

Preface

John Glad is a brave scholar. He here ventures onto the high seas of contemporary intellectual interdict. The term eugenics has been on an ideological hit list both by the irrational left as well as by an intimidated public. However, as Dr. Glad points out clearly and authoritatively, there is virtually no factual basis for what can only be seen as a totemic reaction. The mere mention of eugenics elicits knee-jerk reaction—

“Nazi genocide, forced sterilization.”

Yet by any standard of rational analysis, this vision of improvement for the human species has a strong humanistic tradition to support its further application.

The real history of eugenics, as **Dr. Glad** points out is rich in a truly liberal vision for the improvement in the state of all of humankind. And modern research in the biological nature of human function is opening up opportunities for the enhancement of both the physical as well as the mental condition of the human species. This, at a blazing speed of discovery. Thus, we need thinkers such as John Glad who will step up to challenge blind prejudice with fact and possibility. The world is in a descending spiral today, with 6.5 billion people, going on 9-10 billion humans by mid-century, the vast majority living under historically and civilizationally **subhuman conditions**.

The same *powers-that-be*, those that blind the educated with a fear of the term **eugenics**, represent the self-same leadership classes that benefit from the present futile redistributionist social policies that feed into the demographic explosion of the destitute and the vulnerable. What is occurring, and against which Dr. Glad is expostulating, is a shakedown and intimidation of the productive middle classes in order to feed the pathology of poverty, disease, and social disintegration to which we are exposed in the media, each day.

These ideological leadership cadres that stand in the way of the dissemination of the truth concerning the ideals of the old and new eugenics movement indulge themselves luxuriously in the watering places of the “philanthropists,” in Paris, Geneva, New York, Brussels. These international organizations—we know them well—fritter away billions of dollars for their own partying (they call them conferences), the remnant dollars dribbling supposedly into the lands of the needy, but really sucked up by the gangsters who run the tragic show of the Third World. The poor get poorer, their conditions of life increasingly pathological, unprecedented in scope at any time in history.

Eugenics, a vision of human betterment, with real scientific and then social-policy potential for enhancing the evolutionary future of our species, is buried within a demonization of language and misunderstanding. Critical to the linguistic and semantic morass that surrounds this paralysis of understanding is the spectral memories of the German and European perpetration of the Holocaust.

I would like to add a comment to Dr. Glad's clear and decisive puncturing of the balloon of myth that argues that the Nazis claimed to have actually engaged in a program of eugenics. The Nazis also claimed to be a party of socialism! If we define eugenics as encompassing programs of human betterment, physical as well as mental, practices that benefit community in the local sense as well as the species in general, we can say that the Holocaust was the antithesis of eugenic practice. Not only did the Nazis not argue for their participation in the eugenics movement, but they knew that they were practicing dysgenics.

They hid their practices, as do all totalitarian regimes, within a babble of propaganda that presumably validated to the naïve, this mirage of self-justification. A careful reading of their mission statements, and, of course, their unspeakable practices, clearly reveals that that they recognized that they were eliminating a people who they knew to be superior to themselves, a millennial threat to German dominance. They covered these actions by heaping slime on the Jewish people, their racial heritage, their ghetto and post-ghetto cultural behavior, their arrogance and purported economic conspiracies, above all their dominance in all walks of life, quickly attained only a brief moment beyond the ghetto. To the Nazis, this became a universal challenge to German pretensions to leadership. And this from a people that in Germany was a scant one percent of the population, in the entire Austro-Hungarian Empire, about four percent.

One has only to read the literature of polemics arising from the German/Austrian political/cultural scene, from the mid-nineteenth century on, to realize that the hatred of the Jews was not a hatred of religion, but rather of race. The solution, clearly and early bandied about by a wide variety of European hate groups, was one of

potential *cleansing of the Jews* from Europe, if not the world. Simply, the polemics of hate was engendered to facilitate the elimination of a dangerous contender for dominance in this self-same continental environment.

Thus the genocide of the Jews, in which all of Europe became eager participants, was not an example of eugenics gone astray, as **Dr. Glad** suggests. I here, gently demur. Rather, the Holocaust was a vast dysgenic program to rid Europe of superior intelligent challengers to the existing Christian domination by a numerically and politically minuscule minority.

The issue of gypsy genocide has been continuously presented to throw dust in the air, to obfuscate the real significance of the fate of the Jews in Europe between 1933 and 1945. True, the gypsies were persecuted and Hitler disdained them. Yet the **ethnic gypsies**, as distinct from West European converts, represented, to the perverse irrationality of the Nazis, an *ancient Aryan race*.

Thus, as **Aryans**, the gypsies were not subjected to premeditated total genocide. The genocide began with the Nazi accession to power in Germany, 1933; in Austria, 1938. It was both chaotic and bestial, but many German and Austrian Jews made good their escapes. There was truly hatred, a chaos of despicable cruelty in Germany, Austria, and the occupied lands up to January 1942, when the Nazis realized that Britain and the Soviet Union still stood strong against their aggression, while the United States, bruised after Pearl Harbor, reared in fury. At Wannsee, north of Berlin, the final solution was conjured up, the industrial annihilation of the remaining Jews of Europe. If Germany would not prevail, no Jews would be left to gloat vindictively of their own victory.

Another sad mental block over the real meaning of the Holocaust, and here within the Jewish community itself, is the Jews' refusal to accept this event as an exemplar of dysgenics. To do so, many fear, would only reify the view that the Jewish people still considered themselves among the elect, the chosen, as the Torah implies. To admit this would presumably again bring down a vale of tears upon them. The events in Europe during these decades was thus not an exemplification of the theory of eugenics, a supposed liberal and humanitarian vision turned to dross. Rather it was, as noted above, a premeditated program of dysgenics, an aristocide, as with too many other genocides of the twentieth century. How else can we understand the ideology of hate during this century that brought about the destruction of so many talented human beings, members of civilizationally achieving ethnic and social class groups?

Thus we have here witnessed, from Armenia to Biafra and Cambodia, the dysgenic destruction of tens of millions of the most intelligent, productive humans on our planet.

By not recognizing the twentieth century's true "*achievement*," we have thus given in to the defamation of the ideals of the eugenics movement. We have made far more difficult the wider clarification of the true implications of eugenics.

It is doubly important to emphasize the visionary qualities of **Dr. Glad's** book. Because, even after throwing over this contemptible myth of "Nazi eugenics," a twenty-first century campaign for the eugenic ideal must impress upon educated and uneducated alike that the problems that we face require a *healthy humanity* living in tune with nature. It requires a revolutionary turnabout from present dogmatic international thinking. Instead of dissipating our wealth to remediate what cannot be remediated we need to envision clearly what measures humanity needs to take to create a future of hope. Dr. Glad makes this clear: universal high intelligence, altruism, a pragmatic analysis of the facts of our current situation. Our world simply is running aground in majoritarian incapacity and with this impotence, potential medical and ecological disaster.

What a program of eugenics offers potentially goes far beyond even the ongoing strong eugenic decisions made by millions of families with regard to procreation and the raising of healthy youngsters. Here, individuals, if not the power brokers, are obeying the laws of science and thereby acting to prevent more misery and suffering. What a programmatic campaign for eugenics on a worldwide basis could do over the decades if not centuries is to lift a curtain of hope, to be substituted for the cloud of concern that the middle classes have pessimistically internalized over the last decades. We are on the cusp of a scientific reality, the uncovering of a human biological nature as never dreamed possible before.

Not merely the identification of potential disabilities in unborn children, the solving of the sadness of infertility, even to the extent of cloning a desired child when no other pathway of biological reproduction is possible. Scientists today are, in addition, and all over the world, searching for enzymatic indicators during the earliest stages of gestation, for the genes of high and low intelligence. When these markers are discovered, given the acknowledged random nature of intelligence variability even within families, it will allow mothers and fathers to

choose the potential intelligence of their child-to-be. The masses will here no doubt once more vote with their test tubes for a eugenic solution.

It may have been biologist **Bentley Glass** who once commented, eventually sexual relations would be freed from their reproductive role. [Eugenics?](#)

The rub is that we now have to teach the elites that biologically determinant decisions guided by scientific knowledge and careful judicial and moral monitoring can give us the world for which we yearn. Here is real, empirical, scientifically-supported evidence for humanity's hope, not the tragic morass of pathologies that the so-called egalitarians are pulling down over the heads of our grandchildren.

[John Glad's Future Human Evolution](#) is an important book. It needs many readers. I am sure it will achieve this goal.

Seymour W. Itzkoff

[Return](#)

Introduction

I am with you, you men and women of a generation, or ever so many generations hence.

Walt Whitman

“Crossing Brooklyn Ferry”

The [Great War](#) and subsequent [Depression](#) undermined the mentality of Empire and class privilege, leaving a vacuum which was filled by an intellectual climate of extreme egalitarianism. Western society of the twentieth century came to be dominated by a new, unified ideology. Freudianism, Marxism, B. F. Skinner's Behaviorism, Franz Boaz's cultural history, and Margaret Mead's anthropology all stressed the marvelous “plasticity” and even “programmability” of *Homo sapiens*. It was explained over and over that human minds differ little in their innate qualities, and that it is upbringing and education which explain the differences among us.

[Software is everything; hardware is identical and thus meaningless](#). The road to **utopia** lies through improved nurture alone. During the last third of the twentieth century, even while scientists were generally allowed to teach the theory of evolution, that freedom did not extend to raising the topic of humanity's future evolution. It is remarkable that this suppression coincided with a revolution in our understanding of genetics. The censorship has now been lifted, and there is agreement even among the most implacable foes of the eugenics movement that the taboo on eugenics can no longer stand.

The issues involved are so fraught with consequence at all levels that, tiny as the group of individuals concerned over the future genetic composition of humankind is, a single ideological spark in this area has the potential to set off an all consuming conflagration, so that hostility all too often squeezes out rational discussion. But no matter how desperately society attempts to avoid these issues, they already stand before us, demanding at least recognition, if not resolution. In this book I attempt to present the heretofore largely suppressed arguments surrounding the current renaissance of the eugenics movement.

Much as we humans might pride ourselves on our achievements, we are really little closer to resolving the great questions of being than when we still dwelled in caves. Time extending endlessly backward or forward is as unimaginable as is time having a beginning or an end. Psychologically, however, we need a map—a concept of being and of our place in the universe—and thus we engage in elaborate mythmaking to fill the vacuum that we find so intolerable. To be durable, a worldview must first explain the universe to us, and then assuage our fears and satisfy our longings. Logic is not a prerequisite. Myth can even contradict itself—not to mention be at variance with the real world. Regardless of when or where we live, we inevitably perceive ourselves as the Middle Kingdom, and either we smile condescendingly at the mythmaking of other cultures or we go to war with them to force upon them our (uniquely correct) worldview. And if we are better at crafting weapons, we are generally able to persuade those we have physically conquered of the superiority of our myths over theirs.

Until the *mid-nineteenth century*, the Western world accepted a literal interpretation of the *Book of Genesis*, but

then the *theory of evolution* presented a radically different explanation of man's origins.

Today, attempting to *reconcile religion with science*, we have created a new mythology which, not surprisingly, is ripe with contradictions. Here are some of them:

a) While other species of animal and plant can undergo significant change over a few generations, we maintain that thousands of generations of the most radically varying conditions of selection and selective mating have left only the most superficial genetic variance within our species.

b) Intellectuals (albeit not the man in the street) are firmly convinced that we are the product of evolution, but they are equally entrenched in the odd assumption that human beings are the one species no longer affected by that process.

c) Even as society pays a premium for ability and gumption in virtually any form of activity, it has become fashionable to claim that such factors play no role in the formation of social classes, which are held to be entirely a function of chance and privilege. Indeed, the scholars who dominate the publishing marketplace and academia deny the very existence of innate IQ variance in human populations.

d) We have developed a huge academic testing industry, but its findings are widely declared to be not merely approximate but lacking in any validity whatever.

e) With the transition to smaller families, we have observed that generation after generation of the intellectually endowed are failing to replace themselves—exactly as was feared by earlier eugenicists—but we accept the phenomenon as natural.

f) We are more and more successfully implementing a process called “medicine” for the elimination of natural selection, and are firmly convinced that future generations will remain unaffected by our reluctance to implement a substitute for natural selection.

g) Hard at work deciphering the map of the human genome, we continue to apply moral criteria to behavior which we will soon be able to explain scientifically.

h) While our social conduct, like that of all other animal species, is necessarily centered around the mating ritual, our perception of this process is governed by a myriad of *camouflaging taboos* and *fetishes*. The gap between **reality** and **fantasy** could not be more crass.

i) We have created a genetic caste society that co-opts talent born into the less privileged castes, efficiently exploiting and manipulating these castes, while at the same time proclaiming equality of opportunity as our slogan.

j) We refuse to recognize that we are a species that perfectly fits the definition of a disease, freeing itself (very temporarily) from the constraints of natural selection and the limitations of natural resources only to wreak havoc on ourselves and our fellow species in a massive assault on the host that we parasitize—the planet.

k) We have created an unsustainable economy dependent on resource exhaustion. At the same time, we proclaim still greater levels of consumption as the goal of society.

l) We proclaim freedom of speech, all the while ruthlessly excoriating any opinion in the area of human genetics which is found offensive by any significant segment of society.

Thus, the revolution in technology has been accompanied, not by the elimination of myth, but by its modification into a denial of biology. The give and take of any political processes is necessarily determined by the relative power of the participants, so that future generations are not taken into consideration during decision-making.

Despite popular opinion and prejudice, the facts of science are inescapable. In the time you take to read this sentence, humankind will have evolved genetically. There are species such as the coelacanth fish, which – incredibly –has survived more than 400 million years, but they are the rare exception. Homo sapiens is a recent link in the evolutionary chain, and over the past century the conditions governing selection in that population have undergone revolutionary changes.

Ultimately, we have to decide how pleased we are with ourselves as a species. This is the great watershed dividing those who favor genetic intervention and those who oppose it. Regardless of our personal attitudes, however, there is no denying the fact that while the genetic lottery has indeed produced many winners, there are many others who have been less fortunate.

The eugenics movement, which can be understood as *human ecology*, has long considered itself a lobby for future generations, arguing that while it is true that we should not be presumptuous in our ability to predict the future, we can define what we want—healthy, intelligent babies who will grow up to be emotionally balanced, broadly altruistic adults. Now, when the majority of people live far beyond their child-bearing years, it is not

those who have survived a horrendous process of natural selection who will populate the planet in the future, but those who have the most offspring. We now have selection by fertility rather than by mortality – a revolutionary change.

On a theoretical plane we are now – finally – in agreement that equality of opportunity is a desirable goal. At the same time, however, we find ourselves in the grip of a social ethos that insists that not only should we enjoy equal rights but also that we are all virtually identical, differing only in upbringing.

Mercifully, joyously, each of us is a unique individual, and this uniqueness extends to the ethnic and national groups that we form. We are not identical machines with differing software. Without exception, all ethnic groups have produced winners as well as losers in the genetic lottery. Interventionists argue that it is our moral duty to do our utmost to pass on to our children – not the same heritage – but the best, unique heritage possible for each of them. Ant interventionists point out that, in breaking off the precious baton handed on from generation to generation, we can easily produce an irreparable disaster. But no decision is also a decision. Many of our everyday decisions are fraught with genetic consequences. Who is having the babies, and how many? Anything that influences fertility is a factor in the new selection.

This can include a stroll to the nearest pharmacy to purchase contraceptive devices, a visit to an abortion clinic, or a decision to reduce or even renounce childbearing so as to be able to advance career and education. In denying free day care and financial child support to all but the welfare population, government provides incentives to some groups to bear children and disincentives to others, and this policy has already become a momentous factor in genetic selection. **Eugenicists** argue that we must accept our place within the physical world – as biological creatures.

To survive as a species with greater philosophical significance than the other animals, they believe we have no choice other than to agree in the area of reproduction to subordinate our interests to those of future generations and begin to manage our populations according to principles that are uncontested when applied to all other species. In short, they advocate replacing natural selection with scientific selection. In the words of **Sir Francis Galton**, the “father” of eugenics and statistics,

What nature does blindly, slowly and ruthlessly, man may do providently, quickly, and kindly. As it lies within his power, so it becomes his duty to work in that direction. 1

This book concerns the meaning of life and intelligence and our place in the universe. It is based on a rational philosophy of life and love for our children, of a consciousness of the burdens and responsibilities of parenthood. It is proffered in a spirit of collegial friendship to concerned men and women of good will – both the proponents and the opponents of the eugenics movement. Hopefully, many of them will share the same values, hopes, and fears. If nothing else, we should be able to agree on the right to disagree. Fraught with history, values, and emotions, the eugenics movement sees itself as based on science, but is not limited to science.

I will here attempt to tie together a number of fields in a syncretic approach. I ask the reader’s understanding in presenting areas which might seem disparate, but any serious, wide-ranging worldview is necessarily eclectic. Humankind has entered into the first stages of a revolution in the general understanding of genetic mechanisms, new biotechnologies, and scientific explanation of areas of human health and behavior previously viewed through a moral prism. The genie of enlightenment cannot be squeezed back into the bottle of ignorance. The prospect of holding in one’s hands in a few years time the complete human blueprint is awe-inspiring, and we must assume that future discoveries in the field of genetics will give us capabilities that we can barely imagine now.

Disagreements on what is attributable to nature and what to nurture will seem quaint, and we will have to ask ourselves as a species what to do next, how to achieve, if not utopia, at least something closer to it than we now have, or at the very least how to survive. Proponents of eugenics see their cause as part of the struggle for human rights – the rights of people who will come after us. Like Martin Luther King, they argue, we may well wonder whether we will ever reach the Promised Land. Perhaps there is no final goal, just the search, but we owe it to our children to begin the journey, to do our best to ensure that they will be born better people than we are, and that they inherit more of our good qualities and fewer of our flaws.

[Back](#)

What Is Eugenics?

This weeping willow!
Why do you not plant a few
For the millions of children not yet born,
As well as for us?
Are they not non-existent, or cells asleep...

Edgar Lee Masters

“Columbus Cheney,” in “Spring River Anthology”

Once the continuity of humankind with the rest of the animal kingdom was established, invigorated attempts to improve the human genome became inevitable. Eugenics is, after all, quite simply, applied human genetics. Five of the first six presidents of the *American Society of Human Genetics* were also members of the board of directors of the *Eugenics Society*. Historically, modern genetics is an offshoot of the eugenics movement, not the reverse.

Positive eugenics refers to approaches intended to raise fertility among the genetically advantaged. These include financial and political stimuli, targeted demographic analyses, in vitro fertilization, egg transplants, and cloning. *Pro-natalist countries* (that is, those that wish to stimulate their birth rates) already engage in moderate forms of positive eugenics. Negative eugenics, which is aimed at lowering fertility among the genetically disadvantaged, is largely encompassed under the rubric of *family planning* and *genetic counseling*. This includes abortions and sterilization. To ensure that such services are available to all on a nondiscriminatory basis, it is advocated that, at a minimum, persons with low income receive such services on a free basis.

Genetic engineering, which was unknown to early eugenicists, consists of active intervention in the germ line without necessarily encouraging or discouraging reproduction of advantaged or disadvantaged individuals.

[Back](#)

Science

Previous Evolution

The wolf, the snake, the hog, not wanting in me,
the cheating look, the frivolous word,
the adulterous wish, not wanting,
Refusals, hates, postponements, meanness, laziness, none of these wanting.

Walt Whitman

“Crossing Brooklyn Ferry”

The question of where to draw the line between closely related species and subspecies can be resolved differently by different observers. In the case of modern human populations, where scientists tend to pursue conflicting sociopolitical agendas, demarcation lines are hotly contested. The system of binomial nomenclature established in the eighteenth century by the Swedish botanist **Karl von Linné** (Carolus Linnaeus) for mapping the relationships among all living things (at least on our planet) lumps together the totality of modern human populations as *Homo sapiens*. All humans alive today, whether bushmen, Australian aborigines, Japanese, Eskimos, or caucasoids, are thus included in a single species, and any discussion of subspecies is regarded with suspicion and hostility.

Issued in response to a statement by the rightist French politician **Jean-Marie Le Pen** on racial inequality, a 1997 statement signed by a group of prominent biologists denied the very existence of race in human populations. Actually, the denial of race had first been made by the eugenicist **Julian Huxley** in 1935. Again, the assertion had been triggered by political events—in this case the promulgation of Hitler’s anti-Jewish pronouncements.² Accordingly we now have a single “modern man,” and he comes in different colors. It is true that modern genetic studies have shown remarkable similarity among all humans, but for that humans and chimpanzees share something like 99% of their non-duplicative DNA.

Scientists now generally agree that modern human populations have their origins in Africa, but there is considerable disagreement as to whether current intergroup differences are explained by evolution dating back

a million years to *Homo erectus* (“multiregionalism”) or whether *Homo sapiens* showed up as a relatively late arrival, roughly 100,000-200,000 years ago, and then proceeded to wipe out competing hominid emigres wherever he came into contact with them (“replacement” theory). The degree to which earlier hominid species interbred remains in the area of speculation, in which the multiregionalists have been accused of making a case for fundamental biological differences that amounts to racism.³

In the words of the scholar **Seymour Itzkoff**, we are dealing here with a “will to believe [which] is reminiscent of the seduction of intellectuals with abstract ideological models in politics and social thought.”⁴ The family trees of the cheetah and the horse provide useful contrasting models. Genetic studies have demonstrated that today’s cheetahs display so little diversity that their ancestors must at one time have come through such a narrow bottleneck that only a few individuals were able to perpetuate the species by inbreeding. Horses, by contrast, display tremendous variance as a result of independent taming and breeding in different parts of the world.

Ultimately, genetics is more like a game of chess, where the development of a position is of strictly historical interest and plays no role in determining the game’s outcome, than it is like bridge, where success is determined largely by the player’s ability to remember which cards were played earlier. The variability so obvious in human populations, even on an intragroup basis, opens the possibility of intervening in human evolution to guide it and even to search for new horizons, regardless of how present variability came about. Where we came from is a fascinating question, but where we are heading is quite another.

Even the replacement school of thought concedes that the human species developed for at least some five to eight thousand generations outside of Africa under radically differing conditions of selection. Such a sequence is sufficient to produce significant differences in the various subpopulations. In addition, still greater diversity would have to be postulated on the basis of the biological diversity that must have been in evidence at the time the various populations left Africa. Since human populations have had a far longer time to evolve in Africa than outside the mother continent, African populations display far greater genetic diversity than do other races, and the tiny populations who wandered out of Africa may well have reflected at least part of this diversity. Moreover, the émigrés may have interbred with other hominid species both in Africa and with those that had arrived still earlier. Animal breeders, by comparison, can achieve significant changes in just a few generations.

These factors, combined with the professional specialization of modern society and selective mating, represent the chief sources of *intra-species variance*. If **Homo sapiens** has been around for perhaps 150,000 years, our future existence may be considerably more ephemeral. Humanity is thus a colony with a beginning and evidently an end and is viewed here, not just as all people alive at any given moment, but as the totality of future people over the entire lifespan of this community. Eugenicists reason that our moral obligations are to all of them, that we are not only part of the planet’s ecology, its custodians as well.

As the mythologist **Joseph Campbell** put it, we are no less than its consciousness.⁵ The renowned geneticist **James V. Neel** studied the society and genetic makeup of the Yanomama of southern Venezuela and northern Brazil and persuasively argued that the structure of their society was typical of human populations during the period when people still lived exclusively in bands, that is, for all but the last 10,000 years.

These were small, isolated populations which practiced polygamy and incest, permitting nature to select among a rich variety of genotypes in widely differing environments. Such conditions were conducive to rapid evolution. Panmixia may still be a long way off, and indeed may never be total, but the ever-increasing outbreeding of human populations is reducing human diversity while at the same time creating large populations that are, perhaps, less prone to sudden, major genetic fluctuations.

History clearly demonstrates that social harmony is especially difficult to achieve in the face of diversity, whether religious, linguistic, or ethnic. The great historical crimes have all been instances of group-on-group violence. And when two or more ethnoses are clearly distinguishable from one another, the situation is fraught with even greater stress. The United States, which renounced the monstrous crime of slavery only to retain blatant discrimination for a century, is now attempting to achieve racial equity, but the fear of racial conflict is and will undoubtedly remain both large and, unfortunately, well founded. At the same time the issue has been blurred, racism being defined as,

- a) group discrimination and hatred
- b) discussion of intergroup differences

The two topics are really quite different, albeit not unrelated.

Society's elites have decided that studies of intergroup differences are too volatile to permit them to be widely discussed and have falsely presented such studies as claiming total separation of group qualities rather than relative statistical frequency of specific characteristics.

We should all be able to agree that *intergroup differences* are a **scientific, not a moral question**. As far as the **eugenics** argument is concerned, they are irrelevant in the most fundamental fashion. Even if the desired breeding resource proves to be distributed differently in some populations than in others, each group contains a vast pool of talented individuals to draw upon in parenting future generations. Regardless of the magnitude of such intergroup differences, the reality is that even on an intragroup basis we ought to be less than pleased with ourselves.

[Back](#)

Testing

A sure test, an easy test:
Those that drink beer are the best,
Brown beer, strongly...

Robert Graves

“Strong Beer”

Since IQ testing was first initiated in the early part of the twentieth century, it has been utilized intensively by the US army both to select recruits and to determine the areas in which they might best be employed. Proponents of the egalitarian grain have delighted in attacking century-old science and then applying their conclusions wholesale to modern science. Certainly early **IQ tests** contained questions that elicit embarrassed smiles among today's testers. For example, was the Knight engine used in the Packard, the Lozier, the Stearns, or the Pierce Arrow? Or does Velvet Joe appear in advertisements of tooth powder, dry goods, tobacco, or soap??

While such questions might have had some limited validity when addressed to young people who had grown up in America, they were obviously inappropriate for people who had recently immigrated to the United States and barely spoke English. Such persons performed badly on the test, but it does not automatically follow that modern tests, which have been worked on assiduously by thousands of psychologists, are equally flawed and thus totally invalid.

Hopefully, the massive expansion of education throughout the world in the twentieth century has helped people not only to acquire specific facts, but also to use their minds more efficiently. But the fear is that dysgenic fertility patterns inherent in modern society have created a population with less innate ability than that of its predecessors.

To approach this question we must first make clear the difference between genotype and phenotype. Genotype is **genetic potential**; phenotype is **realized potential**. For example, statistics show a constantly rising mean height in most of the world. The cause is obviously not altered genes but improved nutrition (and, perhaps, meat laced with hormones). But *genotypes* set limits. If a group of pigmies were to be given excellent food and a group of Massai tribesmen were to be distributed low-quality nourishment, the pigmies would obviously enjoy a height increase and the Massai a decrease, but the pigmies would not become taller than the Massai, and there would be no Lamarckian carry-over to their children.

As the psychologist **Edwin Boring** quipped in a debate with the columnist **Walter Lippman**, “IQ is what IQ tests measure.” This is not necessarily the same thing as raw intelligence. One must distinguish between a conceptual variable and its operational definition. IQ is simply one possible measure of phenotype.

Some estimates of genotypic IQ decline are in the range of 1 to 4 points per generation,⁸ but the New Zealand political scientist **James R. Flynn** has produced a seminal study claiming that IQ scores have actually been steadily increasing. Such tests as the *Stanford-Binet* and the *Wechsler* regularly measure subjects and establish new mean scores and standard deviations. From 1932 to 1978 testers steadily reset norms, each time raising the bar. When the norms are held constant, the mean IQ has risen 13.8 points—nearly one

standard deviation over the course of 46 years.⁹

This is a potentially very encouraging result. It indicates that IQ differences may prove to be relatively more malleable than was previously thought, and the egalitarian ideal, which lies at the heart of the eugenic cause, may be more easily realizable than previously believed. On the other hand, we still can only surmise the constraints laid upon phenotype by genotype. What evidently has happened, if Flynn is correct, is a phenotypic improvement that has overridden genotypic deterioration. The SAT I is intended as an aptitude test, as opposed to the SAT II, which measures knowledge in specific subjects. The SAT I consists of two parts, the SAT V (verbal) and the SAT M (math). Flynn goes on to point out that, simultaneous with the above-mentioned IQ gains, an opposite trend was noted in SAT verbal scores.

SAT scores can be raised by coaching, but improvements are subject to a law of diminishing returns. Math scores rise by roughly 30 points after 40 hours of coaching, and verbal by about 20. But continued improvement of even 50% in scores is not achieved by putting in even six times that number of hours.¹⁰

Testing has generally enjoyed broad public support. In 1979, the *Gallup Organization* asked a representative sample of Americans what they thought of standardized tests. Eighty-one percent responded that they were “very useful” or “somewhat useful.”¹¹ At the same time, a powerful coalition of the *National Education Association*, *National Association for Colored People*, and **Ralph Nader**’s followers adamantly opposed them. The coalition had many influential supporters in government and the press. **Dan Rather**, for example, in the 1975 CBS news special *The IQ Myth* declared that not only were IQ tests relatively useless as measures of intelligence, but that they were biased as well, for “it’s economic class that marks the main dividing line on IQ scores.”¹²

But the coalition did not have the general support of one group that is allied with it on many other issues. Jews invariably come off well in testing, and thus it is not surprising that the *American Jewish Committee*, the *Anti-Defamation League*, and the *American Jewish Congress* have all filed amicus briefs with the Supreme Court in opposition to Affirmative Action programs.

[Back](#)

g-loading

Lord, make me to know mine end,
and the measure of my days, what it is;
that I may know how frail I am.

Psalm XXXIV, 4

Does such a thing as general intelligence (“g”) exist, or does each individual possess a disparate collection of unrelated abilities –that is, multiple intelligences? Any scientific discussion of “unitary intelligence” is fraught with political significance for it can be interpreted as providing the measure of a person’s overall worth or ranking.

Proponents of general intelligence, beginning with **Charles Spearman** in the early twentieth century, have pointed out the positive correlation between spatial, numerical, and verbal abilities. An IQ score is essentially a numerical **expression of g**. On the other hand, there is no denying the existence of idiot-savants –people who have difficulty in coping with even the most elementary everyday tasks but who may be accomplished musicians or sculptors, can add a series of numbers with no less precision than a calculator, or can easily recount weather conditions on a randomly selected day in the eighteenth century. In other words, the correlation between their one special ability and their other abilities is negative.

And we need not limit ourselves to the exceptional. When specialized aptitude tests were administered to a group of students in place of global measures of intelligence, more than half of them scored in the top 10% on a specific ability.¹⁴ How then to compare or evaluate disparate abilities? The significance of **g-loadings** may well be exaggerated –or even a non sequitur. Given the limited physical space occupied by the brain, hyper-development of certain abilities may even necessarily come at the expense of others. In many ways the question is like the proverbial glass which is either half empty or half-full. It all depends on the observer’s point of view.

[Back](#)

IQ Decline

Tis folly to decline,
And steal inglorious to the silent grave...

Sir William Jones

“An Ode: In Imitation of Alcaeus”

How can we best protect the interests of still unborn generations? This is extremely difficult in a world where many regard children as an ordinary commodity. The so-called “*demographic transition*,” in which people in advanced societies choose to have fewer children, is even studied by economists and demographers in all manner of curves, graphs, and charts, establishing the cost of one child as the equivalent of X number of automobiles, televisions, or what have you. What are the consequences for the gene pool of selecting out young women of ability to pursue education and careers, thus reducing their fertility (in 20% of U.S. couples, delayed fertility turns out to be cancelled fertility) while remunerating young women of lesser ability on the basis of how many children they bear, even denying them abortions when they themselves request them?

Whereas girls in countries with developed welfare programs can choose to escape school by becoming pregnant if they find themselves unable to cope with an academic program, an early 2001 study showed that fully a third of American women earning more than \$55,000 a year are childless at age 40 and are likely to live out their lives without ever giving birth.¹⁵ While “*Total Fertility Rates*” (**TFR** –the number of children a woman has in her lifetime) represent an important yardstick in measuring fertility patterns, generational length also plays a role. Obviously, the earlier a woman begins having children, the more offspring she can bear. Imagine two groups, in one of which women have their children at the average age of 20 and the other at 30. The first group will effectively have 50% more children than the first even if the **TFR** is identical. In the New York Longitudinal Study of Youth, for example, women in the bottom 5% of intelligence had their first baby more than seven years earlier than women in the top 5%.¹⁶

Abortion is significant in terms of the eugenics argument to the degree that it affects selection, particularly when the service is readily available to high-IQ groups, who can easily pay for it, but is denied to low-IQ groups, who are dependent on receiving the service on a subsidized or free basis. The abortion rate is related to years of education, which can be used as an imperfect substitute for **IQ**. In 1979, the standardized U.S. abortion rate by years of education for women 20 years of age and older was 44.3 for women with a high school education but only 3.2 for those who had less than eight years of schooling.¹⁷ Another significant dysgenic factor is war.

The creature who sees himself as molded in the image of *God* has used his improved technology to do vastly greater violence not only to his environment but also to himself. And it has been the egalitarians, not the hereditarians, who have been the least squeamish about murder and exile, be it in Russia, China, or Cambodia. There is a sad consistency to their logic: if everyone is the same, anyone who interferes with achieving utopia in our time can simply be eliminated and replaced when the next generation shows up.

War as a destructive mechanism of natural selection became a frequently discussed topic when “the flower” of Europe’s youth marched off to die en masse in the trenches of World War I. It was, after all, this particular conflict which introduced IQ testing to select out young men of ability more accurately for use as cannon fodder.

In instances of violent civil conflict, too, force is targeted most heavily at the real and potential opposition. Since opposition by definition involves thought and ideological dedication, the targets of destruction, more frequently than not, are persons of ability. The historian **Nathaniel Weyl** christened the phenomenon “aristocide.”¹⁸ Statistical analysis demonstrates that such a process produces a relatively modest lowering of the mean population IQ, but disastrous reductions in the number of persons with exceptionally high scores.¹⁹

The contribution of outstanding individuals to culture, science, and the general quality of life is disproportionate to their numbers. Just imagine what the history of music would be like without just a handful of the great composers –Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Brahms, Stravinsky, Mendelssohn. The same sort of “short list” could be made up of physicists, mathematicians, philosophers. Eliminate these geniuses and the average ability level of the next generations will not be altered perceptibly, but how impoverished our world would be!

The consequences of such a process are obviously alarming. Even with a **relatively stable mean IQ**, a society in which the intellectual leadership is significantly reduced is an impoverished society – at least relative to its original state. The lesson to be drawn is that the turbulence and magnitude of social upheaval do not have a necessary relationship to their genetic consequences.

Genetic Illnesses

There is no such thing as immutability in biological stocks, for with each new generation a species inherits new genes in the form of mutations. On rare occasions a mutation can improve the individual's survivability chances, and the new gene then becomes more widespread in the population as a whole. Nevertheless, the vast majority of mutations end up reducing the number of offspring. This is the classic balance of mutation and death which is called "natural selection," and it is accepted by biologists as decisive in all species. This book aims to pose certain broad philosophical questions about the values and goals of human civilization and the path which humankind will follow in consciously choosing either to pursue or to reject artificial selection. It is not intended as a discussion of the complexities of human genetic disease. By way of analogy, one could compare this document to a roadmap rather than to an automobile repair manual, but a few particularly important nuts and bolts still need to be mentioned.

We have made such advances in medicine that natural selection has been reduced to almost zero. Already 98% of Americans survive at least to their twenty-fifth birthday.²⁰ Medicine is intended largely to benefit its creators –the currently living. Thus, if we speak about illness, the emphasis is on "horizontally transmitted" infectious diseases over "vertically transmitted" genetic diseases. It is, after all, very difficult for a doctor, a pharmaceutical company, or a hospital to collect a fee from people who have yet to be born. Medicine is a business that depends on paying clients, and the most motivated clients –those who not only can but who are eager to pay –are the ones who are hurting now.

The Encyclopedia Britannica succinctly presents some of the salient facts related to the 3,500 autosomal dominant, autosomal recessive, and sex-linked disorders that have already been catalogued (the list is rapidly expanding):

Epidemiological surveys suggest that approximately 1 percent of all newborns have a single gene defect and that 0.5 percent have gross chromosomal anomalies severe enough to produce serious physical defects and mental retardation. Of the 3 to 4 percent of newborns with birth defects, surveys indicate that at least half suffer a major genetic contribution. A minimum of 5 percent of all conceptions that evidence themselves have gross chromosomal anomalies, and 40 to 50 percent of spontaneous abortions involve chromosomally abnormal embryos. About 40 percent of all infant mortality is due to genetic disease; 30 percent of pediatric and 10 percent of adult patients require hospital admission because of genetic disorders.

Medical investigators estimate that genetic defects –albeit often minor – are present in 10 percent of all adults.... About 20 percent of all stillbirths and infant deaths are associated with severe anomalies, and about 7 percent of all births show some mental or physical defect.²¹ It gets scarier. Spontaneous mutation rates, genetic "typos," have been estimated at 200 per person,²² most of which appear to be neutral, but an unknown percentage of which are undesirable when expressed, their effects being cumulative. Aside from genetic anomalies which are necessary and sufficient to cause a specific illness, a much larger number of multifactorial illnesses exist in which certain genes create a disposition toward specific illnesses, for example, most cancers, diabetes, and hypertension.

Early eugenicists had the naïve notion that simply to prevent persons suffering from genetic illness from having children was sufficient to produce a healthier population with each generation; however, most genes which cause diseases are both recessive and extremely rare. Thus, the number of carriers greatly outnumbers the number of persons actually affected, and the nonreproduction of actively ill individuals could achieve only an extremely slow reduction of the disease in subsequent generations. This means that if an undesirable trait occurred in 1% of the population it would take 90 generations to reduce the incidence to 0.01 and 900 generations under conditions of random mating to achieve a reduction to the level of one in a million.²³ Even then, a natural spontaneous mutation rate would remain, which would also have to be countered on a never-ending basis.

Genetic engineering techniques are advancing rapidly. It is already possible for carriers of genetic diseases to conceive children in vitro, then perform embryo screening, known as preimplantation genetic diagnosis, and select a healthy embryo for implantation in the mother's womb. This is a eugenic technique which is already being implemented on a voluntary, gradual basis. In the not so distant future it will be possible to make changes in the germ cells (those involved in reproduction), and not just in the somatic cells (those not involved in reproduction). Germ-line therapy does not fit into either positive or negative eugenics, both of which amount to encouraging or discouraging an individual from entering into the sequence of generations, but such therapy is

unquestionably eugenics. When the possibility first arose, the general attitude was one of absolute condemnation; now the tendency is to speak more in terms of a moratorium of this new therapy. The bioethicist Fritz Mann at the Free University of Brussels writes:

Aside from religious grounds, there exists no ethical justification for not influencing the germ line. If one day a cure is discovered for healing a hereditary disease in this fashion, not only for its bearer, but for all his descendants, what reason could there be for forbidding it?²⁴

Such an achievement will represent a genetic breakthrough, but the puzzle of genes and their interactions is only beginning to be solved. Nevertheless, geneticists are already altering the germ lines of plants and animals, and human germ-line therapy is only a question of time. Meanwhile, genetic counseling and treatment are on occasion helping those alive today at the expense of future generations. A prospective parent who knows that he or she is the carrier of a recessive gene which can cause illness in subsequent generations, can selectively abort fetuses in which the gene will be actively expressed. Thus, the immediate children of the union are free from the illness, but the number of carriers of the recessive gene increases further down the generational chain. The question is whether parents have a moral right to bring children into the world who will be disadvantaged by their heredity.

To quote the philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas,

“my son is not simply my creation, like a poem or an object. He is not my property.”²⁵

Can parental responsibility be sloughed off, denied? Marcus Pembrey, a professor at the Institute of Child Health at the University of London, in discussing genetic counseling argues that The aim should not be to reduce the birth incidence of genetic diseases, because to make that the objective of the services would be to by-pass the mother's choice in the matter of selective abortion... The view that reduction in the birth incidence of genetic disorders is not an appropriate objective for genetic services is finding wide acceptance.

This is the so-called “personal service model”²⁷ of genetic counseling, which subordinates children's well-being to that of their parents. Such a view could well be challenged in the courts, perhaps in wrongful life legal suits (which first appeared in the United States in 1964, claiming wrongful death suits as a legal precedent) or even on a class-action basis. Whereas we may have previously lacked the knowledge to reduce genetic illnesses, the ignorance argument will have less and less weight in the future. The parental appeasement posture will not be comparable to the Thalidomide baby scandal of 1957-1961, for this will be an act committed with full knowledge and intent.

Germ-line interventions will encounter resistance from people who feel, some on religious grounds, that such therapy is “unnatural” and that we have no right to “play God.” Even conventional care is rejected, for example, by certain religious groups, and one occasionally comes across newspaper articles describing a family whose child has died for lack of medical treatment. There will also be nonreligious objections by people who are wary of making mistakes. Indeed errors are a real possibility. When we will have achieved a much better understanding of human genetics, however, the nonreligious objectors will have considerably less wind in their sails. Israel has been a forerunner in genetic counseling. In the words of a researcher at Ben-Gurion University, “Eugenic thinking is alive and well [in Israel] today.”²⁸ Gideon Bach, head of Genetics at the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem commented:

We now know that most, if not all, human disorders have a genetic background, and we're acquiring the tools to study, treat and eventually prevent or cure them.... Israel, with many inbred ethnic groups, has proven a rich human laboratory for genetic detectives. It's far easier to trace genetic anomalies in inbred groups with homogeneous pedigrees.²⁹

Ashkenazim, who until some forty years ago largely intermarried, carry a dozen recessive genetic diseases with relatively high frequency. The best known is an autosomal disorder christened Tay-Sachs after its description in 1881 by the British ophthalmologist Warren Tay. It is caused by the hereditary lack of a crucial enzyme that normally breaks down fatty waste products found in the brain. If both parents are carriers of the gene, the child has a 25% chance of suffering from the disease, and a 50% chance of being a carrier. One in 27 Jews in the United States carries the gene. A baby suffering from the disease at first appears normal, but becomes hypersensitive to sound after a few months. Eventually the child becomes deaf, blind, mentally retarded, and unresponsive to outside stimuli. Death results by age five.

In 1985, Rabbi Joseph Eckstein, citing the Bible and the Talmud, founded the international genetic testing program call Dor yeshorim (“generation of the righteous”) with the goal of preventing further children from being born with the illness. In the program, Orthodox Jewish students are tested to determine if they carry the gene. If only one prospective parent is a carrier they are not advised against marriage, but if both test positive they are

counseled to choose a different marriage partner.

Israel has one of the highest screening rates in the world, testing well over ten thousand people a year.³⁰ The writer Naomi Stone expresses what is evidently the general Jewish attitude toward prevention of Tay-Sachs:

Perhaps, the disease can be eradicated entirely from populations where it is concentrated, and if this were the case, who could reasonably express qualms?... I am an Ashkenazi Jew, and I know that it is my obligation to be acutely aware of my heightened risk factor for the disease.³¹

Understandably, eugenic practices in the United States are often resisted among representatives of the handicapped community. Bioethicist Adrienne Asch writes:

My moral opposition to prenatal testing and selective abortion flows from the conviction that life with disability is worthwhile and the belief that a just society must appreciate and nurture the lives of all people, whatever the endowments they receive in the natural lottery.³²

Much the same position is held by the Canadian ethicist Tom Koch, who believes that all diseases are part of the diversity of the human race.³³

Gregor Wolbring, another Canadian active in the movement of handicapped persons against eugenics, goes even further:

I can say, without hesitation, that my life has been richer because I have MS. How can anyone who has no experience with disabilities understand that?³⁴ Mr. Wolbring, who runs a website with materials both supporting and attacking the eugenics movement³⁵, points out that he himself is opposed to eugenics.

Another internet document reads:

The underlying issue in eugenics is that someone decides, based on stated or unstated values, which characteristics are worthy enough to be part of society and which are not [Discrimination]...

The key question is how a society (social eugenics) or a person (personal eugenics) decides which characteristics are permissible in an offspring/ offspring to be. Can a society influence or regulate the decisions of social/personal eugenics? Is there a rational way to distinguish between Tay-Sachs, beta-Thalassemia, sickle cell anemia, thalidomide, Alzheimer, PKU, gender, sexual orientation (if a way were ever found to predict it), mental illness, cystic fibrosis, cerebral palsy, spina bifida, achondroplasia (dwarfism), hemophilia, Down Syndrome, coronary heart disease, osteoporosis, and obesity?... A war of characteristics is on, which will disenfranchise many characteristics from the human rights movement and from equality rights. This has to stop."³⁶

While this anonymous author does indeed raise thorny questions with regard to certain characteristics –for example, sexual orientation, dwarfism, and obesity –the defense of some of the named horrendous diseases is disconcerting, albeit stemming from a legitimate and well-founded fear of discrimination against the persons who suffer from them. It is our duty to ensure that we indeed discriminate against the disease and not against the victims.

[Back](#)

Scientific Method

Any attempt to channel the sexual act requires that society first dismantle the devilish scaffolding of taboos, phobias, neuroses, and fetishes that has been erected around human reproduction.³⁷ Given the fundamental continuity of the human animal with the entire biological kingdom in general and with mammals specifically – including such intimately related species as the higher primates –the revolution in developmental and molecular biology is resetting the intellectual climate by conceptualizing human reproduction in accordance with the principles of animal breeding.

Genetic selection presupposes genetic variation; otherwise there would be nothing to select from. Heritability is the yardstick by which both natural and artificial selection are measured. Heritability scores are mathematical correlations ranging from 1 (a parental trait is inevitably passed on to the children) to 0 (the children are no more or less likely to possess it).

The heritability of economic traits has been intensively studied for farm animals.

For example, milk production is 0.25, yearling body weight in sheep is in the range of 0.2 - 0.59, and feedlot

gain in beef cattle is 0.5 - 0.55.³⁸ The heritability for height among white European and North American populations is 0.9.³⁹ Using data from twin studies, Thomas Bouchard and colleagues at the University of Minnesota have placed the overall heritability of personality at about 0.5. Heritabilities of social attitudes are even higher: 0.65 for radicalism, 0.54 for tough-mindedness, and 0.59 for religious leisure time interests. Occupational interests correlate at about 0.36.⁴⁰

One study of monozygotic (identical) and dizygotic (fraternal) twins showed that monozygotic twins showed a significantly higher correlation than dizygotic twins for being frank, active, talkative, gregarious, extroverted, assertive, calm, self-confident, even-tempered, emotionally stable, kind, polite, pleasant, agreeable, thorough, neat, systematic, conscientious, inventive, imaginative, original creative, open to experience, refined, sophisticated, and flexible. Model-fit analyses suggested about 40% genetic, 25% shared environmental, and 35% nonshared environmental influence.⁴¹ Although the heritability of any trait or combination of traits can be measured along this same scale, it is the intelligence controversy which has attracted the most heated attention. Low estimates of IQ heritability in human populations are generally on the order of 0.4, with 0.8 being the ceiling for high estimates.

How to disentangle nature from nurture? The correlation between the IQ scores of the same person taking the same test a second time can serve as a benchmark; it is 0.86.⁴² The prominent English psychologist Cyril Burt located a number of identical twins who had been raised separately. In 1966 he reported an IQ correlation of 0.77 among 53 pairs of identical twins whom he had studied. When Burt, who died in 1971, was posthumously accused of having falsified his data, the purported scandal made for major news. Now, however, a great deal more research has been done on the topic, and Burt's findings have been replicated repeatedly, including Bouchard's study of 8,000 twin pairs, which came up with a correlation of 0.76 for identical twins reared separately and 0.87 for those reared together.⁴³

In another study of adopted children, conducted by Sandra Scarr and Richard A. Weinberg, also at the University of Minnesota, the adoptees' IQ scores correlated significantly more positively with those of their biological than with those of their adoptive parents.⁴⁴ Natural selection depends not only on genetic variation but also on environmental variation. The greater the range of the two forms of variation, the greater the intensity of selection—that is, the faster the rate of evolution. For millennia now, without any knowledge of Darwin's theory of evolution, people have been able to pursue artificial selection successfully in plants and animals by simply breeding the most desirable individuals with each other under the principle "like breeds like." This is still the chief methodology of animal breeders. When, however, low variation or low heritability impede selection, modern genetic tools are employed: frozen semen, separation of male- and female-producing sperm, superovulation, embryo storage and transfer, in vitro fertilization, and transfer of genetic material.

The use of artificial insemination renders eugenic measures applied to males far more effective than to females. For example, by employing modern techniques a bull can theoretically be made to produce 200,000 breeding units of semen per year.⁴⁵ One bull already has 2.3 million granddaughters.⁴⁶ Furthermore, sperm can be frozen for long-term storage and later use.

If there is no shortage of premium-quality sperm, the same is also true of eggs. Only a tiny percentage of the eggs created in human females at birth are ever fertilized. In vitro fertilization, with resulting embryos implanted in a womb other than that of the original mother, would make it possible to achieve a revolution in population quality without creating a quantitative bottleneck.

Cloning is a still newer technique. During the process a genetically identical copy of a biological organism is produced by asexual means. Cloning is common in nature. Any plant that can grow from a cutting, or animal tissue that can reproduce itself in a Petri dish, in the process also produce clones.

During laboratory cloning ("nuclear transfer"), the genetic code of an individual organism is inserted into an egg that has been stripped of its own nucleus, and that egg is then implanted in the womb of a "birth mother," just as is already done in cases of in vitro fertilization. The child who is born is the donor's identical twin. The first animal clones were produced in the late 1950s. In 1993 US researchers experimentally cloned a human being as a possible treatment for infertility, but the experiment raised a storm of criticism.

The cloning of the sheep "Dolly" did not take place until 1996. Other mammals already cloned by scientists include horses, rabbits, cows, goats, deers, pigs, cats, rats, and mice. The current debate on cloning is focused on therapeutic cloning. For example, it may be possible in the future to clone cells from a person suffering from

cardiac insufficiency, develop those replacement cells into heart muscle, and then transplant that muscle back into the same patient without fear of rejection.

The real issue, however, is reproductive cloning –conceiving babies who will be brought to term and who will enter the general population as independent persons. Reproductive cloning can be pursued for two reasons: first, as a device to combat infertility, and second, to enrich the human gene pool. I refer here to the latter as “eugenic cloning.” Cloned embryos, as well as embryos produced during in vitro fertilization, could be implanted in a womb which might be human, animal, or even artificial.

“We can see all too clearly where the train is headed, and we do not like the destination,” wrote Leon Kass, chief of George W. Bush’s Bioethics Council.⁴⁷ Revealingly, Kass, who is an observant conservative Jew, has also come out against the dissection of cadavers, organ transplantation, in-vitro fertilization, cosmetic surgery, and sexual liberation. Virginia Postrel, editor-at-large of Reason magazine, responded to the views expressed by Kass by commenting that “This isn’t about the 20th century. It’s about the 16th.”⁴⁸

Much of the criticism of cloning stems from a fundamental misunderstanding –that there is an intent to produce a race of identical creatures lacking any and all individuality. This is definitely not the case, and no such practice has ever been advocated. Rather, it is the expectation that persons born as the result of a cloning process would enter into normal sexual relations with the vastly greater population of individuals born as the result of traditional sex and would multiply in the traditional fashion, thus increasing the frequency of advantageous genes in the following generations.

Despite some well-publicized successes, there remain a number of difficulties to be worked out, and the failure rate is still high. For example, cloned animals often have abnormal placentas –a factor that affects size and survival. Part of the problem evidently lies in abnormalities in gene expression. Much of the resistance to cloning comes from religious groups, but is not limited to them. Aside from a fully legitimate fear that we may still not be knowledgeable enough to proceed immediately to human cloning, the resistance to cloning per se is startlingly reminiscent of the traditional argument against evolution –that it is “an assault on human dignity.”

That was precisely the text and heading of an open letter addressed to President George W. Bush in the Washington Times in January, 2002, signed by 29 conservative political and religious leaders.⁴⁹ The media have waged an energetic campaign against cloning. We have examples in the 1976 novel, *The Boys from Brazil* by Ira Levin, made into a film starring James Mason in 1978, and most recently in 2002, with the appearance of *Star Wars Part II: Attack of the Clones*. There is even a canard as to whether human cloning methods might be patentable.

The New York Times is entirely correct: “Opposition to reproductive cloning is universal in Congress,”⁵⁰ and if any senator or congressman secretly harbors a more benign view of the procedure, the chance that he or she will express that opinion publicly is absolutely zero. In 2001, the House of Representatives voted to ban all forms of cloning, but the Senate resisted a total disallowment. Congress has thus resolved to criminalize reproductive cloning, even though Congress’s unanimity in this area is not shared by everyone in the scientific and scholarly community. According to the Wall Street Journal, “some diplomats said they believe the U.S. stand in the U.N. was primarily intended to score domestic political points with religious conservatives and antiabortion activists.”⁵¹

But such moods are hardly limited to the United States. On November 6, 2003, by a 80-79 vote, with 15 abstentions, the United Nations narrowly resolved to delay by two years a vote supported by the United States and the Vatican to outlaw both therapeutic and reproductive cloning. A number of other countries supported a Belgian proposal to ban reproductive cloning while permitting therapeutic cloning. Animal breeding methods usually amount to producing a specific type on the basis of very strict characteristics. The same is true for plant selection, in which a rich variety of strains is usually replaced by a few monocultures.

Nothing of the sort would be appropriate for human populations. Human selection, as proposed by proponents of eugenics, would be aimed at a far more limited reduction in genetic variance. Diversity is viewed not simply as a great source of strength but also as an integral part of what we are and want to be. A certain reduction of this variability, on the other hand, is the mathematical goal. Eugenicists argue that even a very significant channeling of motherhood and a far more stringent selection among men would still leave billions of people

reproducing. By comparison, all thoroughbred race horses stem from three Middle Eastern stallions, and natural selection can be even more draconian.

[Back](#)

Mapping the Human Genome

We have the intestines of chickens
to tell the fortunes of war.
We have slaves
that they might be silent.
We have stones
that we might build.
Why then should we trouble the gods?
Osip Mandelstam

“Nature is the Same Rome...”

Genetics is a very young science. The theory of evolution was not forwarded until the late 1850s. In 1866 the Austrian monk Gregor Mendel had begun to attempt to pry open the secret of creation when he published the results of his controlled pollination of the garden pea, but his discoveries were ignored for the rest of the century, and Galton never learned of them. Even the discovery of the mechanism of fertilization as a union of the nuclei of male and female sex cells was not made until 1875; 1888 saw the discovery of certain deeply stained bodies in cell nuclei, which were christened “chromosomes,” and in 1909 the word “gene” came to be applied to the Mendelian factors of heredity.

The first in vitro fertilization (rabbit and also monkey) was not achieved until 1934, and as for the double helical structure of DNA, its discovery dates back only to 1953. This is all so recent that although early eugenicists had set their goals and methods they were largely ignorant of the mechanisms involved.

The mapping of the human genome is still in an early stage. The amount we don't know vastly dwarfs what we do know. There appear to be approximately three billion bases, or chemical letters, making up the nucleotide sequences that form 20,000 to 25,000 genes which code directly for proteins. Just how genes and the proteins they produce interact is still poorly understood.⁵² But protein-coding genes comprise only 2% of the human genome. The functions of other DNA sequences are still largely a mystery.

We do know that some of them contain switches that turn genes on and off, and we have learned that at the ends of the chromosomes there are telomeres, whose shortening appears to be related to the aging process, and nonfunctional genomic parasites, whose only function in our bodies seems to be to replicate themselves. An estimated 40-48% consists of repeat sequences. Even when we will have sequenced the genome, we will still have to determine how these data relate to expression. The sequences are only a parts list to a grand machine, the outlines of which we are only beginning to trace.

Scholarly opinion is rapidly growing more cognizant of the role of genes in human society. In 1998, University of Massachusetts political scientist Diane Paul wrote that just fourteen years earlier, in 1984, she had labeled as “hereditarian” or “biological determinist” the view that differences in mentality and temperament were substantially influenced by genes—employing these terms as though their meanings were unproblematic. That usage today would surely be contested. For the view implicitly disparaged by these labels is once again widely accepted by scientists and the public alike.⁵³ The bottom line is that with every day we gain greater knowledge and that in the not all that distant future we will be able to predict with a high degree of certainty the genetic load that we are passing on to future generations.

[Back](#)

Ideology

Essential Conditions

For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

Proponents of eugenics see the movement as an integral component of an environmentalist policy. They reason that, while we cannot predict the distant future, we can with a fair degree of confidence trace out certain conditions which will always be essential or at the very least desirable:

- a supply of natural resources
- a clean, biodiverse environment
- a human population no larger than the planet can comfortably sustain on an indefinite basis
- a population which is healthy, altruistic, and intelligent

The blessings that we are reaping from the industrial revolution are, to a significant degree, unsustainable. We are systematically depleting the planet's riches. Debates as to how long this or that resource will hold out are essentially trivial in the greater scheme of things, for eventually we will have thoroughly sifted through the earth's accessible subsoil. The only resources that we can count on over the long run are those which are truly renewable or inexhaustible. As for science-fiction fantasies about relocating to other planets, this "trash-the-world" vandalism is unfeasible for billions of people. Of course, it can be argued that the inevitability of resource exhaustion makes it a non-topic.

What is the difference if this process is completed sooner or later? The eugenicists' response is a moral one. We embarked upon the industrial revolution only two centuries ago, and we have a huge transition to go through if we do not wish our offspring to return to a hunter-gatherer economy in which there will be precious little left either to hunt or to gather. We need to husband our precious, finite resources to get through this transition in as chary a fashion as possible.

Traditional societies live in harmony with nature. Modern industrial society clearly does not, and we have already overwhelmed much of Nature's ability to heal itself. An enormous number of species have been wiped out, while still others have been transported by man to different environments where, lacking natural enemies, they have followed the example of man in replicating his devastation. Globalization is already delivering devastating blows to the planet's biodiversity. As for pollution, while it has gone so far that it becomes too painful to even read about in the papers, much of it can still be reversed.

And there are population problems which may overwhelm the planet in a relatively short period. In traditional societies children, being the only form of social security around, represent for their parents an economic good. More is better. In economically developed societies, on the other hand, children are strictly an economic liability, and the surest way to maximize consumption (for many the ultimate purpose of life) is at the very least to reduce the number of children.

In 2003, the Total Fertility Rate in East Asia was below replacement at 1.7. The national TFR had even dropped to 1.3 in Japan and Taiwan. Europe's TFR had fallen to 1.4. Canada's and the United States' TFR were 1.5 and 2, respectively. In sharp contrast, Latin America's TFR was 2.7, while Africa's was 5.2.

The global TFR was 2.8, the planet's population having swollen six-fold over the last 250 years. It is still growing by leaps and bounds, although more slowly than formerly. The largest growth is taking place in the poorest countries. While it is hoped that the entire world will eventually pass through the demographic transition, it is not impossible that before this happens individual countries will undergo horrendous Malthusian collapse. Bangladesh, for example, which has a population of 134 million on a land mass roughly the size of the state of Wisconsin, most of which is an alluvial flood plain frequently ravaged by hurricanes, is projected to increase its population to 255 million by the year 2050. Other countries provide even more rapid growth rates:

The Palestinians during the same period are predicted to increase their numbers to form a population 3.3 times its current size, and this on land where water is already in critical shortage.

India is projected to add as many people as Europe's entire population by that time.⁵⁴

Demographic predictions are not made with any claim to precision. There are low, medium, and high projections. And there are questions to which no one has any answers. What is the long-term carrying capacity of the planet? How many lives will be carried off by phenomena that reduce the population not by decreasing fertility but by increasing mortality? Already there are projections of a loss of fifty million deaths from AIDS. Where will it end? What new plagues lurk around the corner? Military conflicts could easily result in the deaths of billions of people. Demographic predictions are really no better than stock market predictions. In any case, eugenicists argue that the wisest approach is to err on the side of caution. A smaller population capable of surviving by the use of current renewable resources will create less stress and make the transition to a new economy more manageable.

[Back](#)

Altruism

You among the dry, dead beech-leaves, in the fire of night,
Burnt like a sacrifice, you invisible...

D. H. Lawrence

“Scent of Irises,” 1916

Darwin pointed out that natural selection favors behavioral patterns which promote survivability. Suicidal behavior, it would seem, should lead to the destruction of the animal involved, thus preventing it from reproducing. How then, sociobiologists asked, could the behavior of a honeybee be explained when, in stinging a perceived threat to the hive, it rips out its own belly together with the stinger and thus perishes? The answer is that survivability of the genotype, not of the individual, is crucial. Although the individual bee dies, the other members of the hive are genetically identical copies, and the chances for the survival of their genes are improved by the sacrifice of the individual.

Up until quite recently, survival of a human individual was extremely problematic. People are physically unimpressive animals, with easily torn skin, no claws, weak musculature, and atrophied canines. In primitive times opportunistic out-of-clan cannibalism would have improved survival chances. Thus, such individuals or groups would have been viewed not merely as enemies but as potential food. We are the products of precisely such an evolutionary process. In all animal species, out-of-family altruism is the rare exception.

Survival requires maximum expenditure of effort, and efforts expended on alien genes (dispersed or nonfocused altruism) waste effort and thus, by definition, reduce survivability. Most traits are arranged along a continuum, and altruism is no exception. If a statistical curve were drawn to display diffuse altruism at one end and focused altruism at the other, the result would be radically skewed toward focused altruism –that is, toward immediate offspring. As man moved into larger groups (tribes), specialization and cooperation went hand in hand.

The skew was retained but became less pronounced, and people learned to “live by the rules” and even to feign nonfocused altruism. But the genes really didn’t really change all that much. Homo sapiens’s political history presents an unbroken string of violence, and any objective determination of his coordinates within the animal kingdom places him among the predators. What sort of a society do we want? To the degree that altruism is determined by our genes, artificial selection could theoretically make it possible to create a social profile skewed toward diffuse altruism. The difficulty of working toward a better society is that such a process necessarily entails effort and even sacrifice on the part of the currently living, who have the power of absolute dictators.

All this leads to gloomy conclusions. Professor of human ecology Garrett Hardin wrote that it is futile to expect people to act against their own self-interest,⁵⁵ and the bioethicist Peter Singer defines “reciprocal altruism” as merely a “technical term for cooperation.”⁵⁶ The big question, of course, is how to select for altruism. The same questions must be answered here as for other traits. How to measure? What are the relative contributions of nature and nurture? Which genes come into play and in which combinations? What is the heritability? What combinations of positive and negative eugenic approaches are likely to prove most effective?

A good Trekkie, the eugenicist wishes to create a global civilization which does not set consumption as its primary goal but longs for a loving, nonpredatory society that pursues the goal of intellectual enrichment, a society that will achieve a material standard of living as a byproduct of this mentality. Culture and science are seen as goals in and of themselves, not just means to a material end. A high material standard of living is viewed as coming from knowledge and love, not the reverse.

No philosophy of life can logically justify its basic premises. These are givens, the values of the individual or the group. The society that acclaims maximized material consumption as its ultimate goal, that expresses only passing concern for the fate of future generations, that places no value in culture and science other than that which derives from their contribution to consumption, proceeds from a point of reference that cannot be logically overthrown. Such a worldview is the product of an evolutionary process of selection which rewarded clan-specific altruism.

By contrast the eugenics movement advocates a universalism that encompasses all humanity while recognizing the continuity of our species with all other species on this planet, disavowing any exclusively homocentric orientation that would view our fellow creatures as mere fodder for our usage. Eugenicists also perceive a need to be open to genetic manipulation, machine enhancement, and even contact with beings from other planets.

The operative phrase of this ethical system is “the greater good,” which is understood more in the spirit of John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) than in the hedonistic pronouncements of a Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). The philosophy extends beyond the creature universe to thought itself.

Eugenicists argue that there is much in our genes which may have been advantageous to previous generations and species, but conditions have now changed radically. They maintain that we can either work with nature and achieve utopia, or we can in our greed reject reform and perish. Dangerous? Unquestionably. It is entirely possible, for example, to create people with limited intelligence to perform our manual labor for us, just as we currently import such persons through our national immigration policy. Given our current, still limited understanding, we can easily overestimate our power to predict. And there is the danger of being overly narrow in separating the desirable from the undesirable.

[Back](#)

Society and Genes

Politics: Manipulation Masked as Democracy

I believe in the division of labor. You send us to Congress; we pass laws under which you make money... and out of your profits, you further contribute to our campaign funds to send us back again to pass more laws to enable you to make more money.

Senator Boies Penrose (R-Pa), 1896

There are two things that are more important in politics.

The first is money and I can't remember what the second one is.

Senator Mark Hanna (R-Oh)

Chairman of the Republican National Committee, 1896 In 1999, even as we forged into the new millennium, the Gallup Poll found that 68% of Americans still favored teaching creationism together with evolution in the schools, with 40% favoring exclusively creationism; 47% percent subscribed to the view that,

“God created human beings pretty much in their present form at one time within the last 10,000 years of so” (up from 44% in 1982!).⁵⁷ In the words of the theologian John C. Fletcher, such “controversy clouds rational discussion with fear and misunderstanding.”⁵⁸

The genetic bases of social and political structures constitute a topic that even bolder sociologists and political scientists have been leery of raising for two-thirds of a century. It is a taboo which grossly distorts our understanding of ourselves. There probably has never existed a society with a totally rigid structure in which ability played no role. Under the Caesars, the Pharaohs, the Ottomans, the Tsars, and probably even the Mayan princes, the gifted slave could on occasion demonstrate his ability and achieve high rank. In modern society, however, where such mobility has been immensely increased, universal education combined with assortative mating is creating greater and greater genetic stratification into classes which are then overlaid with stratifications of wealth and power.

In a dictatorship, government is more inclined to determine directly the various functions performed by its citizens, whereas in a democracy the citizenry usually enjoys greater freedom of selection. But even in the most permissive democracy, if the individual does not possess independent means and does not want to starve to death, he must perform some function to which society assigns a value. Compulsion is a key word in both systems. This is not stated as a value judgment, but is simply a fact of life. The distinction between democracy and dictatorship has to do primarily with how the authorities get the same tasks accomplished – everything from trash hauling to school teaching –and thus make it possible to maintain a functioning social mechanism and allow those in power to remain in power.

The Skinner box of capitalism has proven to be far more efficient than the Gulag in raising production/consumption. Evidently we have much more in common with cattle than with cats, for we are herded with amazing ease. True democracy is not possible if the people fail to understand the issues. Political history is really nothing more than a broken string of days that will live in infamy.

Dictatorships are difficult to maintain, since a leader who refuses to take account of the disposition of forces in that society will eventually be overthrown. Democracies, on the other hand, possess considerably greater flexibility through manipulation of the popular will.

As for political dialogue, it takes place on three levels:

- a) sham issues intended to manipulate the masses
- b) the true (usually clandestine) views of the ruling elite
- c) long-term species survival issues, which, since the beneficiaries do not constitute a constituency, are generally more ignored than suppressed

In 1933, gazing around him in dismay at the Great Depression and peering back at the “holy war fought to make the world safe for democracy,” the former civil servant John McConaughy in *Who Rules America?* defined his country’s “invisible government” as “the political control for selfish, if not sinister, economic purposes – by individual men, or groups or organizations, who are careful to evade the responsibility which should always accompany power. They operate behind a mask of puppets in politics and business.”⁵⁹ Exactly a half century later the sociologist G. William Domhoff, whose political views were far to the left of McConaughy’s, arrived at similar conclusions in his *Who Rules America Now?* when he described a cohesive ruling class that shapes the social and political climate and plays a dominant role in the economy and the government with the goal of promoting its own self-interest.

No human interaction is more fiercely competitive than politics. What is the true nature of that process? To take but one example, Washington, D.C. is home to a society of “networked,” monied, politically sophisticated individuals, while 37% of that same city’s residents read at a third-grade level or lower.⁶⁰ The situation is comparable to a champion sprinter competing against a 90-year-old in a wheelchair. Not surprisingly, the “winners” in this race favor the process that allows them to achieve and maintain their spoils system, and to do so without any sense of guilt.

One percent of American citizens now own 40% of the nation’s wealth.⁶¹ In elections vested interests make electoral campaign contributions, parts of which are used for polling the voters to learn what they want to hear, while the lion’s share is invested in advertising that is as based as little on logic as an ad for a soft drink. The resulting advertising presents a combination of what the pollsters discover and what the propaganda specialists consider the populace will accept. To make matters worse, literally a handful of people now control most of the media, and there is no talk of applying antitrust legislation to stop even further amalgamations.

And the system functions incredibly smoothly –exactly as intended. When the candidate is eventually elected, having outspent his opponent, he then goes on to do the bidding of those who paid the bill. Should the electoral results be in doubt, the candidate has merely to wrap himself in the flag while denouncing his opponents. The result is an unbridgeable chasm of understanding between elites and the broad masses. A serious book published by a university press may have a print run of a few hundred copies, while a television show of only middling popularity will measure its viewership in the tens of millions, and Hollywood aspires to an audience of billions all over the world. Intellectuals are supposedly free to express their opinions (as least as long as they do not threaten the powers that be), but informed opinion is irrelevant to the political process.

This situation has been made possible by the failure of the general populace to comprehend the true nature of the issues. Indeed, how can any rational observer view any human society as a collective of informed individuals making rational decisions? In a 2000 Gallup poll, 34% of those questioned were unable to name the probable presidential candidates. For persons having a high school education or less and earning less than \$20,000 annually, this particular quotient of ignorance rose to 55%.⁶²

According to a survey done by the National Assessment of Education Progress, 56% of those tested could not correctly subtract 55 and 37 from 100; 18% could not multiply 43 x 67; 24% could not convert .35 to 35%; and 28% were unable to express “three hundred fifty-six thousand and ninety-seven” as “356,097.”⁶³ In addition, 24% of adult Americans were unaware that the United States had fought the Revolutionary War with Great Britain, and 21% had no idea that the Earth revolves around the sun.⁶⁴

According to the Northeast Midwest Institute, a nonprofit and education research group, 60 million adult Americans cannot read the front page of a newspaper.⁶⁵ Three Americans in ten between the ages of 18 and 24 could not find the Pacific Ocean on a world map, while 67% of Brits did not know the year World War II ended and 64% did not know which country the French Alps were located in.⁶⁶ As for art, philosophy, serious music, literature, and so on –that intellectual thought and creativity which should lend greater meaning to our lives than those of other animals that love, hate, and dream much as we do –such matters are a subject of disinterest for the overwhelming majority of people. But even this does not represent the furthest extreme of egalitarianist politics.

The millions of people ill with dementia to the point that they are unable to dress themselves or recognize family members also participate in selecting national leadership. Surveys of patients at dementia clinics in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania found that 60% and 64% had voted, respectively. Brian R. Ott of Brown University found that 37% of patients with moderate dementia and about 18% with severe dementia had voted.⁶⁷ In selecting out individuals of ability, modern society now has stripped the broad masses of society of the brilliant artisans and poets who formerly created and maintained national cultures.⁶⁸ A visit to the magazine section of the local supermarket or a flip through the hundreds of television channels is a dismaying experience.

[Back](#)

Welfare and Fertility

See yon blithe child that dances in our sight.
Sara Coleridge, "The Child"

Is the goal of the so-called welfare state fundamentally dysgenic in nature? In 1936, the famous biologist Julian Huxley laid out a hard-hearted version of the hereditarian view in his Galton lecture, delivered before the Eugenics Society:

The lowest strata... , allegedly less well endowed genetically... , must not have too easy access to relief or hospital treatment lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive; long unemployment should be a ground for sterilization, or at least relief should be contingent upon no further children being brought into the world.⁶⁹

We must remember that this was written at the depths of the Great Depression, and that many of those on welfare were simply victims of failed financial policies, not bad genes.

While the average welfare mother receives payments for only two years, never-married mothers who have babies in their teens average eight years or more of dependency.⁷⁰ These are the so-called chronic welfare cases. On average the mothers of illegitimate children score ten points lower in IQ than mothers of legitimate children.⁷¹ These babies make an incommensurate contribution to the future pool of rejected, abandoned, and battered children.⁷² The mechanism would appear to be economic.

A young woman of average or greater ability can look forward to life's many opportunities and finds little temptation in a modest welfare payment, whereas a woman of low intelligence may rationally see government assistance as a ticket to independence and freedom from the hand-to-mouth realities of a minimum-wage job. It would seem logical that the higher the payments, the greater the temptation. Nonetheless, the link between economics and fertility has been challenged as still unproven. Demographer Daniel Vining, for example, has pointed out that lower welfare payments in southern states has not led to significantly reduced fertility patterns.⁷³

We are faced here with a terrible dilemma. Society has an obligation to care for its weakest members, but the flip side of the coin is that in doing so we have significantly increased the fertility of low-IQ women (who generally tend to marry low-IQ men in what is known as "assortative mating"). And we pay them more for each child. Mothers on AFDC had an average of 2.6 children each; non-AFDC mothers averaged 2.1.⁷⁴ This is a major factor in American fertility patterns. What to do? Deny poor women and their children financial assistance? Bribe the upper classes into childbearing? Or throw up our hands in dismay and allow society to be genetically dumbed-down? Indeed, given political realities, what can we do?

Certainly, at the very least, it would behoove us to increase family-planning services to the poor. It is a simple fact that current state policies –both domestic and foreign –already influence differential fertility patterns, despite the fact that the current political climate makes it virtually impossible even to discuss this factor.

Since future generations by definition represent a zero constituency, the public sphere is largely defined horizontally, whereas vertical or longitudinal effects are mostly relegated to the private domain and thus ignored –that is, remain unregulated. Eugenics opposes this horizontal/vertical opposition, maintaining that, since the unborn constitute a vastly greater potential population than do the currently living, their rights take precedence. Politics is, by definition, a struggle among the currently living, and what may well be a victory for some faction in their midst may well be a disaster for their children, just as the disasters of the parents may be to the children's good fortune.

We are now able to separate sex from procreation; either may occur without the other. It is now even possible for women to bypass the male's sperm.⁷⁵ Thus, while leaving the right to sexuality within the private sphere, eugenicists argue that procreational rights –inasmuch as they define the very nature of future people –can be ignored by society only to its own detriment.

[Back](#)

Crime and IQ

Oh blood, which art my father's blood,
Circulating thro' these contaminated veins,
If thou, poured forth on the polluted earth,
Could wash away the crime...

Percy Bysshe Shelley

“The Cenci”

Genes play a major role in virtually all behavior, including alcoholism, smoking, autism, phobias, neuroses, insomnia, consumption of coffee (but not tea),⁷⁶ schizophrenia, marriage and divorce, job satisfaction, hobbies, and fears. Curiously, while one study shows no genetic role in singing ability,⁷⁷ another shows pitch perception to be highly heritable and estimates the heritability of tone deafness at 0.8 –about as high as it gets for genetically complex traits, rivaling features such as height.⁷⁸ Animal breeders and even pet owners have no doubts about differences between and within species, and we all know from everyday experience just much people differ innately from each other. Genes evidently also play a role in crime.

In the mid-nineteenth century, criminal justice systems were still guided by the assumption of man's free will, and crime was viewed as a sin which had to be expiated. In the late 1850s, the French physician B. A. Morel established the field of criminal physical anthropology. Galton himself favored compulsory means to limit the breeding not just of the insane, the feebleminded, or confirmed criminals but also of paupers.⁷⁹ In 1876, just five years after the appearance of Darwin's *Descent of Man*, the Jewish-Italian criminologist and physician Cesare Lombroso published *The Criminal Man*, which attempted to demonstrate the biological nature of criminality. Lombroso claimed to have established during autopsies certain physical stigmata characteristic of the born criminal, whom he saw as possessing a more primitive type of brain structure. If one accepts such biological determinism, punishment becomes meaningless.

Lombroso's theories are now generally rejected as invalid, but studies of the role of genes in crime have not been confined to the nineteenth century. A 1982 Swedish study found that the rate of criminality in adopted children was 2.9% when neither biological nor adoptive parents had been convicted of criminal activity. When one of the natural parents was criminal, the figure rose to 6.7%, but when both biological parents were criminal, the figure was nearly twice as high –12.1%.⁸⁰ At first the left tended to sympathize with biological positivism, but soon Marxists came to view crime as environmentally determined. The anarchists even sympathized with criminals, who were seen as rebels challenging social injustice. Crime in a capitalist system came under the rubric of justified revolution in miniature.

If the egalitarian Franz Boaz was the “father” of anthropology, the paternal rights to criminology (sociology's “stepchild”) have been ceded to Edwin E. Sutherland, for whom learning was entirely a social product

disconnected from biological structures. In 1914, he published *Criminology*, the most influential book on the topic during the twentieth century. Thanks in large measure to its resonance, and especially that of later reworked editions, many textbooks in the field never even mentioned IQ, and when they did the treatment was largely dismissive.

At the same time, intelligence studies have consistently demonstrated a lower IQ among those found to have committed criminal acts than among the general population. The intelligence ratings of 200 juvenile offenders consigned to training schools in Iowa show a mean IQ of 90.4 for the boys and 94.1 for the girls. The mean IQ for non-delinquents was 103 for boys and 105.5 for girls.⁸¹ The 1969 police records of over 3,600 boys in Contra Costa County, California, show a relationship between IQ and delinquency of -0.31 .⁸² A group of 411 London boys was followed over a ten-year period so as to compare delinquent and non-delinquent groups. While only one in fifty boys with an IQ of 110 or more was a recidivist, one in five of those with an IQ of 90 or less fell into this category. ⁸³

Since the advent of the revised Stanford Binet and the Wechsler-Bellevue scales in the late 1930s, it has been consistently found that samples of delinquents differ from the general population by about 8 IQ points⁸⁴ –a significant but not an overwhelming difference. One can only surmise that perhaps the gap would be even narrower if it were possible to control for a higher arrest record among juveniles less skillful in the art of deception. The same general tendency exists within the adult population. Criminal offenders have average IQs of about 92 –that is, 8 points or one-half standard deviation below the mean.⁸⁵ What is actually happening? Life itself is a cruel competition, where the vanquished have ended up more than once skewered and slowly roasting over the victor's cooking fire.

Now civilization imposes rules (so-called middle-class values) that allow some people more success at winning. Imagine a situation where the fastest runner would be the only one to get supper. After a time the slower competitors would be sorely tempted simply to hit him on the head rather than futilely attempt to outdo him in speed. The same is true with intelligence. The successful stockbroker, surgeon, and lawyer do not need to commit crime to gain wealth, but further down the professional scale are those individuals whose low intelligence literally dooms them to a life of material slavery. Can at least part of the explanation for criminal behavior be as simple as that?

To what extent is inherited low altruism a factor in crime? Before axing the old pawnbroker in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov first rationalizes away his guilt. Clearly, the general population contains a vast pool of individuals for whom guilt is, at best, an underdeveloped emotion.

Can we really entrust the awesome task of guiding human evolution to the bureaucrats? Are we not still far from understanding the nature of crime? Do we want passivity bred into the population? Is not crime the statistical tail of such desirable traits as adventuresomeness and the willingness to take risks?

[Back](#)

Migration

Settling and dominating the entire planet, our species has devoted an immense amount of effort to moving around. In the process, entire civilizations have been displaced, conquered, infiltrated, and even swamped by imported alien populations. In economic terms, greater and greater specialization has replaced self-sufficiency and created ruling classes that are often recruited from a multiplicity of ethnic backgrounds.

Since the pool of global talent is neither diminished nor enhanced when a person moves from country A to country B, migration constitutes a zero-sum game. Nevertheless, some countries are winners while others are losers. The United States attracts large numbers of very talented individuals but also many who are unlikely to leave the lower economic rung. The mean IQ of immigrants in the 1980s has been estimated to be about 95, or only about one-third standard deviation below the mean.⁸⁷ This is a small enough difference that it may well be explainable by the disadvantaging environment from which many arrivals come.

Early man migrated slowly, creating diversity by virtue of lengthy periods of relative genetic isolation. Now,

however, the revolution in transportation is undermining this isolation. The United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) estimates that 53% of the 6,809 languages spoken around the world are at risk of extinction by 2100. The destruction of this “reservoir of human thought and knowledge”⁸⁸ is accompanied by a loss of genetic diversity that would cause dismay among ecologists if it were to occur in any species other than man.

