

latter would impose a strict condition that the development of the resulting hybrid must end at the two-cell stage.

Essentially this is saying that we are doing this test, and we will not stop doing it, but it is all right because the subsequent hybrid dies off very rapidly anyway. If you ask what would happen if you were to cross-breed a human, not with a laboratory rat but with one of the higher primates, an orangutan or a chimpanzee, where the hybrid might live much longer, you get the very chilling answer from a utilitarian that "we don't know, and we won't know until we try it!" So maybe we should welcome the movement to establish a charter of rights for apes!

In many countries today there is much more concern for animal rights than for human rights of certain categories of people, especially babies in the womb.

The article in the *Times*, "Should Children Be Allowed to Die?" would seem to be another example of utilitarianism: "Why bother wasting money to cure children in famine-stricken Africa? Since the famine exists, let's just adapt to it." Maybe we could call this the new one-world utilitarian economics.

Well, in fact, this has been going on for a long, long time, this idea that you should subordinate human rights to economic matters. I remember a fine example of this in a report of a Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress in 1976 which gave serious consideration to a suggestion that people should need a license in order to have children (see box). Because children could be so expensive for the state, it was proposed that the existing population was sufficient and so fertility should be controlled to maintain zero population growth (ZPG).

The proposal was quite ingenious. Because about 10% of couples are naturally infertile, it transpires that the optimum number of children to maintain ZPG is 2.2 children per family. Now because it is rather difficult, even with modern technology, to have 0.2 of a child, it was planned to give each woman 2.2 licenses or licenses for 22 "deci-child units." To have a third child, a woman would need to acquire an extra 8 deci-child units, 10 more for a fourth child, and so on. To the objection that this was discrimination in favor of the rich, who could afford to buy in the necessary deci-child units, and against the poor, who might be forced to sell them, the very utilitarian answer was given: "From the point of view of the children, there is something to be said for increasing the probability that they will be born richer rather than poorer." This report aroused such negative reactions that the committee vice-chairman practically disowned it. But remember that there are countries which impose their population policies by law or by force. And the fact that an official government committee would give serious consideration to such a proposal remains a good example of economic utilitarianism being proposed as a reason for overriding normal human rights.

U.S. Congress reviewed plan for 'birth licenses'

The following are excerpts from a Dec. 2, 1976 study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, titled "U.S. Economic Growth from 1976 to 1986: Prospects, Problems, and Patterns. Vol. 5—The Steady State Economy."

Transferrable Birth Licenses. This idea was first put forward by Kenneth Boulding (1964). Hardly anyone has taken it seriously, as Boulding knew would be the case. Nevertheless it remains the best plan yet offered, if the goal is to attain aggregate stability with a minimum sacrifice of individual freedom and variability. It combines macro stability with micro variability. Since 1964 we have experienced a great increase in public awareness of the population explosion, an energy crisis, and are now experiencing the failures of the great "technical fixes" (Green Revolution, Nuclear Power, and Space). This has led at least one respected demographer to take the plan seriously, and more will probably follow (Heer, 1975).

The plan is simply to issue equally to every person (or perhaps only to every woman, since the female is the limitative factor in reproduction, and since maternity is more demonstrable than paternity) an amount of reproduction licenses that corresponds to replacement fertility. Thus each woman would receive 2.2 licenses. The licenses would be divisible in units of one-tenth, which Boulding playfully calls the "deci-child." Possession of ten deci-child units confers the legal right to one birth. The licenses are freely transferrable by sale or gift. . . .

What to do with law-breaking parents and their illegal children? What do we do with illegal children today? One possibility is to put the children up for adoption and encourage adoption by paying the adopting parents the market value, plus subsidy if need be, for their license, thus retiring a license from circulation to compensate for the child born without a license. . . .

Indeed, certain "high people in high places" seem to have had the idea of creating a master-race based on wealth or merit for quite a long time now. Julian Huxley, founder of the United Nations education organization Unesco, was himself an embryologist and quite in favor of the famous