Excerpt from Dr. David C. Reardon's work in progress:
The Eugenics Connection: Shapers of Humanity

Copyright 2006 All Rights Reserved

Will We Cease To Be Humane?

As the technology of species blending becomes more sophisticated, genetic engineers are likely to devote themselves to the creation and cloning of human-animal hybrids specially designed to do jobs that are too dangerous or demeaning to be performed by "pure" humans. These hybrids are likely to be designed to possess physical attributes best suited to the job (for example, the hybrid species would be designed with thick fur coats for cold climates, or given owl eyes for dark environments) and sufficient intellect to perform the task efficiently. But in order to maintain control over the hybrids, these human-animals would be denied the potential for any abstract intellect that could lead to boredom or the desire to resist exploitation.[1]

It is likely that the "superior" humans of the eugenic future would also create subhuman classes of amiable slaves to be their personal house servants. A panel of scientists brought together by the Rand Corporation recently predicted that specialized human-animal hybrids would be commercially available by the year 2050. According to one proponent of slave engineering, these human mutants "might be trained to be the sewer workers and stoop laborers that are now becoming increasingly hard to procure in the Western world."[2]

Always concerned about the supposed imbalance between food production and population, many eugenicists look to reduce human nutritional needs through genetic engineering. To save food costs, Dr. A. M. Chakrabarty, suggests that by altering a few genes the human digestive tract could be changed so that people could eat hay and grass. This cheap food alternative might

be used to feed the unemployed population of today or the slave population of tomorrow.[3] Dr. Kimball Atwood, chairman of the Department of Microbiology at the University of Illinois, sees no reason to stop at a cross between humans and cattle, but suggests the development of a human-plant hybrid "that combines the happy qualities of animals and plants, such as one with a large brain so that it can indulge in philosophy and also a photosynthetic area on its back so that it would not have to eat."[4]

Many eugenicists hope that a "superior intellect" can be created by doubling or even quadrupling the size of the human brain. Bonner suggests that if the brain mass becomes too large to be mobile, a way could be devised so that the "super brains" could "stay comfortably in one place and send their sense organ out into the world."[5]

Not to forget man's insatiable sexual fantasies, some Neo-Malthusians envision the design of perfect sexual beings, playmates of ecstasy, "blooming by the hundred, genetically identical from nipples to fingernails." Others look forward to creating a genderless population and eliminating sexuality altogether; after all, with the ability to manufacture replacement humans in the laboratory, sexuality becomes meaningless.[6]

Genetic engineering may also be used for space exploration. Biologist E.F.E. Hafez believes that frozen human embryos, in conjunction with artificial wombs, are the key to permanent colonization of other worlds:

> When you consider how much it costs in fuel to lift every pound off the launch pad, why send full grown men and women aboard spaceships? Instead, why not ship tiny embryos, in the care of a competent biologist, who could grow them into people, cows, pigs, chickens, horses — anything we wanted — after they got there? After all, we miniaturized other spacecraft components. Why not the passengers?[7]

And once having reached a distant planet, genetic engineers could redesign the passengers to better adapt to the hostile environment.

Back on earth, genetic engineering would have major military applications in the event of war. Germ warfare has long held an honored position in the world arsenals of mass destruction.

Genetic engineering will allow the development of even more potent and sophisticated bacterial weapons. For example, some military specialists are already considering the possibility of "Ethnic Weapons" which would be dangerous only to the target population. Since different regional populations often possess unique genetic susceptibilities, biological weapons would be designed to attack only those who possess that genetic trait. Thus, a genetically altered bacteria would be lethal to one race (the enemy), but not be dangerous at all to another race (the invaders).[8]

Military leaders, especially of small nations, might well desire to clone an army of specially designed, "expendable" soldiers. They would be engineered to always be obedient, to be able to eat grass and store water like a camel, to be strong, durable, and vicious, and to have keen senses and cat-like reflexes. They might even be designed with built in weaponry (claws and horns) for use in hand to hand combat.

Some eugenicists believe that genetic engineering will be the only hope for surviving a nuclear war. They suggest that after a war, future populations could be created from an underground store of frozen embryos, sperm, and eggs. Storage of frozen embryos, plus shelter for a few genetic engineers, would be far cheaper than massive civil defense, and might well render the present population expendable. By eliminating the "unfit" masses, nuclear war might well be turned into an eugenic opportunity to preserve only a "representative sample of healthy and intelligent" persons.[9]

All of the above scenarios are not the mad ravings of lunatics, but are rather the serious dreams of brilliant scientists, philosophers, businessmen, and public leaders. They do not seek tyranny so much as security. They do not seek domination of the future so much as a "reasonable" control of the future. If they seem to go too far, it is only because once one decides to look at human life as a biological product which is both malleable and expendable, there is no logical place to stop. A critic of the eugenic mentality, philosopher Charles Frankel, observes:

> They seem not to hear themselves. It is that other music they hear, the music that

> says that there shall be nothing random in the world, nothing independent, nothing moved by its own vitality, nothing out of keeping with some Idea; even our children must be not our progeny but our creation.[10]

Once one rejects the concept that all human lives are sacred and dignified by God, there can be no logical obstacle to genetic engineering. It is too seductive, too powerful not to be used. But like all technologies, it is also amoral, incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong. According to Howard and Rifkin:

> Genetic engineers decry the unpredictability of the natural world. Social progress is to be measured by the conscious effort to eliminate from the environment whatever is perceived to be random behavior, erratic activity, or unnecessary error. The underlying assumption behind this perspective is that greater predictability means greater control. The greater the control, argue biological engineers, the greater the security. For genetic engineers security is the ultimate value upon which to rest a conceptual framework. . . . [Their] Technique deals only with the verifiable parts of reality. Since moral, ethical, and emotional phenomena cannot be measured in any concrete, objective sense, they play no part in the technological process.[11]

As should be clear by now, eugenicists refute and confirm this observation in the same breath, insisting that traditional moral norms are unrealistic and a barrier to progress. They believe in a new "situational ethic" in which morality changes to fit the needs of progress, not the other way around. Neo-Malthusians believe in a utilitarian morality; the good of the many at the expense of the few. They insist that we must use genetic engineering to change our society if for no other reason than if we don't, someone else will. Geneticist N. J. Berrill, for example, insists that, "sooner or later one human society or another will launch on this venture, whether the rest of mankind approves or not. If this happens, and a superior race emerges with greater intelligence and longer lives, how will these people look upon those who are lagging behind?" Berrill concludes that if Americans fail to take advantage of their lead in genetic research, "they, not we, will be the heirs to the future and they will assume control."[12]

If eugenicists cannot convince us to accept total reproductive control with promises of glory, they will lead us toward a eugenic future by appealing to our fears of conquest. But what

will be the cost?

Judging by the past, it seems clear that our human wisdom is always a step behind our technical skills. We have learned to dominate Nature with our tools, but in the process we have left the environment scarred and polluted. Now that we are turning our technical skill toward the domination of the human body and the human spirit, it is likely that they too will be left scarred and polluted. Psychologist Carl Rogers warns:

> We can use our growing knowledge to enslave people in ways never dreamed of before, depersonalizing them, controlling them by means so carefully selected that they will perhaps never be aware of their loss of personhood.[13]

Eugenicists may well develop a society of perfectly intelligent, perfectly beautiful, perfectly healthy citizens, all of whom are appropriately docile and happy. But in demanding perfection, we will have lost the ability to have compassion for the imperfect. Having achieved perfection, we will have lost the need and capacity for courage. With everyone perfectly lovable, we will never face any challenges to love. Indeed, with our lives and environment paranoically constructed to safeguard our artificial security, we will face no challenges at all. Thus, Neo-Malthusians and their utilitarian philosophy may well lead us to a "more perfect" humanity; but in the process, we will have ceased to be humane.

ENDNOTES
ontspiece.

1.Howard and Rifkin, *Who Should Play God?*, 182-183.

2.Packard, *People Shapers*, 278-280.

3.Howard and Rifkin, *Who Should Play God?*, 174.

4.Ibid., 158.

5.Ibid., 170.

6.Ibid., 126, 156.

7.Ibid., 112.

8.Ibid., 184-186.

9.Ibid., 185.

10.Ibid., 159.

11.Ibid., 214-215.

12.Ibid., 185.

13.Packard, *People Shapers*, f