

# Eugenics

## Part 4. Selective Human Breeding

Let us pause and ask; ‘Is there any chance of long term survival for our species?’ Have we already passed the tipping point, as James Lovelock suggests, or is there still time for our species to reverse the trend? Given that the above three models offer no hope for our long term survival we put forward, from a purely scientific perspective, a forth option that could address the seemingly insurmountable problems outlined in the ‘Business as Usual’, Two-in-Two-out’ and ‘The Swarm’ models.

So for those who cannot accept a fatalistic position we offer this forth option. An option that almost certainly will never be adopted and may well be too late even if embraced by governments around the world as a practical solution to our impending crisis.

We note that many Europeans resent the influx of migrants from the third world. They argue that these new arrivals take jobs away from their own people, they place demands on their countries’ infrastructure and in many cases are reluctant to assimilate into the local culture. The governments of most European countries however, seem to see immigration as an answer to the falling birth rate of their own people and a way to boost the productivity of their sluggish economies.

Political groups opposing migration will note of course that the economic and social cost is mostly shouldered by the middle and lower classes. It is often pointed out that migration seems to be all one way – from poor third world countries to better off and predominantly European countries. It is argued that non-European countries do not welcome large numbers of immigrants and they foretell a future where there will be no home country for the European race. Unfortunately most of these political groups see the falling birth rate of European families the cause of the problem. Their solution, on an already overpopulated planet, is to encourage their people to have larger families.

Here we see two groups of people with population problems. The migrants addressing ‘The Swarm’ problem by seeking a better life in a wealthier, and less populated, country. The host European countries with ‘Two-in and Two-out’ families finding their children less able to compete with the more aggressive migrants. Both population strategies doomed to fail.

So how can these problems be address? The swarm group must of course stop having too many offspring. But how do they, and the ‘Two-in and Two-out’ group, address the problems associated with breeding from the less fit. The only way this can be done is to breed predominantly from the fittest and best-adapted members of their populations.

We note that many parents are happy to have only a single child. Governments could encourage this with most families. Where there are health issues there could be financial disincentives for having more than one child. On the other hand governments could encourage, and offer financial rewards, to strong and healthy women to have many children. Over the long term this would ensure that the bulk of the population are descended from the fittest and best adapted members of our species.

Europeans who lament the mixing of their bloodlines could selectively breed from their own people. Likewise other ethnic groups could preserve their genetic and cultural heritage by reproducing only from their own race. As with the managed breeding of lower order animals – it is generally considered important to preserve the integrity of all breeds. This

model cannot be said to be racist for all ethnic groups would be encouraged to adopt this selective breeding program – and all would benefit equally from such a strategy.

Other critics might say that such a plan is elitist and is designed to favour the perceived genetic supremacy of one group over another. No group of people however need be disadvantaged by such a policy. The group who are chosen as the fittest and best adapted will produce some offspring who lack the physical qualities of their parents. These will join those who are encouraged to have one only child. And the majority less fit group will occasionally produce a child that is very strong and healthy. These progeny could then be encouraged to join the group who maximise their family size. Such a strategy would ensure the majority of offspring are descended from the fittest and best adapted – while at the same time allowing for the greatest possible genetic diversity.

Unfortunately most countries currently allow, and sometimes encourage, their citizens to have large families. In such cases there is no connection between the available resources and the ongoing needs of the people. This short-sighted strategy can only lead to an inevitable social, economic and environmental collapse. A human selective breeding program however, would not only facilitate a healthier population – it would allow for the management of sustainable overall numbers.

While our species has a soul – we need to remember that it is hosted by an animal that is 95% genetically identical to the chimpanzee. The laws of inheritance that apply to the lower order animals also apply to us. By selectively breeding our offspring all racial groups will produce a healthier and more homogeneous offspring. By adopting such a strategy our species could produce progeny that will be better able to cope with the physical and cultural challenges of an ever-changing environment.

For such a breeding program to be successful it would need the cooperation of governments from around the world. Unfortunately however it would almost certainly receive widespread opposition from political, social and religious organisations. Yet without near unanimous support the program will not work. It is likely for example; that a decision by one country, or ethnic group, to reduce their population size would be perceived as an opportunity for a competing racial group, culture, religion etc., to dominate the other.

Thus we concede, a selective human breeding program has a near zero chance of ever being adopted.

## **The Bad News – The Good News**

There have been five great extinction events and this suggests that every era of evolutionary progress is followed by a crash. Even during times of increasing complexity, there is a tendency for species to go extinct – evidenced by the fact that 99.9% of species that have existed, are now extinct.

The fact that increased complexity is followed by a crash is supportive of the *God Gametes* theory. Darwinian survival of the fittest would have all members of a species converge on the strongest and most adaptable traits. This however, is not what we see with either the individual members of a species or with their male gametes. It seems no matter how heavily a species (or the male gametes) are culled, the next generation will have a majority of individuals that are less fit and less well adapted.

So why don't the members of species that survive to reproduce, pass on their fittest and best-adapted traits to all of their progeny? The *God Gametes* theory claims that genetic properties coding for fitness and physical traits are cyclical. Maybe a good way to explain

this concept would be to imagine it was possible for scientists to accurately identify the genes that coded for the ability to play a given sport. If then there was a data base that carried copies of everybody's genome a person might ask the computer to print out the names of 1,000 people who have the genes that best match the traits for playing tennis. He would soon realise however that not all of the 1,000 names would be those of people recognised as great tennis players. Yes the people with the best genes might have the best potential but unless the individuals who carry them have reached the age of 18 they would probably never have rank in the top 1,000 players in the world.

The only possible reason for the ongoing expression of the less fit and less well adapted genes is that the properties that code for these genes are cyclical. The need to survive would ensure that species selected, not only the best genes, but the genes that would best perform, if it was possible to select them.

The following suggest a reason why nature has ensured that this is not an option.

Imagine what would happen if the production of genetic traits was not a cyclical process and a species was able to select only the best performing traits. The best adapted and fittest traits would be selected and the dominant species would soon out-compete all rivals. This of course would be devastating for other species – and ultimately lead to the destruction of the dominant species. But what happens if that dominant species produces offspring that are not all the fittest and best-adapted because most have not reached full maturity? Being the dominant species most of the less mature will survive to reproduce and pass on their less mature, less fit and less well adapted genes to their progeny. The traits that are less fit and less well adapted will become the most prevalent traits and the species will become physically weaker and less able to compete. Other species will then start to out-compete the dominant species and restore the natural balance. The once dominant species however has a chance to bounce back because it possesses young genes that will mature in a way better able to adapt to an ever changing environment.

Our theory holds that genes for traits and fitness start out immature and need many lifetimes to develop the properties that are strong and well adapted to the environment in which their species must survive. The gradual maturing of traits ensures that people who are not the fittest and best adapted are necessary for the future survival of our species. These individuals should not be discouraged that they do not have strong character traits and cannot perform as well as a champion athlete. Instead they should attempt to develop traits that will help them emerge as a stronger person, with better adapted attributes, in a future life.

This natural safety measure will no doubt apply to us. We have become the dominant species on earth and have been responsible for the extinction of thousands of others. As we continue to reproduce from almost all our progeny however, humans will become progressively weaker and eventually crash, allowing other species to move into our environmental niche and restore a natural environmental balance.

We may look at this and think that the human species has been put in a no-win situation. Yet strangely, the realisation that we cannot survive long term, gives us hope. If we have a creator, we must ask why would he create our species, with a consciousness and a sense of morality, only to then set us on a dead-end path? We are like the embryonic chick. If it had a consciousness, it may also think it had no hope of survival. It would perceive its world as what it could observe inside the shell, concerned that its growing body was rapidly depleting all the resources it needs to survive. The chick however is part of the reproductive system of its species, and with determination, will break through its shell and transition into a different dimension of life.

We did not ask to be put here on this planet – and now here, cannot prevent our species from crashing. Yet, as part of the reproductive system of our parent species, we carry the genes from which their future offspring will be coded. Thus our survival will depend on our ability to discover ways to be useful. For like all species, our parent species will retain genes they need, discarding the ones that have no use.

## Conclusion

Our human soul is not limited to the tenure of our body, nor of our species. It is part of an external reproductive system extending to universal and multiversal dimensions of space and time. It matters not that our bodies will die and our species will become extinct. What is important is that we develop qualities in this life, qualities that will be useful to our parent species and will be retained by the *Germ-line of the Gods*.

We need to remember that genes with a useful function will transfer from generation to generation and from species to species, for hundreds of millions of years. And an entangled quantum particle can communicate instantly with another particle that is potentially light years away. Sections of DNA exchange places on maternal and paternal chromosomes and in our dreams we meet strange people and encounter places and events that appear unreal. We claim couples trade parts of their soul when making love, and it would seem that even ancient buildings have transitioned from one dimension of space and time to another.

Our bodies will die and our species will become extinct. While we exist, however, our objective must be to demonstrate we have the intelligence and morality needed by the future progeny of our parent species. If successful, then hopefully our souls and our species will live on as part of the germ-line of our creator-being. Then, as part of the parent species germ-line, we will be able to perceive the 96% of the universe that, as humans, we cannot see or measure. And to comprehend the life encoded for by our silent DNA, the life that exists in places not of this world.

From *Germ-line of the Gods - God Gametes 3 and The Entanglement and Decay of Planet Earth*, Chapter 10, Part 4 Selective Human Breeding, The Bad News – The Good News and Conclusion

## New Generation Eugenics

Early civilisations did not over populate the planet because only those who survived the harsh conditions lived to reproduce. Yet we live in the here and now. We cannot abandon our technology and return to a hunter-gatherer life style where most of our children will not survive. So how does our species recover from becoming progressively weaker as a result of breeding from the less fit and less well adapted?

This work argues that there are four possible ways we can attempt to manage our human population. Briefly put these are:

**Business as usual:** This is when people have as many offspring as possible - as has happened for most of the time our species has existed. No modern medical intervention is provided when people and children get sick and a stable population is achieved by natural mortality. It would of course be unthinkable to deny lifesaving medical intervention to people

who are sick and such a population management program should never be contemplated in the modern world.

**Two in – two out:** Two in – two out is when the number of children born is limited to replacement levels. Such a strategy, with modern medical intervention, would see the majority of the less fit survive and reproduce and cause the population to become progressively weaker.

**The swarm:** This is when people have more offspring than is needed to replace the ones that pass away. It is also when medical intervention is provided such that the majority will live to reproduce. The swarm causes an exponential increase in population and the human demand on resources to outstrip supply.

Unfortunately the strategies for managing population that are currently adopted by countries around the world could be described as Business as usual, Two in – Two out or the Swarm. None of these population management programs can work long term and all three are doomed to fail.

We cannot continue to produce more offspring than the planet can sustain. We also know *homo sapiens* will never be the first ever species to survive by randomly producing only enough offspring to replace those who pass away. And allowing our children to die from preventable disease would of course be morally objectionable and would never be advocated by any sane person.

Future generations however may face a dramatic decline in public health and, if this happens, radical options will need to be considered. Noting that this document is not advocating a policy and is only stating what is possible, we offer a fourth option:

**Selective human breeding:** A woman living a traditional hunter-gatherer existence in the Australian desert would probably have 10 children with only 2 surviving to reproduce. Thus we could say a hunter gatherer couple would only have 20% of their offspring carrying genes that could survive such a harsh environment. Other groups living in more clement conditions would of course have a lower mortality rate and would provide the species with greater genetic diversity.

If then some future society were faced with a dramatic decline in public health, which is likely to happen, they might consider providing incentives for the majority of people to have only one child. On the other hand women who are the fitter and best adapted could be encouraged to have as many children as possible such that the overall population numbers would remain constant. This would allow for the fittest and best adapted genes to again become dominant. Such a system makes it possible for all members of the community, even the less fit, to have a child. Thus, by making sure that everyone has the opportunity to reproduce, the genetic diversity of future generations is assured.

It would seem our gender based reproductive system is designed to facilitate this type of managed breeding program. The fact that two people are the parents of a single child makes the implementation of such a strategy less objectionable than it might first appear. Allowing all couples to have one child gives everyone the opportunity to have a son or daughter – yet it provides the means of reducing the offspring of the less fit by 50% with every generation. On the other hand only 20% of the population with the fittest and best adapted genes can, by having large families, maintain their community's numbers.

Not all the progeny of the fittest parents will be healthy and strong. And the majority of the population who have been limited to one child will produce some sons and daughters that

could be classified as being the fittest and best adapted. Thus the second and subsequent generations of our hypothetical breeding program would see some of the offspring of the fittest parents joining the group having only one child. And the strong and healthy children of the majority group will join those selected to maximise their breeding potential.

We repeat that this document is not advocating such a policy. Our species however is confronting a human disaster and we suggest it is only sensible to look at all possible ways of combatting the impending crisis.

From God Gametes 4 and Earth's Reproductive Chakra, Chapter 6 – God Gametes Q & A 19. Readers might also like to check the 39 minute mark of my God Gametes YouTube video; (see <https://youtu.be/CHHulN2UJbg> )

## The Problems in Europe

Maybe this concept can help those struggling with what is currently happening in Europe. It is possible that this tragedy might ultimately be to our advantage. In a shrinking world the mixing of races (particularly European races) would likely happen as a natural process. The fact that it has been engineered, and driven at a faster pace than is socially acceptable, will force many people to search for a way they can save their race and their heritage.

Asking Europeans, in an overpopulated world, to have more children cannot work. The only way the European race can be saved is by 'eugenics' – and hopefully the current crisis will prompt us to take a closer look at this alternative. There are many benefits:

- We currently have a 500% increase in autism and a general increase in numerous detrimental medical conditions. This presumably is because we currently have nearly all children surviving to reproduce - whereas in the natural environment only the fittest would survive to reproduce. Selectively breeding from the fittest (eugenics) is the only way to address these issues.
- If a group of Europeans started practicing eugenics they would of course be accused of being racist. This criticism could very easily be countered by pointing out that breeding from the less fit will ultimately have the same consequences on all races. And all, if wanting to survive, will eventually need to practice eugenics.
- Humans have engaged in animal breeding for thousands of years. There is an acknowledged benefit in the short term when blood lines are crossed. Successful breeding programs however will always preserve pure blood lines. The retention of pure blood lines is the primary objective of managed breeding programs of the lower order animals - as it would be if we managed the breeding of our own species.

Our bodies host a consciousness that appreciates art, plays music, comprehends complex mathematics, remembers the past and plans for the future. Our remarkable consciousness however is carried by a physical body that is near identical genetically to the lower order animals whose breeding programs we have managed for thousands of years. As an intelligent race of people we should understand the rules for breeding healthy stock will apply equally to our species as it does to the lower order animals.