

▪ **CSS Precs 2012**

One of the most ominous and discreditable symptoms of the want of candour in present-day sociology is the 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 quantity and quality, is imperatively necessary. There is no self-acting adjustment, apart from starvation, of numbers to the means of 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 deaths by an equivalent number of new births; while the underworld, which always exists in every civilised society the failures and misfits and derelicts, 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 unborn have no votes. Employers 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 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 fanatical vehemence that the fear of losing the votes which they control is a welcome excuse for the baser sort of politician to shelve the subject as inopportune. The Socialist calculation is probably erroneous; for experience has shown that it is aspiration, not desperation, that makes revolutions.

~~Title~~

An Unbothered Question of Population.

In modern day sociology, the most neglected question is about population growth. Rational regulation of population is necessary. If all natural checks are removed, the population growth will increase and living standard of people will decrease. When the pressure of decreasing living standard will be felt, the useful people of society will practice birth control but the uncivilized or misfits will not exercise any control and nation's resources will go to drain. The section of people without quality will grow in nation and the problem is obvious. But politicians, employers, militarists and revolutionists will not focus on this problem because they need votes and labours for them. As, they don't want to lose, they use quasi-religion as a base to support unlimited population growth. So, sociologists needs to understand that revolutions comes from hope not desperation.

(138 words)

this sentence is too long and in the previous sentence same point has been told

main idea is picked
but you are unable to explain in your own words
need improvement
content has no versatility
write total words too
not satisfactory