

Eugenics Moves to the Twenty-First Century

From the elimination of undesirables from the human race; mass culling in the name of saving the earth; to altering the genetic code of humanity with advanced technology; eugenics has moved into a new era.

Old-thinker news | August 27, 2007

By Daniel Taylor

This report is not meant to be a comprehensive history of eugenics. The initial article that I was going to write was less than half of what you will read here, but as I investigated this area I discovered how ignorant I was as to how expansive this topic is. Initially researching John D. Rockefeller, a Pandora's box of information opened up, inevitably leading to the topic of this article. I hope that this information will help you come to a greater understanding of this subject, and to warn others of its grave dangers.

From the elimination of undesirables from the human race; mass culling in the name of saving the earth; to altering the genetic code of humanity with advanced technology: Eugenics has moved into a new era.

What is eugenics?

The word eugenics comes from the Greek words *eus* (good or well) and *genēs* (born) meaning "well born". The American Heritage dictionary of the English language describes eugenics as, "The study of hereditary improvement of the human race by controlled selective breeding." Sir Francis Galton was the man who coined the term, and developed the first eugenic policies. Galton expressed distress at the lack of emphasis on the betterment of the human race during his time, comparing men and women of his day to "pariah dogs". In 1864, Galton wrote in an article titled "Hereditary Character and Talent," published in two parts in MacMillan's Magazine,

"If a twentieth part of the cost and pains were spent in measures for the improvement of the human race that is spent on the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle, what a galaxy of genius might we not create! We might introduce prophets and high priests of civilization into the world, as surely as we can propagate idiots by mating cretins. Men and women of the present day are, to those we might hope to bring into existence, what the pariah dogs of the streets of an Eastern town are to our own highly-bred varieties."

The Population Council was founded by John D. Rockefeller the 3rd in 1952

The history of eugenics in America is filled with controversy and harrowing stories of forced sterilization throughout many U.S. states. In 2002 Mark R. Warner, the governor of Virginia issued an apology for the thousands of individuals that the state had sterilized from 1924 to 1979. USA Today reported on the governors statement,

"With the governor's statement Thursday, Virginia becomes the only of the 30 states that conducted eugenics sterilizations to apologize. There are believed to be more than 60,000 eugenics victims nationwide.

‘Today, I offer the commonwealth’s sincere apology for Virginia’s participation in eugenics,’ Warner said.

‘As I have previously noted, the eugenics movement was a shameful effort in which state government never should have been involved,’ he said. ‘We must remember the commonwealth’s past mistakes in order to prevent them from recurring.’”

The aristocratic, wealthy elite of America played a central role in the development of eugenics in America and abroad. Two such elite families are the Rockefellers and the Carnegies.

In 1902, Andrew Carnegie founded the Carnegie Institute which among other things, funded the Eugenics Record Office in America. The ERO (1910-1944) operated from Cold Spring Harbor in New York. Eugenics policies, which led to the sterilization of thousands of Americans, were developed in this office.

The Rockefellers, perhaps more so, were also heavily involved with eugenics. Rockefeller influence in American eugenics can be traced to the beginnings of Cold Spring Harbor Laboratories. John D. Rockefeller, along with Averell Harriman gave \$11 million to create the facility in the early 1900’s. Rockefeller influence also spread overseas to Germany, where the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry, and the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Eugenics, Anthropology and Human Heredity resided. Much of the money used to run these facilities came from Rockefeller. These weren’t just average scientific institutes; the Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes would become the center for Nazi eugenics programs.

As documented by Gary Allen in “The Rockefeller File” the Rockefellers continue to give money to eugenics and population control related organizations,

“In 1970, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund gave \$500,000 to the Population Council. The Rockefeller Foundation gave ecology grants of \$10,000 to the New School for Social Research, and \$10,000 to the Population Reference Bureau.”

In 1973, the Rockefeller Foundation again gave \$500,000 to the Population Council and \$25,000 to the Population Crisis Committee, while the Rockefeller Brothers Fund gave \$250,000 to the Population Council, and \$250,000 to the Population Institute.

The Population Council was founded by John D. Rockefeller the 3rd in 1952. The first president of the Council, Frederick Osborn, was appointed by Rockefeller. Osborn was the leader of the American Eugenics Society, and member of the Galton Society, founded in 1918.

Osborn stated in the 1956 edition of “The Eugenics Review” that,

“...the reasons advanced must be generally acceptable reasons. Let’s stop telling anyone that they have a genetically inferior genetic quality, for they will never agree. Let’s base our proposals on the desirability of having children born in homes where they will get affectionate and responsible care, and perhaps our proposals will be accepted. It seems to me that if it is to progress as it should, eugenics must follow new policies and state its case anew, and that from this rebirth we may, even in our own lifetime, see it moving at last towards the high goals which Galton set for it.”

Killing to save the earth

Since the early days of eugenics, a new “brand” of this science has emerged in modern times. The environmental branch of eugenics believes that, due to overpopulation, measures must be taken to either impede population growth through various eugenic policies, or take drastic measures to eliminate living human beings from the earth. Unlike those who advocate eugenics to strictly rid humanity of “undesirables,” some advocate the culling of humanity in general in order to save planet earth. Many globalist initiatives surround environmental issues, one of which has been population control and reduction.

John Glad, a professor of Russian studies who has taught at several universities and worked for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, wrote a book titled “Future Human Evolution: Eugenics in the Twenty-First Century.” In the introduction, Glad writes,

“Eugenics views itself as the fourth leg of the chair of civilization, the other three being a) a thrifty expenditure of natural resources, b) mitigation of environmental pollution, and c) maintenance of a human population not exceeding the planet’s carrying capacity. Eugenics, which can be thought of as human ecology, is thus part and parcel of the environmental movement.”

Notable quotes:

“In order to stabilize world population, we must eliminate 350,000 people per day. It is a horrible thing to say, but it’s just as bad not to say it.” – Jacques Cousteau

“The world has a cancer, and that cancer is man.” – Merton Lambert, former spokesman for the Rockefeller foundation

“... The first task is population control at home. How do we go about it? Many of my colleagues feel that some sort of compulsory birth regulation would be necessary to achieve such control. One plan often mentioned involves the addition of temporary sterilants to water supplies or staple food. Doses of the antidote would be carefully rationed by the government to produce the desired population size.” – Paul Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, p.130-131

“If I were reincarnated I would wish to be returned to earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels.” - Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh, leader of the World Wildlife Fund – quoted in “Are You Ready For Our New Age Future?,” *Insiders Report*, American Policy Center, December ’95

“A total population of 250-300 million people, a 95% decline from present levels, would be ideal.” – Ted Turner – CNN founder and UN supporter – quoted in the *McAlvany Intelligence Advisor*, June ’96

“Even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.” – Sir Julian Huxley, first director general of UNESCO (1946-1948)

Photo: David Rockefeller with Ted Turner

News articles regarding sterilization:

UNICEF Nigerian Polio Vaccine Contaminated with Sterilizing Agents Scientist Finds
KADUNA, Nigeria, March 11, 2004 (LifeSiteNews.com) – A UNICEF campaign to vaccinate Nigeria's youth against polio may have been a front for sterilizing the nation.

U.N. Complicit in Forced Sterilizations

There is compelling evidence that the United Nations collaborated in the forced sterilization of poor, rural women in Peru from 1995 to 1997.

Video presentation by David Ayoub, M.D.: Mercury, Autism and the Global Vaccine Agenda

In 2004 the publication World Watch published an article titled, "Global Population Reduction: Confronting the Inevitable," by Ken Smail, a professor in the Anthropology department of Kenyon College in Ohio. In this article, Smail proposes that the earth's carrying capacity will reach, or has reached already, its limit. In what Smail calls a modern day "Malthusian dilemma", he cites measures to merely slow population growth as being inefficient, stating that,

"Looking past the near-term concerns that have plagued population policy at the political level, it is increasingly apparent that the long-term sustainability of civilization will require not just a leveling-off of human numbers as projected over the coming half-century, but a colossal reduction in both population and consumption." [emphasis added]

Smail says that a large scale global population reduction is inevitable, but that there are two possible ways for this to happen,

"That there will be a large-scale reduction in global human numbers over the next two or three centuries appears to be inevitable. The primary issue seems to be whether this process will be under conscious human control and (hopefully) relatively benign, or whether it will turn out to be unpredictably chaotic and (perhaps) catastrophic."

The new eugenics

"Eugenic goals are most likely to be attained under another name than eugenics." - Frederick Osborn

Since the founding of eugenics, the movement has changed, but it has retained its core goals over the years. Thomas H. Campbell of the University of California believes that the eugenics model of Galton is outdated and impractical, as do many other scientists. Instead of relying on breeding "better humans," without the intervention of technology, many scientists believe that technological means should be employed to further our "evolution." With the rise of advanced scientific technologies, the ability to alter the genetic code of living organisms, and the augmentation of human bodies has become a reality. Some individuals who are involved with the modern eugenics movement see the rise of these capabilities as an opportunity to create or alter human beings to acquire the most "desirable traits" and rid humanity of traits deemed "undesirable".

Is there a link between eugenics and the Human Genome Project? If so, what does this mean for future generations?

During the 34 years (1910-1944) the Eugenics Records Office was active, it collected information on specific human traits in what was called The Trait Book. Also collected was information on “Pedigree” families and their specific traits. Today, the Human Genome project is in effect carrying on what the Eugenics Records Office could only dream of.

James Watson, who began the initial research for the Human Genome Project, directed the operation from 1988-1992. Watson then served as director at the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory and would eventually become president of the Laboratory in 1994. Watson’s beliefs about the betterment of mankind mirror those of past eugenics leaders.

Watson is quoted as saying at a 1998 UCLA conference that,

“I mean, sure, we have great respect for the human species But evolution can be just damn cruel, and to say that we’ve got a perfect genome and there’s some sanctity to it, I’d just like to know where that idea comes from. It’s utter silliness. And the other thing, because no one really has the guts to say it, I mean, if we could make better human beings by knowing how to add genes, why shouldn’t we do it?”

Celera Genomics

Craig Venter caused many to question his ethics when he moved to found Celera Genomics in 1998, carrying the study of the human genome into the private sector, using the “shotgun strategy” to sequence the human genome at a faster clip than the public project.

In a press release dated March 1, 2001, Celera Genomics announced that it signed a “multi-year agreement” with AMDeC LLC to “allow member institutions to access Celera’s database information [Human Genome data] through its Celera Discovery System.” Some of those member institutions included Rockefeller University, and Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. Interestingly, Rockefeller University was founded by John D. Rockefeller in 1901 with a dedication to biomedical research. Today, David Rockefeller, grandson to John D. Rockefeller Jr., is the Chairman of the Rockefeller University Council.

Venter further maddened fellow scientists when he moved to patent human genes. Serious ethical discussions took place after the first attempts to patent human genes, but ultimately the decision stood to allow patenting. The United States Patent and Trademark Office issued guidelines on patenting. The American Medical Association describes the guidelines,

“The rules are intended to help end a bitter debate on gene patenting. These regulations have put to rest any question about whether genes can be patented at all — making it clear that companies may indeed patent both whole genes as well as pieces of genes...”

The guidelines allow patenting when the those applying for a patent on a gene show a “utility” for the gene. The AMA goes on to state that arguments were heard opposing the decision based on the fact that these genes were not created by anyone, and thus could not be patented. The AMA describes how the

Patent office rejected these ideas,

“The PTO firmly rejected this notion based upon the fact that a gene may be removed from a person, then a clone of that gene may be made in a machine, which is then not a part of nature, but a product of the lab.”

A search in the online patent database for “human genes” yields an astonishing 159021 results as of August 2007.

Designer babies

The apex of a futuristic eugenics program comes with the advent of designer babies, embryos that are genetically enhanced through various methods. The knowledge gathered through the study of the human genome will, according to some, lead to the ability to create such designer babies.

In 2000, the BBC aired a documentary called “Who’s Afraid of Designer Babies?” Featured in this clip is Lee M. Silver, professor at Princeton University and former investigator for Cold Spring Harbor (1980-1984).

The future is now: Genetically altered babies already born

There is still doubt among scholars and scientists that the Human Genome Project will lead to a new eugenics program, such as designer babies. They cite limitations on current technology and the need for further research as reasons for this position. However, unknown to many, genetically altered babies have already been born. The implications of this development are immense, but it has received little attention. Because these babies were “created” in the private sector and the lab did not receive government funding, there were no governmental restrictions on what could be done. As Wired magazine reported in 2001,

“Researchers have genetically-altered humans for the first time, but experts question the moral implications of tinkering with the unborn.

The scientists weren’t looking to create genetically-enhanced Michael Jordans or Anna Kournikovas. Rather, they repaired the defective eggs of prospective mothers by injecting them with DNA from the eggs of healthy donors.

But regardless of the scientists’ intentions, they’ve created the first human offspring with changes to their “germline,” or the genes they’ll pass on to future generations. In this case, the babies’ genes

contain DNA from two women instead of just one.

Researchers at the Institute for Reproductive Medicine and Science of Saint Barnabas in West Orange, New Jersey, have achieved 15 births using the technique. In their paper, published in the March 2001 issue of the Human Reproduction journal, they say at least 15 additional healthy babies have been born as a result of this technique in other labs.

The researchers performed the fertilizations in 1997 and 1998. In March, they published data on the results of DNA fingerprint tests on two of the children, each one year old, confirming that they contain a small quantity of additional genes not inherited from either parent.

Most scientists consider altering the germline unethical, since no one knows what the long-term effects might be. The researchers, however, are confident the technique is safe.”

What will the future look like?

What will the future hold in a world in which eugenics, utilizing advanced technology, has become a reality?

Lee Silver describes in his book “Cloning and Beyond in a Brave New World”, a future scenario in which humanity splits into two distinct classes, the “GenRich” and the “GenPoor.”

“The GenRich—who account for 10 percent of the American population—all carry synthetic genes. Genes that were created in the laboratory....The GenRich are a modern-day hereditary class of genetic aristocrats....All aspects of the economy, the media, the entertainment industry, and the knowledge industry are controlled by members of the GenRich class.”

Those who are not as fortunate to have access to genetic modification, called “Naturals” by Silver, will “...work as low-paid service providers or as laborers.”

Bertrand Russel says in “The Impact of Science on Society” (1953) on pages 49-50 that,

“Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton.”

Hollywood has apparently been keeping up to date on genetic technologies, adding their own theatrical twist. The movie “Gattaca”, released in 1997, portrays a despotic future world in which designer babies are born every day, and the perfection of genes has become the center of society.

Watch the Gattaca trailer:

Thomas H. Campbell of the University of California believes that humanity is destined to gain access to methods of “autoevolution.” Writing in his paper, “The Moral Imperative of Our Future Evolution“, Campbell describes future technologies and their eugenic implications. Campbell praises eugenics

policies, and cites the Human Genome Project as a positive development in the identification of “defective” genes.

“We have catalogued defective genes behind a variety of dreadful neurological and metabolic disorders as parts of programs to eliminate them eugenically. Our systematic mapping of the human genome will identify many others. Everyone applauds the goal of purging these defects in our heredity – notwithstanding quibbles over the ethics of the techniques of amniocentesis, abortion and even contraception. I emphatically embrace this eugenic program even though its evolutionary impact is insignificant. Most defective genes are rare, and their total elimination does little for evolution except squeeze the range of variation of humans.”

“We probably will begin our interventions into brain and embryonic development with drugs and hormones and subsequently engineer the desirable intrusions into the genome. Then, after a further generation of accumulating biological information about individual gene function, developmental pathways, and the neural substrate of brain function, evolutionists probably will write novel genes for these traits from scratch using a DNA synthesizer.”

“Of course, the methods for evolving our genetics extend beyond biotechnology. Ultra-sophisticated parallel processing computers and software programs will predictively model how particular gene configurations translate into phenotype, and how particular phenotypic traits can be engineered into developmental pathways. As a start, new computer technology is being developed today as an integral part of the human genome project.”

Campbell, like others, says that future genetic technologies will be extremely expensive, leaving the average person out of the loop. Campbell expresses his approval of this expense due to the fact that only the “most successful generative lines” will have access to these technologies.

“The costs will be enormous, far beyond what most people could afford. This has kept our democratic society from appreciating that these possibilities will be used and will be important. However, their feasibility cannot be judged from what the average person will be willing to pay to procreate. What matters are the resources that the most successful generative lines will be able to apply to their goals. A million dollars per conception seems a great underestimate to me for the beings who hold evolution’s frontier.”

The legacy of Galton, John D., and Carnegie lives on. Though terms have changed, the names of organizations altered, the methods of propagandizing the public reformed; the ideology behind eugenics is being carried into the twenty-first century, and a new eugenics is creeping into our society. Will humanity as we know it today become a fossil as some have proposed? Public awareness is the key. The information contained in this report needs to be spread far and wide, for the future of humanity as we know it depends on it.