

Eugenics Axioms Clear In 'Human Cloning'

by Paul Gallagher

On Aug. 10 Lyndon LaRouche issued the statement below, exposing the evil principle underlying the current public discussion of "cloning of human beings," and pointing to the clearly anti-human intent of such as the "manifesto" in support of human cloning, which we also report below. That pro-human-cloning manifesto is being circulated by the likes of "apes' rights" advocate Richard Dawkins and other leading neo-Darwinists.

The Aug. 7 U.S. National Academy of Sciences seminar on this subject, revealed the eugenics axioms underlying the current cloning proposals. Scientists who have pioneered in the cloning of animals, strongly opposed attempts to clone human beings; they made clear, among other reasons, that most cloned animals have suffered from genetic illnesses, defects, or malformations. In other words, the attempt to copy, by molecular biology alone, even the barest beginning of life—the embryo—does not function in the same way, for reasons, the scientists acknowledge, that are unknown to them.

The Italian and Swiss "fertility experts" so-called, Antinori and Zavos, who now propose to try human cloning, publicly assert the intention to overcome these defects by "pre-selection" of the embryos they clone: In other words, to practice aggressive eugenics. Implicit is the intention to create, by cloning, a certain "separate race" of human beings. Though such intentions as those of Antinori and Zavos are themselves illusions, LaRouche's judgment of them is rigorously valid.

The Political Issue Of 'Human Cloning'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

LaRouche in 2004, the campaign committee of Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, issued this statement on Aug. 10, 2001.

The essence of the political issue of "cloning," is underscored by a current series on this subject appearing in the German popular-entertainment daily *Bildzeitung*. There we find fea-

tured a reported intention to clone a replica of Adolf Hitler, using material extracted from Hitler's skull. Ironically, this scandalous news item accurately underscores the fact, that the current rash of proposals for cloning do, like much of current trends in U.S. health-care policy, parody the Nazi regime's views on the biology of mankind.

The inhuman views of the Nazis, and those Americans who, back then, shared and praised the Nazis' eugenics policies, are echoed widely today among those susceptible persons who have been duped into admiration for the cult of "molecular biology." What is new, is the revival of the kinds of thinking on eugenics associated with the Nazis then, as is to be seen now in the influence of the science-fiction cults of the "New Economy" cult of "information theory," and "artificial intelligence," today. There has been a recent spillover of those science-fiction cults, into the spread of such wildly reductionist doctrine of molecular biology as the infamous "Bell Curve" racism spilled out of locations such as Harvard University.

The clear and present danger from the spread of this "human cloning" fad, is to be recognized in the mass slaughter of cows and sheep in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. That killing, in conscious and malicious violation of all well-established, successful methods for dealing with the control of the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease, is being explained by some official circles in Britain, as a probable precedent for the application of the same mass-killing policies against human beings, in the case of major epidemics among human populations.

If we look around us, in the world at large today, no honest and intelligent person could deny, that there is, indeed, the smell of Auschwitz in the currently panicked efforts to ram through such wild-eyed assertions of the universal authority of molecular biology, as seeking clearance for human cloning.

Documentation:

Man Is an Animal, Say Human Cloning Advocates

Ape Advocate Richard Dawkins and other prominent Darwinist "socio-biologists" are among the signers of the following call for human cloning, found on a website (www.human-cloning.org) dedicated solely to the project. The following "Declaration in Defense of Cloning and the Integrity of Scientific Research," is from Free Inquiry magazine, Vol. 17, No. 3.

We, the undersigned, welcome announcements of major ad-

vances in the cloning of higher animals. Throughout this century, the physical, biological, and behavioral sciences have placed important new capabilities within human reach. On balance, these advances have contributed to enormous improvements in human welfare. Where novel technologies have raised legitimate ethical questions, the human community has in general demonstrated its willingness to confront those questions openly and to seek answers that enhance the general welfare.

The cloning of higher animals raises ethical concerns. Appropriate guidelines need to be developed that will prevent abuses, while making the benefits of cloning maximally available. Such guidelines should respect to the greatest extent possible the autonomy and choice of each individual human being. Every effort should be made not to block the freedom and integrity of scientific research.

No one has demonstrated a present capability to clone humans. Yet the very possibility that contemporary achievements may open a path toward cloning has sparked a hail of protests. We view with concern the widespread calls to delay, defund, or discontinue cloning research which have come from sources as disparate as President Bill Clinton in the United States, President Jacques Chirac of France, former Prime Minister John Major of Great Britain, and the Vatican in Rome.

We believe that reason is humanity's most powerful tool for untangling the problems that it encounters. But reasoned argument has been a scarce commodity in the recent flood of attacks on cloning. Critics have delighted in drawing parallels to the myth of Icarus and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, predicting terrible consequences if researchers dare to press on with questions whose answers "man was not meant to know." Behind the most vituperative critiques seems to lie the assumption that human cloning would raise moral issues more profound than those faced in connection with any previous scientific or technological development. What moral issues would human cloning raise? Some religions teach that human beings are fundamentally different from other mammals—that humans have been imbued with immortal souls by a deity, giving them a value that cannot be compared to that of other living things. Human nature is held to be unique and sacred. Scientific advances that pose a perceived risk of altering this "nature" are angrily opposed.

Deeply rooted as such ideas may be in dogma, we question whether these should be used to decide whether human beings will be permitted to benefit from new biotechnology. As far as the scientific enterprise can determine, *Homo sapiens* is a member of the animal kingdom. Human capabilities appear to differ in degree, not in kind, from those found among the higher animals. Humankind's rich repertoire of thoughts, feelings, aspirations, and hopes seems to arise from electrochemical brain processes, not from an immaterial soul that operates in ways no instrument can discover.

The immediate question raised by the current debate

over cloning is, therefore, do advocates of supernatural or spiritual agendas have truly meaningful qualifications to contribute to that debate? Surely everyone has the right to be heard. But we believe that there is a very real danger that research with enormous potential benefits may be suppressed solely because it conflicts with some people's religious beliefs. It is important to recognize that similar religious objections were once raised against autopsies, anesthesia, artificial insemination, and the entire genetic revolution of our day—yet enormous benefits have accrued from each of these developments. A view of human nature rooted in humanity's mythical past ought not to be our primary criterion for making moral decisions about cloning. We see no inherent ethical dilemmas in cloning non-human higher animals. Nor is it clear to us that future developments in cloning human tissues or even cloning human beings will create moral predicaments beyond the capacity of human reason to resolve. The moral issues raised by cloning are neither larger nor more profound than the questions human beings have already faced in regards to such technologies as nuclear energy, recombinant DNA, and computer encryption. They are simply new. Historically, the Luddite option, which seeks to turn back the clock and limit or prohibit the application of already existing technologies, has never proven realistic or productive. The potential benefits of cloning may be so immense that it would be a tragedy if ancient theological scruples should lead to a Luddite rejection of cloning. We call for continued, responsible development of cloning technologies, and for a broad-based commitment to ensuring that traditionalist and obscurantist views do not irreverently obstruct beneficial scientific developments.

The signers of the Declaration are Humanist Laureates of the International Academy of Humanism [partial list]:

- Pieter Admiraal, Medical Doctor, The Netherlands
- Rubén Ardila, psychologist, National University of Colombia, Colombia
- Sir Isaiah Berlin, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Oxford University, U.K.
- Sir Hermann Bondi, Fellow of the Royal Society, Past Master, Churchill College, Cambridge University, U.K.
- Vern Bullough, Visiting Professor of Nursing, California State University at Northridge, U.S.A.
- Mario Bunge, Professor of Philosophy of Science, McGill University, Canada
- Bernard Crick, Professor Emeritus of Politics, Birkbeck College, University of London, U.K.
- Francis Crick, Nobel Laureate in Physiology, Salk Institute, U.S.A.
- Richard Dawkins, Charles Simonyi Professor of Public Understanding of Science, Oxford University, U.K.
- José Delgado, Director, Centro de Estudios Neurobiológicos, Spain
- Paul Edwards, Professor of Philosophy, New School for Social Research, U.S.A.