

THI-SHOW TRANSCRIPT 2021-03-23

WHAT'S THIS LIFE FOR Tonight's show we go into another topic that divides the narrative, too few will discuss it and it is often overlooked. It is only spoken about in negative terms due to the racial profiling elements of the Hebrew Annunaki, and their statement of only they are the important ones, as they are the chosen people. Which turns out to be an out and out lie based on our shows From Russia with Love Plus 4 and 5. This subject was debated and discussed 2300 years before they ran their hidden hand programs of mind control from the 1880's onwards, but kicked into a higher gear around the 1940's. This divides opinion like no other topic, is it right? do people have a say in it? who decides it's process or parameters? will it benefit the few or the many? will it develop our species or destroy it? All highly evolved species at some point in time must develop the species into a better version than the past. Teaching is the best format, but with education designed to produce copy and repeat after me bot like people, that has essentially lowered the intelligence of our species drastically. That was designed to help the weak based controllers, they are terrified of the so called lesser masses having the intelligence to work out their game. We at THI have achieved that, we have worked out all of their game, their strategies, their intentions and their future based projections. We are not sheep so they can't pull their wool over our eyes. We are not baaarbarians and we see your antics and we are entitled to have a say in how this planet is run. We the people, not just by fire hazardous people with too many pieces of paper, or psychotic religious elements with their fake righteousness, or Hebrew Annunaki with their racist Talmudic law book, all should have a say on it. Tonight I will produce both sides of the debate, raise the questions, be it of ethical, sociological, psychological aspects in a common sense overview manner that is befitting of an advanced species. WHO MADE WHO

GENE DRIVE TECHNOLOGY: A gene drive is an existing technology of genetic engineering, that is able to propagate a particular suite of genes throughout a population, by altering the probability that a specific allele will be transmitted to offspring (instead of the Mendelian 50% probability). Mendelian inheritance is a type of biological inheritance, that follows the principles originally proposed by Gregor Mendel in 1865 and 1866, these principles were initially controversial. When Mendel's theories were integrated with the Boveri–Sutton chromosome theory of inheritance by Thomas Hunt Morgan in 1915, they became the core of classical genetics. Ronald Fisher combined these ideas with the theory of natural selection. It's application is particularly suited for creating an irreversible species extinction. The U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has given approximately \$100 million for gene drive research, making them likely the largest single funder of gene drive research on the planet. The secretive top-level JASON group of military advisors produced a classified study on gene drive in 2017, reflecting an extremely high level of interest and activity, by other sections of the U.S. military and Intelligence community. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation paid a

PR firm \$1.6 million, to secretly stack key UN advisory processes with gene drive-friendly scientists. Gene drives can arise through a variety of mechanisms. They have been proposed to provide an effective means of, genetically modifying specific populations and entire species. The technique can employ adding, deleting, disrupting, or modifying genes. This latest techno jab is designed as I understand to Genetically Modify the people taking the jab, and because they own the patent on the material being injected, can subject the people receiving it under an ownership scheme. This is no different to the past of various ET species genetically seeding their genes into humans, for the purpose of ownership, like our recent show stated, have the "gods" returned. Proposed applications include exterminating insects that carry pathogens (notably mosquitoes that transmit malaria, dengue, and zika pathogens), controlling invasive species, or eliminating herbicide or pesticide resistance. As with any potentially powerful technique, gene drives can be misused in a variety of ways or induce unintended consequences. For example, a gene drive intended to affect only a local population might spread across an entire species. Gene drives used to eradicate populations of invasive species in their non-native habitats, may have consequences for the population of the species as a whole, even in its native habitat. Any accidental return of individuals of the species to its original habitats, through natural migration, environmental disruption (storms, floods, etc.), accidental human transportation, or purposeful relocation, could unintentionally drive the species to extinction, if the relocated individuals carried harmful gene drives. "It is very much easier to kill or sterilize a plant using gene editing, than it is to make it herbicide or insect-resistant." Guy Reeves, expert in GM insects at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology. Remember we out Max Planck in earlier shows of being involved in rogue human experimentation. Gene drives can be built from many naturally occurring selfish genetic elements, that use a variety of molecular mechanisms. These naturally occurring mechanisms induce similar segregation distortion in the wild, arising when alleles evolve molecular mechanisms that give them a transmission chance greater than the normal 50%. Most gene drives have been developed in insects, notably mosquitoes, as a way to control insect-borne pathogens. Recent developments designed gene drives directly in viruses, notably the herpes viruses. These viral gene drives can propagate a modification into the population of viruses, and aim to reduce the infectivity of the virus. The documents also reveal that DARPA either funds or co-ordinates with almost all major players working on gene drive development, as well as the key holders of patents on CRISPR gene editing technology. "Given that DARPA is a military agency, we find it surprising that the obvious and concerning dual-use aspects of this research have received so little attention," Felix Beck - lawyer at the University of Freiburg. This is the dual purpose Gain of Function we discussed in Expose Part 7. Whereby funding supposedly is going into research for agriculture purposes, that is the front for the funding, whilst behind the scenes it is being developed for warfare purposes. With the secretive top-level JASON group of military advisors also involved, emails show that the JASON study was initiated with a two day meeting of a select group of invited gene drive researchers in

June 2017. Who are the Jason group? The JASON Society, or JASON Scholars, takes its name from the story of Jason and the Golden Fleece, and it is a branch of the Order of the Quest, one of the highest degrees in the Illuminati. In Top Secret documents it stated that President Eisenhower had commissioned the JASON Society to examine all of the evidence, facts, lies, and deception and find the truth of the alien question. Founders of the JASON Group (not the same as JASON Society) include members of the famous Manhattan Project, which brought together almost every leading physicist in the nation to build the atomic bomb during World War II. The group is made up mostly of theoretical physicists and is the most elite gathering of scientific minds in the United States. More commonly known as the Operation Paperclip crew. As of 1987 the membership included four Nobel Prize winners, yes they say that award is for peace, we have shown it is not. Today JASON continues to offer scientific help the government cannot find anywhere else. They are probably the only group of scientists in the United States that know the true state of highest technology. JASON is shrouded in what appears to be unnecessary secrecy. The group refuses to release its membership list, none of the members list JASON membership on their official resumes. Working completely behind the scenes, JASON has guided the nation's most important security decisions. These include, but are not limited to, Star Wars, Submarine Warfare, and predictions about the greenhouse effect. In the documents it was revealed that the JASONS predicted that the greenhouse effect would lead ultimately to an ice age. The JASON members are paid \$500.00 per-day consultant's fee. According to the Pentagon, the JASONS hold the highest and most restrictive security clearances in the nation. They are given the protocol rank of rear admiral (two stars) when they visit or travel aboard ships or visit military bases. The veil of secrecy around the JASON Group has been so tight and so leak-proof since its conception, that those who think the government cannot keep a secret need to reexamine that position. The government was able to contain the JASON secret except the one leak; but the JASON Group itself, a civilian group, did even better. No leaks have ever occurred from within JASON. JASON is administered by the Mitre Corporation. Government contracts allotted to the Mitre Corporation are in reality allotted to the JASON scientist. This is done so that the name JASON does not ever appear in documents which may come under public scrutiny. The Mitre Corporation are involved in and work with, The Department of Defense, the Federal Aviation Administration, The IRS, Dept of Veterans Affairs, Homeland Security, Administrative Office of the United States courts, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Quite a list for someone most have never heard of. Former President Eisenhower commissioned a secret society known as the Jason Society (or Jason Scholars) under the leadership of the following; Director of Central Intelligence, Allen Welsh Dulles, Dr Zbigniew Brzezinski, President of the Trilateral Commission from 1973 until 1976, and Dr. Henry Kissinger, leader of the scientific effort, to sift through all the facts, evidence, technology, lies and deceptions and find the truth of the Alien question, the reality is it is to provide a cover up, not get to the truth. The society was

made up of thirty two (32) of the most prominent men in the USA. MJ-12 is the name of the secret control group inside the Jason Society. The top 12 members of the 32 members of the Jason Society were designated as MJ-12. MJ-12 has control of everything. They are designated by the code J-1, J-2, J-3, etc. all the way through the members of the Jason Society. The director of Central Intelligence was appointed J-1 and is the Director of the MJ-12 group. Confirming the CIA was in part created to run the alien program, as we had stated in the FRWL series and The Events that changed the world shows 1-3. MJ-12 use to only be responsible to the President of the United States (not true anymore). The actual cost of funding the Alien connected projects is higher than anything you could imagine. Believe it or not, MJ-12 runs most of the worlds illegal drug trade. This was done to hide funding and thus keep the secret from Congress and the people of the United States. The drug trade was justified in that, it would identify and eliminate the weak and undesired elements of our society. Fascinating reveal that, they introduced drugs to the populace, which we know from previous shows, to highlight the weak and undesirables of those who participated in drugs. If that doesn't stop some of you smoking pot, I don't know what will. A secret meeting place was constructed for the MJ-12 group in Maryland and is only accessible by air. It contains full living, recreational, and other facilities for the MJ-12 group and the Jason Society. It is code named "The Country Club", the land for The Country Club was donated by the Rockefeller family. Only those with ULTRA TOP SECRET - MAJI clearances are allowed to go there. MAJI - Majority Agency for Joint Intelligence, all information, disinformation, and intelligence is gathered and evaluated by this agency. This agency is responsible for all disinformation and operates in conjunction with the CIA, NSA, DIA, and the Office of Naval Intelligence. This is a very powerful organization and all Alien projects are under its control. MAJI is responsible only to MJ-12. MAJIC is the security classification and clearance of all Alien connected material, projects, and information. MAJIC - means MAJI controlled (MAJI plus controlled = MAJIC)

At the meeting, the VP of Global Biotechnology for Monsanto gave a presentation on crop science and gene drives. The Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Agency (IARPA), an organization within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, has also expressed interest in funding gene drive work. A scientist involved describes IARPA as "basically the intelligence agencies version of DARPA, which may be more frightening" The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation paid a PR firm \$1.6 million to secretly stack key UN advisory processes with gene drive-friendly scientists, and recruited ostensibly independent academics and public officials into a private collaboration, to counteract proposed regulations and to resist calls by scientists and conservationists for an international moratorium. Target Malaria, a project funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, invested \$75 million in gene drive technology. The foundation originally estimated the technology to be ready for field use by 2029 somewhere in Africa. However, in 2016 Gates changed this estimate to some time within

the following two years. Because Target Malaria hopes to deploy their gene drives in African countries, they have been at pains to emphasize independence from military agendas. However, Target Malaria's Andrea Crisanti (working at Imperial College) is also a lead grantee or subcontractor for DARPA's Safe Genes project, having confirmed he has been hired by DARPA on a \$2.5m contract. Imperial College London has been a pioneer in gene drive research, also with DARPA funding. In trials 2016-2018, scientists succeeded in destroying a population of mosquitoes in a lab by introducing a genetic mutation, that spread through the population and eventually sterilized all of the mosquitoes. In previous experiments, mosquitoes had small random mutations that immunized them against the gene drive. The Imperial College scientists created a gene drive that did not fall prey to this type of resistance. Since it can never more than double in frequency with each generation, a gene drive introduced in a single individual, typically requires dozens of generations to affect a substantial fraction of a population. Alternatively, releasing drive-containing organisms in sufficient numbers can affect the rest within a few generations; for instance, by introducing it in every thousandth individual, it takes only 12–15 generations to be present in all individuals. Whether a gene drive will ultimately become fixed in a population, and at which speed depends on its effect on individuals fitness, on the rate of allele conversion, and on the population structure. In a well mixed population and with realistic allele conversion frequencies, approximately 90%, population genetics predicts that gene drives get fixed for selection coefficient smaller than 0.3; in other words, gene drives can be used to spread modifications, as long as reproductive success is not reduced by more than 30%. This is in contrast with normal genes, which can only spread across large populations if they increase fitness. Because the strategy usually relies on the simultaneous presence of an unmodified and a gene drive allele in the same cell nucleus, it had generally been assumed that a gene drive could only be engineered in sexually reproducing organisms, excluding bacteria and viruses. However, technological breakthroughs have enabled the design of a gene drive strategy that doesn't involve sexual reproduction, but relies on co-infection of a given cell by a naturally occurring and an engineered virus. Which is exactly what this Covid is, an engineered virus, of which the prove we gave in Expose 7 became overwhelming. Upon co-infection, the unmodified genome is cut and repaired by homologous recombination, producing new gene drive viruses that can progressively replace the naturally occurring population. In cell culture experiments, it was shown that a viral gene drive can spread into the viral population, and strongly reduce the infectivity of the virus, which opens novel therapeutic strategies against herpes viruses. That word again, novel. Because gene drives propagate by replacing other alleles that contain a cutting site and the corresponding homologies, their application has been mostly limited to sexually reproducing species (because they are diploid or polyploid and alleles are mixed at each generation). As a side effect, inbreeding could in principle be an escape mechanism, but the extent to which this can happen in practice is difficult to evaluate. Ask the royal and elite family how or whether that works or not, the answer is, it doesn't.

Due to the number of generations required for a gene drive to affect an entire population, the time to universality varies according to the reproductive cycle of each species: it may require under a year for some invertebrates, but centuries for organisms with years-long intervals between birth and sexual maturity, such as humans. Hence this technology is of most use in fast-reproducing species, or so they say. Remember everything with them is futuristic or dystopian, to throw the ignorant masses off the trail of how new technology really works. It's like in Expose 7, the GMO insect machines, that the CIA have been using and working on since 1970, and people think drones are new technology. Other problematic issues highlighted by researchers include: Mutations: A mutation could happen mid-drive, which has the potential to allow unwanted traits to "ride along". Escape: Cross-breeding or gene flow potentially allow a drive to move beyond its target population. Ecological impacts: Even when new traits' direct impact on a target is understood, the drive may have side effects on the surroundings.' The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard added gene drives to a list of uses, of gene-editing technology it doesn't think companies should pursue. Whether MIT and Harvard were being socially responsible that remains suspicious, as likely they are far ahead in their testing and wish at some point to monetize it to their advantage, using private contractor companies as the mode of delivery, so it doesn't link back to them. Gene drives affect all future generations, and represent the possibility of a larger change in a living species than has been possible before.

CRISPR TECHNOLOGY ARRIVES: In December 2015, scientists of major world academies, called for a moratorium on inheritable human genome edits that would affect the germline, including those related to CRISPR-Cas9 technologies, but supported continued basic research and gene editing that would not affect future generations. In February 2016, British scientists were given permission by regulators to genetically modify human embryos by using CRISPR-Cas9 and related techniques, on condition that the embryos were destroyed in seven days. Whose embryos were they using? How where they obtained and who approved it? is the questions never asked. In June 2016, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine released a report on their "Recommendations for Responsible Conduct" of gene drives. Models suggest that extinction-oriented gene drives will wipe out target species, and that drives could reach populations beyond the target given minimal connectivity between them. Kevin M. Esvelt stated that an open conversation was needed around the safety of gene drives: "In our view, it is wise to assume that invasive and self-propagating gene drive systems, are likely to spread to every population of the target species throughout the world. Accordingly, they should only be built to combat true plagues such as malaria, for which we have few adequate countermeasures, and that offer a realistic path towards an international agreement to deploy among all affected nations." He moved to an open model for his own research on using gene drive to eradicate Lyme disease (itself a biological weapon released by accident) in Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. Funny the

coincidences of these all being released by accident, yet years later under the Freedom of Information Acts, we find out it was a Military experiment. Esvelt and colleagues suggested that CRISPR could be used to save endangered wildlife from extinction. Esvelt later retracted his support for the idea, except for extremely hazardous populations such as malaria-carrying mosquitoes, and isolated islands that would prevent the drive from spreading beyond the target area. Austin Burt, an evolutionary geneticist at Imperial College London, introduced the possibility of conducting gene drives based on natural homing endonuclease selfish genetic elements in 2003. Researchers had already shown that such genes could act selfishly to spread rapidly over successive generations. Burt suggested that gene drives might be used to prevent a mosquito population, from transmitting the malaria parasite or to crash a mosquito population. Gene drives based on homing endonucleases have been demonstrated in the laboratory in transgenic populations of mosquitoes and fruit flies. However, homing endonucleases are sequence-specific. Altering their specificity to target other sequences of interest remains a major challenge. The possible applications of gene drive remained limited, until the discovery of CRISPR and associated RNA-guided endonucleases such as Cas9 and Cpf1. In June 2014, the World Health Organization (WHO) Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases, issued guidelines for evaluating genetically modified mosquitoes. Given the mention of bats in Expose 7, is it a coincidence that they are focusing on mosquitoes, given the main consumer of mosquitoes are bats? In 2013 the European Food Safety Authority issued a protocol for environmental assessments of all genetically modified organisms. In sexually-reproducing species, most genes are present in two copies (which can be the same or different alleles), either one of which has a 50% chance of passing to a descendant. By biasing the inheritance of particular altered genes, synthetic gene drives could spread alterations through a population. At the molecular level, an endonuclease gene drive works by cutting a chromosome at a specific site that does not encode the drive, inducing the cell to repair the damage by copying the drive sequence onto the damaged chromosome. The cell then has two copies of the drive sequence, the method derives from genome editing techniques. Whilst I am limited in my understanding of this science, isn't what has just been described the RNA interference with DNA sequencing code method, described by Gates in his video? As a result, the gene drive insertion in the genome will re-occur in each organism, that inherits one copy of the modification and one copy of the wild-type gene. If the gene drive is already present in the egg cell (e.g. when received from one parent), all the gametes of the individual will carry the gene drive (instead of 50% in the case of a normal gene). Scientists have designed multiple strategies to maintain control over gene drives. The *Drosophila* drive requires at least thousands of insects for the drive to begin. A few individuals escaping the target region would be unlikely to spread the drive. In 2020 researchers reported the development of two active guide RNA-only elements that, according to their study, may enable halting or deleting gene drives, introduced into populations in the wild with CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing. The paper's senior author

cautions that the two neutralizing systems they demonstrated in cage trials, "should not be used with a false sense of security for field-implemented gene drives". CRISPR is a DNA editing method that makes genetic engineering faster, easier, and more efficient. The approach involves expressing an RNA-guided endonuclease such as Cas9 along with guide RNAs directing it to a particular sequence to be edited. When the endonuclease cuts the target sequence, the cell repairs the damage by replacing the original sequence with homologous DNA. Homologous - having the same evolutionary origin but not necessarily the same function; "the wing of a bat and the arm of a man are homologous" All of which sounds to me like chimeric, remember in Expose 7 they spoke of chimeric drugs, yet the description of chimeric states illusionary and doesn't exist, all a myth. Yet, in Egypt the hieroglyphs are riddled with chimera beings, half man and half something else. By introducing an additional template with appropriate homologues, an endonuclease can be used to delete, add or modify genes in an unprecedentedly simple manner. As of 2014, it had been tested in cells of 20 species, including humans. Indeed, of course they have, and seven years later that development is much further down the line. In many of these species, the edits modified the organism's germline, allowing them to be inherited. In 2014 Esvelt and coworkers first suggested that CRISPR/Cas9 might be used to build endonuclease gene drives. In 2015 researchers published successful engineering of CRISPR-based gene drives in *Saccharomyces*, *Drosophila*, and mosquitoes. All four studies demonstrated efficient inheritance distortion over successive generations, with one study demonstrating the spread of a gene drive into laboratory populations. Drive-resistant alleles were expected to arise for each of the described gene drives, however this could be delayed or prevented by targeting highly conserved sites, at which resistance is expected to have a severe fitness cost. Because of CRISPR's targeting flexibility, gene drives could theoretically be used to engineer almost any trait. Which means gene drive is essentially a program, which you write the code for, and once injected, could be used to operate that person via diverse methods unbeknown to the host. Unlike previous designs, they could be tailored to block the evolution of drive resistance in the target population, by targeting multiple sequences within appropriate genes. CRISPR could permit a variety of gene drive architectures intended to control rather than crash populations. Intended to control being the operative word, this is hive mind technology to me, all people being nice little bots for the fear and weak based controllers. Why fearful and weak? because anyone who wishes to control somebody else, is inherently weak and fearful, people of inner strength don't do that. WHAT ABOUT US

Gene drives have two main classes of application, which have implications of different significance: To introduce a genetic modification in laboratory populations; once a strain or a line carrying the gene drive has been produced, the drive can be passed to any other line by mating. Here the gene drive is used to achieve much more easily a task that could be accomplished with other techniques. Introduce a genetic modification in wild populations. Gene drives constitute a major development that makes possible previously

unattainable changes. Because of their unprecedented potential risk, safeguard mechanisms have been proposed and tested. One possible application is to genetically modify mosquitoes and other disease vectors, so that they cannot transmit diseases such as malaria and dengue fever. Researchers have claimed that by applying the technique to 1% of the wild population of mosquitoes, that they could eradicate malaria within a year. A gene drive could be used to eliminate invasive species and has, for example, been proposed as a way to eliminate invasive species in New Zealand. Gene drives for biodiversity conservation purposes are being explored as part of The Genetic Biocontrol of Invasive Rodents (GBIRd) program, because they offer the potential for reduced risk to non-target species and reduced costs, when compared to traditional invasive species removal techniques. Given the risks of such an approach described below, the GBIRd partnership is committed to a deliberate, step-wise process that will only proceed with public alignment, as recommended by the world's leading gene drive researchers from the Australian and US National Academy of Sciences and many others. A wider Outreach Network for Gene Drive Research exists to raise awareness of the value of gene drive research for the public good. That goes by the name of pro pagan da, clearly they have been using this technology more for warfare purposes, than anything beneficial for we the people. Some scientists are concerned about the technique, fearing it could spread and wipe out species in native habitats. The gene could mutate, potentially causing unforeseen problems (as could any gene). Many non-native species can hybridize with native species, such that a gene drive afflicting a non-native plant or animal that hybridizes with a native species could doom the native species. But, this raises serious questions based on cross breeding of differing colors of humans does it not. We have covered recently that not all humans on this planet come from the same stock, genetically and blood group wise it is not possible. We also know the powers that be and the sub gray Hebrew Annunaki group, used black people to mate with whites to lower the genetic stock of the white race, if we were all the same group this would not be possible. So, with that ascertained, this line they state could and should raise serious questioning of these methods " Many non-native species can hybridize with native species, such that a gene drive afflicting a non-native plant or animal that hybridizes with a native species could doom the native species." Many non-native species have naturalized into their new environment, so well, that crops and/or native species have adapted to depend on them. The Predator Free 2050 project is a New Zealand government program to completely eliminate eight invasive mammalian predator species (including rats, short-tailed weasels, and possums) from the country by 2050. The projects was first announced in 2016 by New Zealand's prime minister John Key, and in January 2017 it was announced that gene drives would be used in the effort. In 2017 one group in Australia and another in Texas, released preliminary research into creating 'daughterless mice', using gene drives in mammals. In 2017 scientists at the University of California, Riverside developed a gene drive to attack the invasive spotted-wing drosophila, a type of fruit fly native to Asia that is costing California's cherry farms \$700 million per year because of its tail's razor-edged

“ovipositor” that destroys unblemished fruit. The primary alternative control strategy involves the use of insecticides called pyrethroids, that kills almost all insects that it contacts. The transhumanist philosopher David Pearce has advocated for using CRISPR-based gene drives to reduce the suffering of wild animals, given he is transhumanist, does he consider other humans as wild animals, like the Talmud readers and followers do? Kevin M. Esvelt, an American biologist who has helped develop gene drive technology, has argued that there is a moral case for the elimination of the New World screwworm, through such technologies because of the immense suffering that infested wild animals experience when they are eaten alive.

Eugenics from Greek εὖ- 'good' and γένεσις 'come into being, growing') is a set of beliefs and practices that aim to improve the genetic quality of a human population, historically by excluding people and groups judged to be inferior or promoting those judged to be superior. The concept predates the term; Plato suggested applying the principles of selective breeding to humans around 400 BC. Early advocates of eugenics in the 19th century regarded it as a way of improving groups of people. In contemporary usage, the term eugenics is closely associated with scientific racism and white supremacy. That is how the powers that be work, discredit something whilst continuing to operate the same dynamics of the program in secrecy. Modern bioethicists who advocate new eugenics characterize it, as a way of enhancing individual traits, regardless of group membership. While eugenic principles have been practiced as early as ancient Greece, the contemporary history of eugenics began in the early 20th century, when a popular eugenics movement emerged in the United Kingdom. It then spread to many countries, including the United States, Canada, and most European countries. In this period, people from across the political spectrum espoused eugenic ideas. Consequently, many countries adopted eugenic policies, intended to improve the quality of their populations' genetic stock. Such programs included both positive measures, such as encouraging individuals deemed particularly "fit" to reproduce, and negative measures, such as marriage prohibitions and forced sterilization of people deemed unfit for reproduction. Those deemed "unfit to reproduce" often included people with mental or physical disabilities, people who scored in the low ranges on different IQ tests, criminals and "deviants", and members of disfavored minority groups. The eugenics movement became associated with Nazi Germany and the Holocaust, when the defense of many of the defendants at the Nuremberg trials of 1945 to 1946, attempted to justify their human-rights abuses, by claiming there was little difference between the Nazi eugenics programs and the U.S. eugenics programs. In reality they were correct, because they were one and the same group, as we discovered in FRWL 4. In the decades following World War II, with more emphasis on human rights, many countries began to abandon eugenics policies, although some Western countries (the United States, Canada, and Sweden among them) continued to carry out forced sterilizations. They didn't abandon them at all, it just went

underground and covered up in a myriad of Universities, Hospitals, Research Centers and Military and Agency programs, all far away from the public glare.

FORCED STERILIZATIONS COUNTRIES Since the 1980s and 1990s, with new assisted reproductive technology procedures available, such as gestational surrogacy (available since 1985), pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (available since 1989), and cytoplasmic transfer (first performed in 1996), concern has grown about the possible revival of a more potent form of eugenics after decades of promoting human rights. A criticism of eugenics policies is that, regardless of whether negative or positive policies are used, they are susceptible to abuse, because the genetic selection criteria are determined by whichever group has political power at the time. Furthermore, many criticize negative eugenics in particular as a violation of basic human rights, seen since 1968's Proclamation of Tehran as including the right to reproduce. Another criticism is that eugenics policies eventually lead to a loss of genetic diversity, thereby resulting in inbreeding depression due to a loss of genetic variation. China's one child policy is the obvious selection for that. Yet another criticism of contemporary eugenics policies is that they propose to permanently and artificially disrupt millions of years of evolution, and that attempting to create genetic lines "clean" of "disorders" can have far-reaching ancillary downstream effects in the genetic ecology, including negative effects on immunity and on species resilience.

Origin and development: Types of eugenic practices have existed for millennia. Some indigenous peoples of Brazil are known to have practiced infanticide, against children born with physical abnormalities since pre-colonial times. In ancient Greece, the philosopher Plato suggested selective mating to produce a guardian class. In Sparta, every Spartan child was inspected by the council of elders, the Gerousia, which determined if the child was fit to live or not. Gerousia were like a Council of elders whose powers went above the Government and Monarchs, I suspect they were not involved in currency revaluations though, like so called modern day elders of the Chinese variety. In the early years of the Roman Republic, a Roman father was obliged by law to immediately kill his child if they were "dreadfully deformed". According to Tacitus, a Roman of the Imperial Period, the Germanic tribes of his day killed any member of their community they deemed cowardly, unwarlike or "stained with abominable vices", usually by drowning them in swamps. The idea of a modern project for improving the human population through selective breeding was originally developed by Francis Galton, and was initially inspired by Darwinism and its theory of natural selection. Galton had read his half-cousin Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, which sought to explain the development of plant and animal species, and desired to apply it to humans. Based on his biographical studies, Galton believed that desirable human qualities were hereditary traits, although Darwin strongly disagreed with this elaboration of his theory. In 1883, one year after Darwin's death, Galton gave his research a name: eugenics. With the introduction of genetics,

eugenics became associated with genetic determinism, the belief that human character is entirely, or in the majority caused by genes, unaffected by education or living conditions. Many of the early geneticists were not Darwinians, and evolution theory was not needed for eugenics policies based on genetic determinism. Throughout its recent history, eugenics has remained controversial. Eugenics became an academic discipline at many colleges and universities and received funding from many sources. Organizations were formed to win public support and sway opinion towards responsible eugenic values in parenthood, including the British Eugenics Education Society of 1907 and the American Eugenics Society of 1921. Both sought support from leading clergymen and modified their message to meet religious ideals. In 1909, the Anglican clergymen William Inge and James Peile both wrote for the British Eugenics Education Society. Inge was an invited speaker at the 1921 International Eugenics Conference, which was also endorsed by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York Patrick Joseph Hayes. Again here comes the common sense question, why are religious leaders who proclaim themselves as messengers of god, playing god themselves with other peoples lives? Did god tell them to do that? Why did god create deformed children to begin with, is the greater question. The whole contradictory nature of the church is rarely questioned, because if it is questioned in any detail, the whole program would fall apart, and they know it. The book *The Passing of the Great Race (Or, The Racial Basis of European History)* by American eugenicist, lawyer, and amateur anthropologist Madison Grant was published in 1916. Although influential, the book was largely ignored when it first appeared, and it went through several revisions and editions. Nevertheless, the book was used by people who advocated restricted immigration, as justification for what became known as "scientific racism". Three International Eugenics Conferences presented a global venue for Eugenicists with meetings in 1912 in London, and in 1921 and 1932 in New York City. Eugenic policies were first implemented in the early 1900s in the United States. It also took root in France, Germany, and Great Britain. Later, in the 1920s and 1930s, the eugenic policy of sterilizing certain mental patients was implemented in other countries including Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Japan and Sweden. Frederick Osborn's 1937 journal article "Development of a Eugenic Philosophy" framed it as a social philosophy, a philosophy with implications for social order. That definition is not universally accepted. Osborn advocated for higher rates of sexual reproduction among people with desired traits ("positive eugenics") or reduced rates of sexual reproduction or sterilization of people with less-desired or undesired traits ("negative eugenics"). In addition to being practiced in a number of countries, eugenics was internationally organized through the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations. Its scientific aspects were carried on through research bodies such as the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics, the Cold Spring Harbor Carnegie Institution for Experimental Evolution, and the Eugenics Record Office. Politically, the movement advocated measures such as sterilization laws. The irony in all of this is, these bloodline families who speak of positive eugenics are the most corrupted genetics on the planet, with their

incest and inbreeding program, yet speak of others as a negative eugenics. These are the same people who created global warming if it exists, shortages of materials and forestry due to their greed based harvesting, who own vast quantities of the land, yet corral people into cities and towns of squalor. They are squalor because of their own failed policies, we have shortages due to their own failed policies, there is wars, death, sickness and lack of basic education due to their own failed policies. In my opinion the Carnegie's, Rockerfellers, Rothschild's, Astors, Medici's and others of the so called families have proven to be incapable of deciding anything for the people of this planet, because aside from collecting material gains for their greed, their record of failure is mindboggling. In its moral dimension, eugenics rejected the doctrine that all human beings are born equal, and redefined moral worth purely in terms of genetic fitness. Its racist elements included pursuit of a pure "Nordic race" or "Aryan" genetic pool and the eventual elimination of "unfit" races. Except the Jewish nobility are neither Nordic or Aryan, so that blows that myth into smithereens, that is the hook to blame the White Race, which was the sub gray race plan all along. Many leading British politicians subscribed to the theories of eugenics, Winston Churchill supported the British Eugenics Society, and was an honorary vice president for the organization. Churchill believed that eugenics could solve "race deterioration" and reduce crime and poverty. Early critics of the philosophy of eugenics included the American sociologist Lester Frank Ward, the English writer G. K. Chesterton. The German-American anthropologist Franz Boas, who argued that advocates of eugenics greatly over-estimate the influence of biology, and Scottish tuberculosis pioneer and author Halliday Sutherland. Ward's 1913 article "Eugenics, Euthenics, and Eudemics", Chesterton's 1917 book *Eugenics and Other Evils*, and Boas' 1916 article "Eugenics" published in *The Scientific Monthly*, were all harshly critical of the rapidly growing movement. Sutherland identified Eugenists as a major obstacle to the eradication and cure of tuberculosis in his 1917 address "Consumption: Its Cause and Cure", and criticism of Eugenists and Neo-Malthusians, in his 1921 book *Birth Control* led to a writ for libel from the Eugenist Marie Stopes. Several biologists were also antagonistic to the eugenics movement, including Lancelot Hogben. Other biologists such as J. B. S. Haldane and R. A. Fisher expressed skepticism in the belief that sterilization of "defectives", would lead to the disappearance of undesirable genetic traits. Among institutions, the Catholic Church was an opponent of state-enforced sterilizations. Attempts by the Eugenics Education Society to persuade the British government, to legalize voluntary sterilization were opposed by Catholics and by the Labour Party. The Catholic church wanted to build their numbers up is why they had that stance, all a power play. The American Eugenics Society initially gained some Catholic supporters, but Catholic support declined following the 1930 papal encyclical *Casti connubii*. It is said the Catholic no condoms was a money based idea, more parishioners equals more donations to the church. In this, Pope Pius XI explicitly condemned sterilization laws: "Public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects; therefore, where no crime has taken place and there is no cause present for grave punishment, they

can never directly harm, or tamper with the integrity of the body, either for the reasons of eugenics or for any other reason." As a social movement, eugenics reached its greatest popularity in the early decades of the 20th century, when it was practiced around the world and promoted by governments, institutions, and influential individuals. Many countries enacted various eugenics policies, including: genetic screenings, birth control, promoting differential birth rates, marriage restrictions, segregation (both racial segregation and sequestering the mentally ill), compulsory sterilization, forced abortions or forced pregnancies, ultimately culminating in genocide. By 2014, gene selection (rather than "people selection") was made possible through advances in genome editing, leading to what is sometimes called new eugenics, also known as "neo-eugenics", "consumer eugenics", or "liberal eugenics". " By 2014, gene selection (rather than "people selection") was made possible through advances in genome editing" Is that not what is playing out now? and now you should understand where I say racism is geneticism, it has zero to do with the color of your skin. They are trying to mask it, in the same way they denigrated all Aryans as white supremacists, it is reverse psychology programs they are employing on the people. The modern day vaccines are nothing to do with Covid, they are testing out their technology and gene editing jabs on an unsuspecting public. That may not have the full consequences of actions, until a later date. This is a part of what Anna Von Reitz stated about people becoming owners of the now GMO people, because like the 26 species of ET's did in the past, planted their seed and we became part ownership for those species. LET MY PEOPLE GO

Eugenics and racism in the United States: The title itself is pro pagan da, eugenics and racism is pushed by those with an agenda, none of their agendas have ever been beneficial to we the people. Anti-miscegenation laws in the United States made it a crime for individuals, to wed someone categorized as belonging to a different race. These laws were part of a broader policy of racial segregation in the United States, to minimize contact between people of different ethnicities. Race laws and practices in the United States were explicitly used as models by the Nazi regime, when it developed the Nuremberg Laws, stripping Jewish citizens of their citizenship. Actually that is not true, they were applying the original laws of the refugees who came here, were told not to mix species. The Jewish Israel Cohen speech confirmed it, when he said we will get the blacks to mix with the whites and devalue their race and genetics. They clearly knew about the secret knowledge, otherwise why would he say that? Despite how it sounds given the pro pagan da surrounding racism, and the fake I am offended by everything culture, this as I understand it was the golden rule. Why? not because of the color of your skin, but because we were all different species of human, is why. Using the term Nazi and Jewish is a mind control program, designed to create revulsion and stop the person thinking about the subject rationally. Ignoring the irony of the fact that the two are one and the same, NAational ZIonism and hence the Jewish flavor. Nazism and the decline of eugenics: Schloss Hartheim, a former center for Nazi Germany's Aktion T4 campaign. A

Lebensborn birth house in Nazi Germany, created with the intention of raising the birth rate of "Aryan" children, from the extramarital relations of "racially pure and healthy" parents. The scientific reputation of eugenics started to decline in the 1930s, a time when Ernst Rüdin used eugenics as a justification for the racial policies of Nazi Germany. Adolf Hitler had praised and incorporated eugenic ideas in *Mein Kampf* in 1925, and emulated eugenic legislation for the sterilization of "defectives", that had been pioneered in the United States once he took power. Some common early 20th century eugenics methods involved identifying and classifying individuals and their families, including the poor, mentally ill, blind, deaf, developmentally disabled, promiscuous women, homosexuals, and racial groups (such as the Roma and Jews in Nazi Germany) as "degenerate" or "unfit", and therefore led to segregation, institutionalization, sterilization, and even mass murder. The Nazi policy of identifying German citizens deemed mentally or physically unfit, and then systematically killing them with poison gas, referred to as the Aktion T4 campaign, is understood by historians to have paved the way for the Holocaust. There is no evidence poison gas called Zyklon B was ever used in those camps, there were no blue walls, which is the residue left after Zyklon B is used. By the end of World War II, many eugenics laws were abandoned, having become associated with Nazi Germany. H. G. Wells, who had called for "the sterilization of failures" in 1904, stated in his 1940 book *The Rights of Man: Or What Are We Fighting For?* that among the human rights, which he believed should be available to all people, was "a prohibition on mutilation, sterilization, torture, and any bodily punishment". After World War II, the practice of "imposing measures intended to prevent births within [a national, ethnical, racial or religious] group" fell within the definition of the new international crime of genocide, set out in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union also proclaims "the prohibition of eugenic practices, in particular those aiming at selection of persons". In spite of the decline in discriminatory eugenics laws, some government mandated sterilizations continued into the 21st century. During the ten years President Alberto Fujimori led Peru from 1990 to 2000, 2,000 persons were allegedly involuntarily sterilized. China maintained its one-child policy until 2015, as well as a suite of other eugenics based legislation to reduce population size, and manage fertility rates of different populations. In 2007, the United Nations reported coercive sterilizations and hysterectomies in Uzbekistan. During the years 2005 to 2013, nearly one-third of the 144 California prison inmates who were sterilized did not give lawful consent to the operation. Lebensborn means the fount of life, and whatever people think they know and indeed have been corralled into thinking a certain way, the reality is and was far from the truth. Lebensborn began as the solution to a problem, as Germany was facing a demographic catastrophe. World War I had decimated the country's young male population, nearly 2,000,000 German soldiers were never coming home. A loss that had dire consequences for not only the years immediately following 1918 but the next decades as well. Those soldiers would never marry or start families, which meant the new

generation of Germans would be a small group indeed. Unsurprisingly, marriage prospects for German women in the 1920s and 30s were especially grim, a circumstance that led to a number of unwanted out-of-wedlock pregnancies. In 1935, the German government estimated that as many as 800,000 pregnancies were ending in abortion every year. To Adolf Hitler, this was an unconscionable waste of young Aryan children who might be swelling the ranks of the nation's depleted population. It was in that context that the Lebensborn program was created. On its face, Lebensborn, meaning "Fount of Life," appeared modest: It would establish a number of excellent facilities to offer the pregnant wives of S.S. officers free prenatal and postnatal care. The mothers and babies would be looked after scrupulously while their husbands ran the Nazi regime, and with no financial or healthcare concerns to hold them back, the couples would be encouraged to procreate as often as possible. That is the reality of that program, Germany had lost many of their own peoples, and they wished to repopulate it and end the staggering amount of abortions. Does that sound as sinister as the historians and media have made it out to be?

Modern eugenics: Developments in genetic, genomic, and reproductive technologies at the beginning of the 21st century, have raised numerous questions regarding the ethical status of eugenics, effectively creating a resurgence of interest in the subject. Some, such as UC Berkeley sociologist Troy Duster, have claimed that modern genetics is a back door to eugenics. This view was shared by then-White House Assistant Director for Forensic Sciences, Tania Simoncelli, who stated in a 2003 publication by the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College, that advances in pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) are moving society to a "new era of eugenics", and that, unlike the Nazi eugenics, modern eugenics is consumer driven and market based, "where children are increasingly regarded as made-to-order consumer products". In a 2006 newspaper article, Richard Dawkins said that discussion regarding eugenics was inhibited by the shadow of Nazi misuse, to the extent that some scientists would not admit that breeding humans for certain abilities is at all possible. He believes that it is not physically different from breeding domestic animals for traits, such as speed or herding skill. Dawkins felt that enough time had elapsed to at least ask, just what the ethical differences were between breeding for ability, versus training athletes or forcing children to take music lessons, though he could think of persuasive reasons to draw the distinction. Lee Kuan Yew, the founding father of Singapore, promoted eugenics as early as 1983. A proponent of nature over nurture, he stated that "intelligence is 80% nature and 20% nurture", and attributed the successes of his children to genetics. In his speeches, Lee urged highly educated women to have more children, claiming that "social delinquents" would dominate unless their fertility rate increased. In 1984, Singapore began providing financial incentives to highly educated women, to encourage them to have more children. In 1985, incentives were significantly reduced after public uproar. In October 2015, the United Nations' International Bioethics Committee wrote that, the ethical problems of

human genetic engineering should not be confused with, the ethical problems of the 20th century eugenics movements. However, it is still problematic because it challenges the idea of human equality and opens up new forms of discrimination and stigmatization for those who do not want, or cannot afford, the technology. Transhumanism is often associated with eugenics, although most transhumanists holding similar views nonetheless, distance themselves from the term "eugenics", preferring "germinal choice" or "reprogenetics", to avoid having their position confused with the discredited theories and practices of early-20th-century eugenic movements. Yet more word salad liberalism to avoid calling it as it is. Prenatal screening can be considered a form of contemporary eugenics, because it may lead to abortions of children with undesirable traits. A system was proposed by California Senator Skinner to compensate victims of, the well-documented examples of prison sterilizations resulting from California's eugenics programs, but this did not pass by the bill's 2018 deadline in the Legislature.

Meanings and types: The term eugenics and its modern field of study were first formulated by Francis Galton in 1883, drawing on the recent work of his half-cousin Charles Darwin. Galton published his observations and conclusions in his book *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. The origins of the concept began with certain interpretations of Mendelian inheritance and the theories of August Weismann. The word eugenics is derived from the Greek word eu ("good" or "well") and the suffix -genēs ("born"). Galton intended it to replace the word "stirpiculture", which he had used previously but which had come to be mocked due to its perceived sexual overtones. Galton defined eugenics as "the study of all agencies under human control which can improve or impair the racial quality of future generations".

Oneida stirpiculture: The stirpiculture experiment at the Oneida Community was the first positive eugenics experiment in American history, resulting in the planned conception, birth and rearing of 58 children. The experiment lasted from 1869–1879, it was not considered as part of the larger eugenics history because of its radical religious context. Until the late 1860s, John Humphrey Noyes and his community prevented the unintentional conception of children through their practice of male continence. Noyes and the community believed in only having children with purpose and preparation. In this communal society, it was not simply about the preparedness of the parents, but rather the preparedness of the community to support a new generation. In the early years of the community, when poverty was an issue, the community did not feel adequately prepared to take on the raising and support of children. Therefore, procreation was discouraged in these early days before the financial successes of the community's trap-building manufacturing. An "accidental" conception was thought to be a failure in male continence, the act that was meant to prevent unwanted pregnancies, through the withholding of male ejaculation during intercourse, however, accidental conceptions did occur. In 1869, the Oneida Community began its experiment with stirpiculture, which

Noyes governed in tandem with a committee. Community men and women were paired owing to their exhibition of superior mental and spiritual qualities. Noyes was the main judge of the men and women selected to parent children in the experiment, but he also sought the aid of a committee. This committee approved and denied requests of community members to have a child. Many members applied as couples, and some of the couples were actually encouraged by the committee itself. There was a set of standards by which each candidate should meet; older men in the Community were especially sought after, according to the community's idea of Ascending Fellowship, as Noyes believed they were much wiser and spiritually sound. Women, on the other hand, were typically between the ages of 20 and 42. Both men and women were chosen based on spiritual and virtuous qualities, as opposed to physical ones. Children at Oneida were raised communally, not specifically by their biological parents. They were brought up under the supervision of community "Mothers" and "Fathers", who were assigned the job of child care in a separate wing of the Oneida Community's Mansion House. Many community members helped out with this, and therefore the children were surrounded with guidance and support from multiple sources. The children were brought up in a healthy country environment with plenty of fresh air, good food, and attention, and Oneida was isolated from chronic diseases, that might have affected children in more crowded areas. As they grew up in the years following the breakup, their families and friends encouraged them to go to college and to achieve worldly success; The Practice of Perfection. In part, this push toward outside education, especially scientific education, would contribute to the breakup of the Oneida Community. The experiment with stirpiculture in the Oneida Community lasted from 1869 to 1879. Fifty-eight live children were produced as a result of the experiment. Most women and men only produced one child, some produced two or three, and 13 of those were recorded as "accidental conceptions". To prove his religious and social prowess, as well as that of his bloodline, John H. Noyes and his son Theodore produced 12 children between them, 11 of whom survived (Carden 64). Not sure what the Carden 64 refers to in this, but perhaps this is related to that group. The Carden pre school education group, Carden teaches children how to think, and provides them with the tools of self-expression they need to succeed in whatever field they choose. Understanding takes precedence over memorization—self-reliance, stamina, and perseverance result. The development and nourishment of these children were very diligently attended to, and values such as non-attachment were impressed on children, even at a very young age. Many of the children lived long and were very well-educated; however, it has been offered that perhaps the children's environment lent them these abilities. Each child at Oneida was well supported and cared for within the community. They were given a lot of play time and rooms to do it in, as the Oneidan's believed in the importance of exercise. Both girls and boys were provided an education, and some of the children even went on to college, and were encouraged to do so. They were under the constant guidance of older community members. The children learned the importance of non-attachment and commitment to the community. The

modern day interpretation of that would be called a cult, as heaven forbid you have people thinking for themselves, caring for each other, developing their children, nurturing their children, not relying on the government and or authority is now considered almost a national crime, and subsequently labeled a cult. The world is lacking true love and the authorities and their insane programs are largely responsible for it. THE POWER OF LOVE

Historically, the idea of eugenics has been used to argue for a broad array of practices, ranging from prenatal care for mothers deemed genetically desirable, to the forced sterilization and murder of those deemed unfit. To population geneticists, the term has included the avoidance of inbreeding without altering allele frequencies; for example, J. B. S. Haldane wrote that "the motor bus, by breaking up inbred village communities, was a powerful eugenic agent." The great question is, who taught them the inbreeding method? The answer is the "gods" and the elite family bloodlines, and yet these same people want to change things and keep themselves as a model example, me thinks they are not. Debate as to what exactly counts as eugenics continues today. Edwin Black, journalist and author of *War Against the Weak*, argues that eugenics is often deemed a pseudoscience because, what is defined as a genetic improvement of a desired trait is a cultural choice rather than, a matter that can be determined through objective scientific inquiry. The most disputed aspect of eugenics has been the definition of "improvement" of the human gene pool, such as what is a beneficial characteristic and what is a defect. Historically, this aspect of eugenics was tainted with scientific racism and pseudoscience. Early eugenicists were mostly concerned with factors of perceived intelligence, that often correlated strongly with social class. These included Karl Pearson and Walter Weldon, who worked on this at the University College London. In his lecture "Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics", Pearson claimed that everything concerning eugenics fell into the field of medicine. Eugenic policies have been conceptually divided into two categories. Positive eugenics is aimed at encouraging reproduction among the genetically advantaged; for example, the reproduction of the intelligent, the healthy, and the successful. Possible approaches include financial and political stimuli, targeted demographic analyses, in vitro fertilization, egg transplants, and cloning. Negative eugenics aimed to eliminate, through sterilization or segregation, those deemed physically, mentally, or morally "undesirable". This includes abortions, sterilization, and other methods of family planning. Both positive and negative eugenics can be coercive; in Nazi Germany, for example, abortion was illegal for women deemed by the state to be fit.

Arguments for scientific validity: The first major challenge to conventional eugenics based on genetic inheritance was made in 1915 by Thomas Hunt Morgan. He demonstrated the event of genetic mutation occurring outside of inheritance involving the discovery of the hatching of a fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) with white eyes from a

family with red eyes, demonstrating that major genetic changes occurred outside of inheritance. Additionally, Morgan criticized the view that certain traits, such as intelligence and criminality, were hereditary because these traits were subjective. Despite Morgan's public rejection of eugenics, much of his genetic research was adopted by proponents of eugenics. The hetero-zygote test is used for the early detection of recessive hereditary diseases, allowing for couples to determine if they are at risk of passing genetic defects to a future child. The goal of the test is to estimate the likelihood of passing the hereditary disease to future descendants. There are examples of eugenic acts that managed to lower the prevalence of recessive diseases, although not influencing the prevalence of heterozygote carriers of those diseases. The elevated prevalence of certain genetically transmitted diseases among the Ashkenazi Jewish population (Tay–Sachs, cystic fibrosis, Canavan's disease, and Gaucher's disease), has been decreased in current populations by the application of genetic screening. Can you imagine the outcry if people said we should eliminate the Ashkenazi Jews, who are about 70% of Jews, for being carriers of numbers of transmitted diseases? If you are eugenist thinking, eliminating that one group that would be the common sense solution would it not? Yet, it is never discussed is it? why is that? and to be clear no I am not advocating for that. Could it be that the higher echelons of that race, are the ones promoting eugenics to get rid of the other races? Pleiotropy occurs when one gene influences multiple, seemingly unrelated phenotypic traits, an example being phenyl-ketonuria, which is a human disease that affects multiple systems but is caused by one gene defect. Andrzej Pękalski, from the University of Wrocław, argues that eugenics can cause harmful loss of genetic diversity, if a eugenics program selects a pleiotropic gene, that could possibly be associated with a positive trait. Pekalski uses the example of a coercive government eugenics program, that prohibits people with myopia from breeding, but has the unintended consequence of also selecting against high intelligence since the two go together.

Objections to scientific validity: Eugenic policies may lead to a loss of genetic diversity. Further, a culturally-accepted "improvement" of the gene pool may result in extinction, due to increased vulnerability to disease, reduced ability to adapt to environmental change, and other factors that may not be anticipated in advance. This has been evidenced in numerous instances, in isolated island populations. A long-term, species-wide eugenics plan might lead to such a scenario, because the elimination of traits deemed undesirable, would reduce genetic diversity by definition. While the science of genetics has increasingly provided means by which, certain characteristics and conditions can be identified and understood, given the complexity of human genetics, culture, and psychology, at this point there is no agreed objective means of determining, which traits might be ultimately desirable or undesirable. Some conditions such as sickle-cell disease and cystic fibrosis respectively confer immunity to malaria and resistance to cholera, when a single copy of the recessive allele is contained within the genotype of the

individual, so eliminating these genes is undesirable in places where such diseases are common.

Ethical controversies: Societal and political consequences of eugenics call for a place in the discussion, on the ethics behind the eugenics movement. Many of the ethical concerns regarding eugenics arise from its controversial past, prompting a discussion on what place, if any, it should have in the future. Advances in science have changed eugenics. In the past, eugenics had more to do with sterilization and enforced reproduction laws. Now, in the age of a progressively mapped genome, embryos can be tested for susceptibility to disease, gender, and genetic defects, and alternative methods of reproduction such as in vitro fertilization are becoming more common. Therefore, eugenics is no longer ex post facto regulation of the living, but instead preemptive action on the unborn. With this change, however, there are ethical concerns which lack adequate attention, and which must be addressed before eugenic policies can be properly implemented in the future. Sterilized individuals, for example, could volunteer for the procedure, albeit under incentive or duress, or at least voice their opinion. The unborn fetus on which these new eugenic procedures are performed cannot speak out, as the fetus lacks the voice to consent or to express his or her opinion. Philosophers disagree about the proper framework for reasoning about such actions, which change the very identity and existence of future persons.

Opposition: In the decades after World War II, the term "eugenics" had taken on a negative connotation, and became increasingly unpopular within academic science. Many organizations and journals that had their origins in the eugenics movement, began to distance themselves from the philosophy, as when *Eugenics Quarterly* became *Social Biology* in 1969. Edwin Black has described potential "eugenics wars" as the worst-case outcome of eugenics. In his view, this scenario would mean the return of coercive state-sponsored genetic discrimination and human rights violations, such as compulsory sterilization of persons with genetic defects, the killing of the institutionalized and, specifically, segregation and genocide of races perceived as inferior. Law professors George Annas and Lori Andrews have argued that the use of these technologies could lead to such human-posthuman caste warfare. Environmental ethicist Bill McKibben argued against germinal choice technology, and other advanced biotechnological strategies for human enhancement. He writes that it would be morally wrong for humans to tamper with fundamental aspects of themselves (or their children), in an attempt to overcome universal human limitations, such as vulnerability to aging, maximum life span and biological constraints on physical and cognitive ability. Attempts to "improve" themselves through such manipulation would remove limitations, that provide a necessary context for the experience of meaningful human choice. He claims that human lives would no longer seem meaningful, in a world where such limitations could be overcome with technology. Even the goal of using germinal choice technology for clearly

therapeutic purposes should be relinquished, he argues, since it would inevitably produce temptations to tamper with such things as cognitive capacities. He argues that it is possible for societies to benefit from renouncing particular technologies, using as examples Ming China, Tokugawa Japan and the contemporary Amish.

Endorsement: Some, for example Nathaniel C. Comfort from Johns Hopkins University, claim that the change from state-led reproductive-genetic decision-making to individual choice, has moderated the worst abuses of eugenics, by transferring the decision-making from the state to the patient and their family. Comfort suggests that "the eugenic impulse drives us to eliminate disease, live longer and healthier, with greater intelligence, and a better adjustment to the conditions of society; and the health benefits, the intellectual thrill and the profits of genetic bio-medicine are too great for us to do otherwise." Others, such as bioethicist Stephen Wilkinson of Keele University and Honorary Research Fellow Eve Garrard at the University of Manchester, claim that some aspects of modern genetics can be classified as eugenics, but that this classification does not inherently make modern genetics immoral. In their book published in 2000, *From Chance to Choice: Genetics and Justice*, bioethicists Allen Buchanan, Dan Brock, Norman Daniels and Daniel Wikler argued that, liberal societies have an obligation to encourage, as wide an adoption of eugenic enhancement technologies as possible. So long as such policies do not infringe on individuals' reproductive rights, or exert undue pressures on prospective parents to use these technologies, in order to maximize public health, and minimize the inequalities that may result from both natural genetic endowments, and unequal access to genetic enhancements. In his book *A Theory of Justice* (1971), American philosopher John Rawls argued that "Over time a society is to take steps to preserve the general level of natural abilities, and to prevent the diffusion of serious defects". The Original position, a hypothetical situation developed by Rawls, has been used as an argument for negative eugenics.

In fiction: The film *Gattaca* (1997) provides a fictional example of a dystopian society that uses eugenics, to decide what people are capable of and their place in the world. Although critically acclaimed, *Gattaca* was not a box office success, but it is said to have crystallized the debate over the controversial topic of human genetic engineering. The film's dystopian depiction of "genoism" has been cited by many bioethicists and laypeople in support of their hesitancy about, or opposition to eugenics, and the societal acceptance of the genetic-determinist ideology that may frame it. In a 1997 review of the film for the journal *Nature Genetics*, molecular biologist Lee M. Silver stated that "Gattaca is a film that all geneticists should see if for no other reason than, to understand the perception of our trade held by so many of the public-at-large". In his 2018 book *Blueprint*, behavioural geneticist Robert Plomin writes, that while *Gattaca* warned of the dangers of genetic information being used by a totalitarian state; that genetic testing could also favour better meritocracy in democratic societies, which already administer

psychological tests, to select people for education and employment. Plomin suggests that polygenic scores might supplement testing in a manner that is free of biases. That completes the overview of both sides of the narrative and I will do my summation of it after this music break, but soon enough we will know for the first time if we were evil or divine, were the last in line remember. WERE THE LAST IN LINE

The current Covid crisis deliberately engineered so these eugenicists can partake in data collection, is an example of our current lack of choice on global matters. All decided for you by secret think tank groups, with nothing better to do than interfere in peoples lives. At the end of the day it is a free will choice, people who wish to not partake in the government scandemic should be freely allowed to do so, without guilt, shaming and ridicule.

I am in favor of eugenics? it all depends on what eugenics is or means. Do I favor progressing our species? yes, does that make me a eugenicist? no. Do I favor improvements in medical care via genetics? yes, but at the expense of others? no. The same applies should people wish to take the test not designed for Covid or any virus, and take a vaccine that has no live virus isolated within it, go ahead take your PCR and Vaccines. Those PCR tests are a way of collating data and filtering and can in essence be described as live eugenics? This is a eugenics exercise and if people want to non think their way through life, let them. That is natural eugenics in essence and people have made their own choices, albeit from our perspective foolish ones. But, it is in and of itself sinister as the people themselves who rely too heavily on the television for the information, that the information and truth was not provided for them to make better balanced choices. This then means that the portal people (news readers) are responsible for all those who got sick, sterilized, maimed or died, for their failure to provide accurate information. But that very fact proves the elites theory that too many of our species are undesirables as they call them. Not intelligent enough to make their own choices, too willing to rely on the system, too eager to let others take responsibility for them, and essentially they are child like adults, always needing a parent to run their lives for them. Our species will thrive better with the self thinkers and self governing, not act like children relying on the government to fix things for them. "Eugenics is a set of beliefs and practices that aim to improve the genetic quality of a human population, historically by excluding people and groups judged to be inferior or promoting those judged to be superior." That one sentence is why there are so many conflicting portions to this issue. The two need to be split up and clarified for it to have any rational debate. If eugenics is a practice to improve the genetic quality of the human population via medical technology, then I think most would approve of that being a legitimate cause. But the other part muddies the picture, of excluding people and groups judged to be inferior, is where the real issues come in. Who are the so called superiors to decide who is inferior? Who selected them to be the superior? Is that them playing god? We are told to believe in gods

and he is the almighty, yet these disciples of Satan are asking us to make them god and have and make choices on our lives? There are many contradictions within the science, and the discussions on which has left out a key component on decision making for it, we the people. Is eugenics not a fancy term for racism? What about the Ashkenazi Jews mentioned earlier, on the basis of the scientific discussion, 70% of Jews would be wiped out? There is arguments for and against the people being born with deformities, severe disabilities, being subjected to the removal of their life. Those people suffer all through their lives and are subjected to abuse, ridicule and medical experimentation, that one could argue that is not a life, and eugenics style abortions in those cases, would be from an overview insight, a positive choice. One must always look upon discussions of this nature in a non emotional aspect of observing and not absorbing, as absorbing then becomes emotional, and that doesn't always lead to good solutions within that state. Have the undesirables been given an opportunity in life to become non undesirable? That is the great question, have they been given access to education? has that education been of a high enough standard? have they had access to affordable medical treatment and care? Has the food and water been accessible and clean? Have they been given access to affordable housing, supplied with energy needs? The answer to that in overview is, an emphatic no. So, how can you make an informed opinions on people when denied the basic rights in life of food, water, clothing, shelter, energy and proper teaching, not education? Does the lower classes actually create the mess the world is in? or does society, governments, cultures, religions, authorities and think tanks do that for us? People may argue it is not fair to add religions in that class, but they promote the follow of everything being external, when in reality everything is internal, and that is why we have so many undesirables as they are called. Our human stock devalued by incest, class, wars, religions and racial mixing, which affects all colors not just one, with devastating effects. For those advocating for the all is one, and I agree to a point, but have we really developed into a cohesive all inclusive unit? The answer is an emphatic no, not one color is an all inclusive unit within their own group, never mind other groups. Should politicians and think tanks decide? absolutely not, they have proven incompetent on all levels, this is a choice for the people. This is why we created The Peoples Club, whereby the people in it become the decision makers of the future, never in history have we had a say in things. Why? because we the people never came together and preferred to stay separate, when all that was required was one powerful group and voice to be included in decision making. The one debate that is left out of this equation is, where do the ET's sit on and in this narrative. With their dabbling with our genetics of the past, how much influence are they applying now. We spoke recently about them creating Genetic Modified Organisms via the vaccines, and then claiming ownership of the person due to their program being inserted into our gene code. That is no different than what the 26 ET species did to us in the past, and claimed part ownership. What if the ET races are behind this plot today again? whereby they claim our sovereignty based yet again on our own ignorance? Whether you are a sleep or awake, good or evil, decisions of this magnitude

should be a universal choice, following informed and balanced information for and against it. It should then be our choice to make and also having a say in it. The argument is stupid people can't make those choices, the counter argument is people are stupid and uneducated are a failing of the system, who wish to take and make these choices themselves. The one thing you cannot make a choice of this magnitude on is, it should never be based on monetary purposes, either by a lack of it, or by how much wealth you have. There is a lack of money solely due to greed based people harvesting vast quantities of it. Could the solution be to segregate the world between desirables and undesirables? that is a question not a statement. Given only one race currently is under threat of extinction via numbers and genetic mixing depopulating that race, should the white race be segregated to then rebuild their numbers? The overview of situation is, where is the peoples choice and say in it? Do the elites pushing this have the right to play god? Is their record of decision making competent enough to make any decisions for humanity? The answer in my opinion is no. It was they who created the mess to begin with, with their greed based harvesting, all authoritarian attitudes, pushing us into war after war, destroying many ecosystems with their greed based harvesting, creating nuclear, bio warfare and other weaponry against we the people, their divide and conquer tactics, their program denying people access to source via religion, their polluting of the air, water, food and our vessels. These are the people who decided to make all of us slaves, and so these are the last people we want making decisions of this magnitude on our behalf. Those people all made their wealth off the back of the people, and perhaps the best eugenics program would should think about is, as they were the problem of most of the worlds ills, perhaps this world would be better off without them? The great question is, what and how do each of you think? If you were asked today to create a world panel of discussions on this subject, what would be your input into it? What decisions would you make? What solutions would you put forward? We finish tonight with a piece taken from a piece of a Druidic religion, which whilst is not supported by myself, some of the words in this piece are, I have changed some of the words to add a THI terminology to it. "The soul is a particle of the Source possessing in embryo all his capabilities. It's action is defined and regulated by the nature of the physical organization it animates. The lowest point of sentient existence is that, in which evil is unmitigated by any particle of good. From this point existence ascends by cycles of genera, until it attains its acme by being blended with that of the Source. The human cycle is the middle one in which good and evil are equipoised. Every human being is a free agent, the soul according to its choice being liable to fall back into the lower cycles, or capable of rising into the higher. Probation ceases with the human cycle. Above it good becomes the dominant, evil the helpless principle. Continually thus ascending, the soul becomes at last united to and part of Source, and in Source again pervades the universe." EPCOT NEW HORIZONS - WE GO ON

