

the argument: eugenics is evil because Hitler believed in eugenics. Is everything that Hitler believed in wrong ipso facto because he believed in it? If Galileo had been a mass murderer, would that prove the world was flat? Eugenics is a moral commitment, not a racial affiliation.

This schizophrenic attitude toward eugenics is muddled and confused further by the pseudo-intelligentia of sectarian atheists, humanists and socialists who think of themselves as the most liberal and objective free thinkers? Instead of entering into an honest discussion of eugenics, they catechize us with slogans like "we hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal." This fanciful slogan is interpreted by egalitarians as a pseudo religious mystical 'divine right of birth'; that is parallel to the medieval concept 'divine right of kings'. In medieval times, a child who happened to be born to a king was thought to be endowed with a metaphysical divine right to control the resources of the earth and the destiny of man. In modern times, according to the 'divine right of birth', a person who happened to have been conceived and born because of the chance combination of sperm and egg and a thousand other happenstances is thought to be magically endowed with a mystical supernatural right to command the resources of the earth and the destiny of man. Both the 'divine right of kings' and the 'divine right of birth' involve the medieval assumption that those who happen, by chance and coincidence to have been born, have somehow more right to control the resources of the earth than those who did not yet happen to have been born. The 'divine right of birth' has no more validity than the capitalist assumption that those who happen to have been born with wealth have somehow more divine right to use the resources of the earth than those who do not happen to have wealth. The procreation of children is a combination of caprice, opportunism, greed and chance in much the same way that the acquisition of money is. The socialists and sectarian humanists would claim, with some validity, that an economic system is valuable only in so far as it contributes to mankind as a whole. To a much greater extent, this premise should be applied to the birth of each individual human being.

An even more fantastic objection to eugenics comes from superstitious people who base their objection on what they call religious or moral grounds. They claim that if a child is born retarded, it could only be because it was the intention of some all knowing and all powerful entity who wanted the child to be born retarded. Do we really believe that a child is born because of immaculate conception: because some ghost comes down and picks one sperm out of millions and matches it alone with the egg and determines that the child will be born with downs syndrome, mental retardation, spina bifida, and club foot and

that it would be a sin against the ghost for a human being to protect his own children from physical and mental defects? What is the difference between this attitude and that of a Jehovah's Witness or Christian Scientist who refuses medical treatment for his children?

Do we have a right to determine who will be born in the next generation and thus who will control and direct the destiny of man and the universe? We are already doing that through the tax and welfare structure. A person who accepts responsibility for restructuring society in one generation automatically becomes responsible for the effects of that restructuring on future generations. "The pattern of present births is the pattern of future population." Suppose we continue the present policy of encouraging the least capable members of the human race to reproduce by giving them encouragements, welfare grants and rewards for bearing more children? In the end, there would be more people consuming goods than there would be people who had the ability to produce these goods and the very people we were trying to help would starve.

The existence of man depends on the genetically capable individuals because they are the only ones who can maintain society. If the capable individuals are not born or educated, all the people will starve. In order to prevent human suffering, we must first take care of those who can maintain civilization rather than those who will never be able to contribute. It is irresponsible for any society to adopt a social welfare system as they have today, without adopting a eugenic welfare system in conjunction with it. We must consider the future good of mankind. The premise of working for the greatest good for the greatest number is correct, but we must include in that number all the children who will ever be born in all the days that will ever be not just those who happen to have been conceived and born and who happen to exist at this particular stage in evolution.

Redistribution of life support away from the productive and creative members of the more "favored" socio-biological class to the less "favored" socio-biological class through the tax and welfare structure causes genetic change in the next generation. We as a species will change as a result of this redistribution. Our present welfare system is redistributing life support systems away from the capable to the incapable and thus reducing the genetic quality of future generations. We are indulging in unnatural selection by giving welfare to non-producers. We are creating a whole generation of parasites and problem makers and preventing the birth of those very people who could solve those problems. It is not a question of beginning or initiating a eugenic program. It is a matter of recognizing that we have already begun an