are two types of communities: one which restricts its offspring numbers to maintain their living, while the other takes no effect because they are not concerned with producing useful citizens for the society. Even politicians do not give due attention to this issue.

Every group in the country is concerned with its own benefits, so they do not raise their voices for the issue. The religious group connects increased numbers of offsprings with God's will.

Due to different opinions of society, politicians do not want to just secure their vote bank. Controlling population is the hope/goal which must be taken under consideration

by the politicians and religious groups do not raise their voices for population control for their own vested interests.

Title:- Population explosion: A threat to natural resources.

Population control: A responsibility