

Giant Panda Doesn't Travel

The Himalayan giant panda was not, as Oberle reported ("Endangered species: Congress curbs international trade in rare animals," 9 Jan., p. 152), granted a reprieve when the President signed PL 91-935 to protect endangered species. The animals are known to exist only on the Chinese mainland and in Tibet, and the State Department refused to permit their importation even in the days when Mr. Nixon was Vice-President, apparently deciding that giant pandas are not only black and white but red all over.

The species is on the endangered list, but appears to be increasing its numbers both in the wild and in Chinese zoos. The giant panda appeared on the cover of *Science* some years ago (7 Apr. 1967), in connection with a review of a book, *Men and Pandas*, to which Oberle is referred for the U.S. import policies concerning the giant panda (*ibid.*, p. 53).

HOWARD M. SHAPIRO
5304 Pooks Hill Road,
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Population Controls

Spengler's article "Population problem: In search of a solution" (5 Dec., p. 1234) correctly states the issue of population control as one involving a judicious application of "carrot and stick" motivational techniques, but he makes several important naive assumptions in his prescriptions for coping with large-scale child-bearing patterns. . . . We are dealing with the issue of providing motivation to those persons whose systems of reward-expectation are generally highly deficient with respect to reproductive control. . . . If modern psychology has taught us anything about motivating behavior, we have learned that time of delay of reward—be it symbolic or material, positive or negative—is one of the most important factors in attaining new learning.

Who is willing to support research of the following dimensions: (i) using analyses of variance methodology, present a sufficiently large group of persons with a series of rewards—money, educational opportunities, hard goods, vacation trips, and so forth; (ii) distribute these various rewards at different times—weekly, monthly, annually, so as to find the optimal points of interaction between delay of reward with

amount and type; (iii) analyze results in terms of census subclasses, then validate the original findings by administering the optimally effective rewards differently to the various subclasses in the population. When sufficient data have been accumulated to determine the most effective system of rewards, a government agency should administer them to the population at large in order to attain a population growth rate of zero or less.

A system of negative rewards (punishments) might also be considered, but would require the ministrations of a police state or certainly of a nondemocratic government institution. The scientific problems are identical and merely require determination of the parameters of effective negative rewards: imprisonment, celibacy, sterilization, taxes, and so forth.

Some might say that both alternatives smack of thought control, deprivation of personal liberties, and moral evil. Of course, they are correct. Consider the final alternative: total economic collapse and demoralization of earth's human population within two or three generations!

GERALD GELBER
67 South Munn Avenue,
East Orange, New Jersey 07018

The point that "there exists no General Will to bring about these [population] objectives" is well taken. However, Spengler's assertion that "reliance has been placed almost entirely upon 'private conscience'" is misleading. Even in the relatively advanced state of California in 1969, the Governor vetoed, on moral grounds, a bill which would have legalized the sale of prophylactics to unmarried persons under 18 years of age; and in 1950 the State Attorney General issued an opinion stating that consensual vasectomies were illegal because they were against a public policy of promoting a high birthrate and because they were proscribed by the law against mayhem, an opinion which had the force of law until 1969. Thus "reliance" has actually been placed on what amounts to a coercion to reproduce, and the coercive force is greater than is often realized.

One should not overemphasize the great "utility or satisfaction which parents expect to derive from their children" as a factor in the population explosion. In several countries which legalized abortion, including Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Japan, the birthrate immediately dropped by

around a factor of 2. In the United States, unwanted pregnancies accounted for about 40 percent of births between 1960 and 1968, according to Charles Westoff of the Princeton University Office of Population Research. But even legalization of abortion does not actually confer "unrestricted freedom to reproduce" (or not to reproduce), because such measures cost time and money to those who avail themselves of them. Birth control will truly be freely available only when the more impoverished members of society are given just compensation for the time they spend on it. Under such a truly free-choice situation, the evidence cited above suggests that the birthrate would immediately drop by more than a factor of 2, enough to halt the population explosion.

How long free choice would continue to hold down the population is a matter for conjecture. To the extent that there is an innate, inherited desire to have children, as distinguished from desire to have sex, differential reproduction would increase its effect on birthrate. However, any substantial change in genetic profile of the population could hardly occur in less than several generations; and since desire to have children is probably governed more by cultural than by genetic causes, the evolutionary process might be quite slow, and thus freedom of choice might conceivably maintain a satisfactory level of population for thousands of years to come. In any case, free choice is a goal which is clearly achievable, since the majority of people in the world would probably not oppose individual freedom of choice at the present time; and this could hardly be true of proposals for compulsory control. Consequently, in suggesting practical programs for eliminating excessive reproduction, Spengler should not ignore the immediate task of working toward greater freedom from present governmental restrictions on birth control.

R. H. GOOD
California State College,
Hayward 94542

An overlooked area in the population explosion is that of geriatrics . . . efforts to control reproduction through contraception are important, but present convalescent home facilities are increasing day by day and are still insufficient to care for the problem of domiciliary care of the geriatric patient . . . physicians should "pull the electric plug" on the sophisticated devices used to keep