
While this special issue of California Agriculture focuses primarily on the impacts of population growth in California, Executive Editor Janet White asked Cohen to put the state’s concerns into a global perspective.

The world’s population changed dramatically in the 20th century. What can we expect in the century to come?

During the past century, the human population nearly quadrupled to 6 billion. Today more young people than ever before are entering childbearing age. Through sheer momentum, and barring catastrophe, their children will increase the world population by another 2 to 4 billion people by 2050.

Perhaps the most important demographic event in the history of the human species, however, took place around 1965, when the world’s annual growth rate began to decline from its peak of 2.1%. After World War II, the industrialized countries learned how to export health without wealth. They provided cheap public health measures that dramatically lowered infant mortality in developing countries. As death rates dropped, growth rates in those countries shot up. It took from the end of World War II until 1965 for poorer countries to begin to control their fertility.

The 21st century is likely to see continued slowing, and perhaps even an end to population growth. Population is expected to reach 8 to 10 billion by mid-century.

The 20th century will be the last in human history in which most people live in rural areas. The number of urbanites rose from 200 million to 2.9 billion between 1900 and 2000; today 47% of people live in cities. The United Nations estimates that almost all population growth in the next half century will be in cities, while the rural population will remain near 3 billion people.

During the last century, the world’s people shared very unequally in rising incomes. The average annual gross domestic product per person more than quadrupled to $5,200, as the aggregate world economy grew 16-fold. Between 1960 and 1994 the disparity in per capita income between the richest and poorest fifths of the world’s nations widened from 30 to 1, to 78 to 1. If the populations of developing countries continue to grow faster than those of industrialized countries, this gap could widen further.

What problems are associated with projected population growth in developing countries and urban areas?

At present, about 80% of the world’s population lives in the poor, developing world. The rest live in the rich, industrialized world. The “rich” world consists of North America, Europe, Australia, Japan and New Zealand. The “poor” world is virtually everything else. While the poor already outnumber the rich, in the coming century there will be a further, massive shift in the relative sizes of the poor and rich sectors. At current rates, in one lifetime of 75 or 80 years the poor countries will increase by 400% while the rich countries will grow by about 8%. The growth rates in the developing world will not be uniform, with the largest increases expected in certain countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia.

There are many problems that are associated with being poor and numerous. About a third of the earth’s people are infected with the bacillus of tuberculosis; in Africa it’s roughly half. Foodborne pathogens such as E. coli O157:H7 are more difficult to control, as crowded urban areas are less well-equipped with the basic means of sanitation. At present, about half the people in the world have no place to go to the toilet.
What are the implications for world hunger?

Today the developing countries are importing massive amounts of food from the developed countries. Wheat and cereal yields have continued to rise steadily and the prices of major cereals have dropped dramatically. In world commodity markets the price of food is now cheaper than it has ever been.

A positive consequence is that the number of people in the world who are chronically hungry has dropped quite dramatically. In 1970, the FAO estimated that nearly a billion people were chronically hungry, more than a third of the population living in developing regions. In 1990, three-quarters of a billion people were hungry, about 20% of people living in developing regions. However, in Africa the number of chronically hungry people has grown from 100 million to 168 million.

How is it possible, if the price of food was cut in half, that more than three-quarters of a billion people are chronically hungry? The answer is that the very poor are economically invisible. They don't have cash and therefore cannot exert what economists call “effective demand” in world commodity markets. Prices are a poor indicator of scarcity, and are not a reliable measure of human well-being.

How will energy use and the environment be affected?

From 1860 to 1990, there was a 5-fold increase in the number of people on earth and a 19-fold increase in per capita energy use, due primarily to the consumption or combustion of fossil fuel. Likewise, the aggregate impact of humans on biotic and geological processes grew enormously. In the 20th century, human-induced emissions of carbon to the atmosphere grew from a half-billion tons to 7.3 billion tons per year, raising the carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere by about 20%. World water withdrawals from all renewable freshwater sources grew 8-fold in this century, to roughly 4,000 cubic kilometers per year. Humans now withdraw annually about a quarter to a half of all available renewable freshwater.

In the course of our demographic and economic expansion, humans have altered the habitats and populations of many other species, raising widespread concerns about extinction. For example, the area of cultivated land nearly doubled between 1900 and 1960. Since 1960, the area cultivated has not grown substantially. Rather, new lands have been converted to agriculture to replace lands abandoned or converted to nonagricultural uses, and the intensity of cultivation and the yields per cultivated hectare have increased globally.

How are cultural and economic changes expected to shape the 21st century?

It’s not just population versus the environment; their interaction with culture, government and the economy must also be considered. In Brazil, for example, when interest rates are low, capital is cheap and roads can be built into new blocks of forest making it easier for peasants to deforest large areas of land. When interest rates are high, fewer roads are built and large blocks of land are nibbled at from the edges. Another factor is government regulation of the forest, and what economic activities are allowed or encouraged.

The situation of women in the economy has also changed radically in the last generation. In 1970 there were 37 working women for every 100 working men in the world, with wide variations from country to country. Twenty years later, that number has nearly doubled to 62 working women for every 100 working men. The labor force is not dependent solely on population growth but on what are culturally acceptable activities for women.

Likewise, primary education has become the norm in Western Europe, North America, and the most industrialized nations of Asia and the Pacific. However, only three-quarters of the children eligible to attend primary schools in developing countries do so today, and the 130 million children who are out of school are disproportionately girls.
Women, minority farmers are growing in California

As California agriculture and population become increasingly diverse (see p. 11), women and ethnic minorities are finding new opportunities to own and operate farms.

“In the long term, it’s inevitable that we’ll see greater diversity” among growers, says Desmond Jolly, director of the UC Small Farm Center. “The trend is clear and irreversible.”

According to the U.S. Census of Agriculture, 14% of California farm operators in 1997 were female (10,064), up from 11% of the total a decade earlier. During the same time-period, farm operators of Spanish, Hispanic or Latino origin increased 30%, from 3,471 in 1987 to 4,515 in 1997, while the number of Asian, black, American Indian and “other” owners increased 21%, from 3,663 in 1987 to 4,430 in 1997.

Steven Blank, farm finance management specialist at UC Davis and author of The End of Agriculture in the American Portfolio, says California’s total acreage and the number of distinct farming operations slowly continue to shrink, yet the relative percentage of small farms is growing. Many new farm operators are women and immigrants, who generally start new businesses on smaller farms.

“The smaller size of farms allows easier entry in comparison with other businesses,” Jolly says.

Nonwhite growers. New immigrants to California during the past two decades (such as Southeast Asian refugees) often feel at home on small farms in the Central Valley, Blank says, while long-term immigrants (such as workers from Mexico) have “acquired wealth and are now able to own farms” (see p. 33).
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Nonwhite growers. New immigrants to California during the past two decades (such as Southeast Asian refugees) often feel at home on small farms in the Central Valley, Blank says, while long-term immigrants (such as workers from Mexico) have “acquired wealth and are now able to own farms” (see p. 33).

“Many new immigrants are not coming from an urban setting,” Jolly agrees. “It’s easier to adjust to rural heritage and culture.” Farm operation and ownership allows Hispanic immigrants greater stability than working in the fields, although it is still a “risky and marginal enterprise,” he says.

Despite the historical dominance of Europeans in California agriculture, black farmers built a number of Central Valley towns, while Sikh growers and other ethnic groups have a “long and distinguished history of agriculture in the