

## **STUDY- BIO TECHNOLOGY**

What should we do regarding the Bio-Technology that would, in future, mixes between the great benefits and threatens, that could be material and clear or moral and light? The answer is clear; we should use the State's power to regulate the same; if proved that exceeds the regulatory power of any sovereign individual State; then, it should be regulated in international level. Right from now, we should start thinking rationally on how to build the institutions that could differentiate between the good and bad uses of the Bio-Technology and **implementation** of such laws effectively on the national or international level.

However, this obvious answer is not clear for many of those participating in the debate going on now regarding the Bio-Technology. The discussion remains stagnant on abstract level relatively on the ethics of certain procedures such as cloning or the truncal cells, and divided into two camps: one is interested in allowing every thing and the other one wish to restrict a large fields of researches and practices. Obviously the large debate is important, but the events are accelerating in way that soon we would need a more practical guide on how to direct the future developments so the technology remains in service of the Man and not his master. As it is, improbable that would allow every thing or prohibit the researches that include high degree of promise, there is a need to find a middle way.

We should not initiate, in light way, establishment of new regulating institutions, in the light of the deficiency aspects that cover all the regulatory efforts. During the last three decades, there was a movement, worth appreciation all over the world, to set free a large sectors of each nation's economy, from airlines to telecommunications, and in a larger way to decrease the size and fields of the State's influence. The world's economy resulted out of the same is far effective for wealth generating and technology creating. The excessive legislations in the past pushed many to become hostile by nature for any State's interference whatsoever. This deep hatred for legislations will be one of the major hindrances on putting the Human Bio-Technology under political control.

However, it's highly relevant to improve the distinction: What is good for certain social segment, would not be fit for another; the Information Technology, for instance, provides lot of social benefits and less number, relatively, of disadvantages; thus, it has escaped in suitable way with minimum of the State's legislations. As for the other side, the nuclear materials and toxic wastes are subject to strict national and international measures, as it's obvious that the business in such things that don't come under the legislations are risky.

Of the most major problems that facing the issue of regulating the Human Bio-Technology is the spreading concept that if suspending the technology's developments were preferred; it would be impossible to execute the same. If the United State of America or any other individual State, prohibited Human Cloning, Genetic Engineering or any other procedure, those who are interested would simply move to other suitable more convenient jurisdiction domain where the laws allow them to practice such works. The globalization and international competition

in the Bio-medical research fields guarantees punishment of the States that restricts themselves by ethical restrictions on their scientific societies or Bio-Technology industries.

The idea of impossibility of suspending technology advancement or controlling the same is, simply, a faulty idea for reasons will be explained in greater details in chapter ten of this book. We are; in fact, control all kinds of technology and many of the scientific research forms. People are no freer in undertaking their experiments on new Bio-weapons, more than their freedom in undertaking experiments on humans without obtaining their consent resulting of their full acquaintance with the content of the experiment. The fact that there are some individuals or organizations do not violate such laws; or existence of countries where such law are not exist or do not taken seriously, are not enough justification for not making such laws in the first place. However, there are some people who get away from the sealing of murdering punishment; but that is not a reason for permitting sealing or murdering.

We need to avoid, by all means, adopting defeatist stands regarding the technology that says as far as we can not do any thing to stop or form the developments that we like, we should refrain training doing this in the first place; installing a regulatory apparatus that allow for the societies to control the human bio-technology will not be an easy thing; that would required gathering of legislators from all over the globe to take difficult decisions on complicated scientific issues. The form and stereo type of the institutions that would be established to implement such new laws are yet an issue open to all possibilities; there is a big challenge capitalized in it's design so it's hindrance to positive developments would be in its minimum level; awarding to it, meanwhile, effective

executive powers; the main challenge will be legislating general laws in the international level and to realize unanimity of all countries of different cultures and ideologies regarding the basic ethical issues. However, there are political tasks of the same degree of complication have been tackled successfully in the past.

### **Bio-Technology and Resuming History once again:**

There are many present debates on the Bio-Technology; on the issue of cloning, the marrow cell & Genetic engineering that are subject to attraction between the scientific society and those with religion commitment. I believe such attraction is a misfortune as pushing many people to believe that the only reason that makes a person protests certain developments in field of Bio-Technology, are resulting of religious convention; in the United State of America in particular , the bio-technology has been induced to the going on debate regarding abortion; many of the researchers believe that a valuable development is suspending as response to a little number of fanatic any abortion activists.

I believe it's important for us to be cautious of certain innovations in field of Bio-technology for reasons irrelevant to religion. The issue that I will raise now can be called **Aristoic**; that is not because I refer to **Aristotle** as philosopher but rather I adopt his method in rational philosophical argument on politic and nature as sample for what I would like to achieve.

**Aristotle** argued, in fact, that the human doctrines regarding the write and wrong – which we now call it the human rights – was laying, eventually, on the human nature it self; that to say, without comprehending the method that the desires, targets, features and natural behaviors in every mature human, are harmonized; we can not comprehend the human targets or to judge the write and

wrong, the good and bad, justice and injustice and like many contemporary profiteering philosophers, **Aristotle** believed that the good is determined by the people's wish; but while the opportunists seek to reduce the human objectives to common simple qualities such as mitigating pain or reaching the utmost happiness; **Aristophanes** has maintained a complicated and progressive view regarding the variety and splendor of the human natural objectives; the target of his philosophy was to differentiate between the natural and traditional and to put a logical order for the human blessing aspects.

**Aristotle** and before him **Aristophanes**, initiated debate on the human nature lasted in the western philosophy till the beginning of the modern era when the liberal democracy is born. While there were remarkable differences on the human nature; no body challenged the it's relevance as a base for the rights and justice. Among the believers of the natural rights, we find the fathers founders of America; those who built on it their revolutions against the British crown. However, this concept has remains detested among the philosophers and academic thinkers for the whole one or two centuries.

As we will see in the second part of this book; I believe that is a mistake and any identification of meaning for the rights should rely on basic judgments on the human nature. The Bio-technology science, eventually, starts giving a meaningful experimental content for the human nature concept, just on time when the Bio-Technology revolution starts withdrawing it's glass of wine away.

whatever the understanding of the academic philosophers and sociology scientists on the human nature concept, the fact of a firm existence of human nature all through the human history has resulted in major political consequences ; As Aristotle has realized and all serious human nature theorist, the human-beings are cultural animals by nature, in terms that they can learn from their experiences and transfer what they have learned to their children in other than heredity method. Thus, the human nature do not determine in narrow way the human behavior, it rather leads to huge difference in the methods that a person raises his children with, controlling the same within themselves and providing through it the resources and similar. The consistent human efforts on amending the cultural self resulted in existence of the human history and the progressive development in the complication and development of the human institution over time.

The fact of the cultural advancement and development has made many of the contemporary thinkers believe that humans are enjoying approximately unlimited flexibility – i.e. their social environment can not form them so their behavior would be fit for every thing. Here the contemporary bias starts against the human nature concept. Many believers of the social interpretation for the human behavior got strong concealed motives; they are hopping to use the social engineering to create fair and justice societies in accordance with abstract ideological principle. Effective from the French revolution, a series of utopian political movements have rocked the world; than sought to make paradise on earth through reorganizing the most fundamental institutions in the society- from the family, private ownership to the state. Such movements are crowned in the twentieth century by the socialist revolutions that break out in each of Russia, China, Cuba, Cambodia & others.

By the end of the century, each of these experience had been almost failed and replaced by effort to create or to recuperate a similar modern liberal democracy but less radical political wise. One of the major reasons of such international gathering on the liberal democracy is the tenacity of the human nature; as although the human behavior is flexible and variant; it's not like this in unlimited way; at a certain point, the natural instincts and variant coherent human behaviors in reproofing itself to smash out the plans of the best social engineers. Many of the socialist systems went for cancelling the private ownership, weakened the family and asked people to be unselfish words humanity in general and not towards a tiny circuit of friends and family members. However, the evolution doesn't form the human beings this way; the people in the socialist societies resisted the new institutions in all corners. When the socialist collapsed, after the fall of Berlin wall on 1989; the old and familiar types of behaviors returned to confirm existence everywhere.

The political institutions can not fully cancel the role of innate or adaptability and succeeds ; the twentieth century history is determined by to contradicting terrified acts: The Nazi system advocating that Biology is all and every thing while the communism said it's almost next to nothing. The liberal democracy appeared as political system, dynamic and legitimate for the modern societies as evades both these contradicting extremes; it drafts policy as per samples of justice that formed historically without excessive interference in the natural behavioral forms.

There were score of effective factors on the bath of history that I have discussed in my book entitled "End of History and Last Human being". The science and technology development was one of the main motives of the human history process, which determines the horizon of the economic production's probabilities; thus, a large amount of society's structural features. The technology development in the ends of twentieth century leads in a good way to liberal democracy; not because technology enhances liberty & political equality in their essence – it doesn't do so – rather the end of twentieth century's technology (specially those relevant to information) are that identified by the political science specialist **Athel D'sola pul**, as the liberty's technologies.

However, there is no guarantee that the technology would always generate positive political results. No little of development's aspects in the past resulted in retraction of the human being liberty; for instance, the agricultural development resulted in appearance of great premedical societies and made the slavery more convenient as before during the hunting era – fruits collectors. In a period more recent to our modern era; Elly Huitny's invention for the cotton gin resulted in making the cotton an important cash crop in southern America on the beginning of the nineteenth century, resulting in revival of slavery's institution there.

As the more enlightened critics of the "End of History" pointed; the history can not be ended before the end of the natural science and modern technology; we are not only fare from the end of the knowledge and technology but seem as we have put the sharp edge of the most serious technological development era in the history; the bio-technology and the larger scientific understanding for the human brain are promising with very important political results; they are together reopen



the social engineering probabilities that the societies which adopted the twentieth century's technologies, had relinquished.

If we looked back for the instruments of the socio-engineers and utopian planners in the last century; it would appear rude and enormously unscientific. The propaganda for left's principles, the labor camps, reeducation, Freudism, adaptation in early childhood, behaviorism – all are techniques targeted inserting the square wedge of the human nature into the round hole of the social panning – none of them was laying on knowledge with the brain's nervous structure or it's bio-chemical principles; none of them understood the causes of the hereditary behaviors – even if understood the same, none of them could have done any thing to affect the same.

All that could be changed during the next generation or the one that follows; we should not presume return of the progeny improvement movement, supported by the State or the large spread heredity engineering, to see how such thing could happen. The nervous drugs science has produced, not only the PROZAC for treatment of depression but also the RETALIN for controlling the wild behavior of children. As our discoveries do not limit on associative relations only but rather on genuine particles ways between the genes and qualities such as intelligence, hostility, gender, criminality, alcoholism and similar; it would, definitely, jump into people's head that they could exploit such knowledge in certain social targets; that would manifest as series of ethical issues facing the **individual** fathers; also as political issue might dominate the political arena one day; if the rich fathers find suddenly before them an opportunity to increase the intelligence of their children and all members of their offspring, it would appear before us not only a mere ethical problem but rather a comprehensive class war.

