

Editorial

What Is the Intent of Science?

In our *Feature* we present scientific denunciations against “the new Ape Science” of breeding human embryos to create tissue or to clone human beings, which should shock you. Not because the speakers at the panel in Oberwesel, Germany had any startling new revelations to present on this topic so crucial to our culture and civilization. But because they — and most emphatically Lyndon LaRouche, who concluded their panel — absolutely refused to treat this matter as a “single issue” of whether to one is “for or against” human embryological research; or whether to support “morality” or to support “the march of science and technology.”

The human cloning/stem-cell research debate is shockingly rigged, both in the media and in the science the media is reporting — rigged on behalf of the molecular-biological cult-dogma of the nature of human life. This dogma in turn represents, in science, the old and evil idea of the human being as a logical-sensory apparatus — a member of the animal kingdom — rather than the species defined apart from the beasts, by the unique cognitive power of discovery.

That is why those “scientists” who have publicly come out for human cloning — we published their anti-human “Manifesto” two issues ago — are *not* the scientists involved in this field of research. Rather, they are the world’s leading neo-Darwinians, the “sociobiologists” led by such as Robert Dawkins, Peter Singer, and Hubert Markl, whom Gabriele Liebig refers to in her presentations and articles as the Ape Scientists. Their program is explicit: Man is no different from the beasts, has no more natural rights than any ape; the human race should be reduced drastically in numbers while being “improved in quality” by the practice of eugenics. They may not all take precisely the public position of Singer, that active infanticide should be practiced against severely handicapped infants, in order to save medical costs and “improve quality of life.” But they all share the oligarchical view of man and animals — the view of “culling the herd” to produce human or animal popula-

tions with only the desired physical-mental characteristics. For this view — the evil cult view which LaRouche shows is actually dominating the biological sciences — human cloning experiments and stem-cell research are both new means to a Nazi-eugenical intention.

The debate is rigged in another, more blatant way. Unless you closely search scientific journals, you have heard nothing of the actually most promising stem-cell research being conducted. This research does not involve the much-ballyhooed “embryo stem-cell lines,” about which very little is really known. (So little, that dim-bulb President Bush thought he had learned all about them in a weekend of briefings.) Rather, it is research, noted in our *Feature*, using the stem-cells of an adult human being — for example, bone marrow cells — for therapeutic growth of new tissues for the same person. These efforts, bearing promise for therapy but none for eugenics, are blacked out in the raging “stem-cell/cloning debate.” The intent, is to make you believe that you must choose, between supporting promising scientific research, and your moral or perhaps religious opposition to the use of human embryos for the mere purpose of production of tissue.

A more difficult scientific question — why cloned animals have usually turned out *not* to be just like their parents at all, but rather disabled or defective in some way — remains to be solved. Its solution should come back to the fundamental falsehood of the molecular-biological definition of life, exposed in Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum’s contribution.

But the more fundamental question of the *intent* of those practicing science, is already clear. That *intent* runs from the neo-Darwinian seeking new means to cull the human herd, to the company seeking control of medical therapy, and down to the parents seeking to play God with the characteristics of their future offspring. Such an intent cannot be consistent with actually successful scientific work. Of such an intent, we said, “Never again.”