**1.Thomas Malthus in 1798 argued that living conditions for the masses could not be improved, because nature would never be able to produce enough food to keep pace with the rapidly expanding population. Was he right? Bring examples and reasons to support your point of view.**

At the end of the XIII century, British economist Thomas Malthus argued that the food produced by nature could not be able to satisfy the needs of a growing population. His theories included starvations and measures to prevent overpopulation in order to avoid a wrong usage of natural resources. Two hundred years have passed and the problems concerning the environment have not changed, so the question is: all in all, was Malthus right?

It is true that 7 billion inhabitants is a huge amount of people to feed, especially when such a massive population growth took place in a relatively short period of time (approximately a thousand year), nevertheless, agriculture has made enormous progress in the field of cultivations and it is now possible to produce almost every kind of fruit even in the remotest area of the world and in every weather condition. The point is that these incredible improvements are not so widespread as they should be, considering that only developed countries tend to take advantage of them.

Secondly, it is undeniable that factories introduce millions of products in supermarkets every day and farmers’ delicacies are so easy to find that the risk of a famine is nearly inexistent, however it would be thrilling to discover how much of that food goes straightforward to the bin. As usual, it is a two-speed world with many people eating excessively and carelessly and many others that cannot afford even the thinnest loaf of bread: figures show that almost a billion people live with less than 2 dollars a day while the eight richest persons own the same amount of money of the 3 billion poorest.

In addition, governments play a major role in the process of ending the struggle for food and as the journalist Thomas Dichter affirms, speed is a crucial element for every country, considering that by 2050 there will be a population of 11 billion people with all the consequences related to the needs (water, soil and energy sources) of an almost doubled humanity. There are still 30 years to adopt a correct strategy capable of combining a growing demand and a sustainable development, yet the task is quite hard.

In conclusion, whether Malthus was right or wrong is tough to define: his theories have never seen a direct feedback in real life and his figures were a way too far from reality, however people’s attitude towards the planet may lead to a point of no return. Natural resources are not everlasting and at the time it is not possible to recreate them. So, from head of states with laws to citizens with everyday habits, everyone should do its best to preserve the world we live in from an exploitation that would have more serious consequences that the ones speculated by Malthus.