

# A Darwin's Look into The Next Million Years

## The Next Million Years Part 1

Brent Jessop - [Knowledge Driven Revolution.com](http://KnowledgeDrivenRevolution.com)

March 3, 2008



Charles Galton Darwin's 1952 book *The Next Million Years* [1] attempts to give a general outline of the "future history" of mankind by using the "law of human nature". C.G. Darwin (1887-1962) was an English physicist and grandson of Charles Darwin of evolutionary fame. Despite being concerned about the over-population of the world he had four sons and one daughter with his wife Katharine Pember. The hypocrisy of this may seem odd, but the concern about over-population only refers to inferior breeds of humans and not superior breeds like himself and his lineage. C.G. Darwin was a long time member and eventual president of the Eugenic Society (1953-59) which represented the belief system held among many of the political, scientific and aristocratic elites of his day and the present.

### Why the Next Million Years?

This article will examine some of C.G. Darwin's views of what the next million years of mankind's future history will look like. But first, why such a enormous length of a **million** years of future history?

From *The Next Million Years*:

"... in the evolution of life, how long does it take to make a new species? The answer is a million years. That is the reason for the title I have chosen for this essay - for a million years to come we have got to put up with all the defects in man's nature as it is now." – 78

### **The Laws of Human Nature**

"Nevertheless for all of us it is intolerable to think of the future unfolding itself in complete predestined inevitability for the eternity of a million years. There are two things we must do; one is to know, the other to act. As to knowing, in my introductory chapter I described an analogy in mechanics, and I suggested that it should be possible to discover a set of laws, like the laws of thermodynamics, which would place absolute limits on what can be done by humanity. Biological laws cannot be expected to have the same hard outline as physical laws, but still there are absolute laws limiting what an animal can do, and similar laws will limit man not only on his physical side, but also on his intellectual side. If these could be clearly stated, we should recognize that many attempts that have been made at improving man's estate were hopeless.

It is for others, better versed than I am in the biological sciences, to work out these laws, and it is in all humility that I put forward the basis, on which, it may be, that they could be founded. The first principle is that man, as an animal, obeys the law of variation of species, which condemns human nature to stay nearly constant for a million years. **The perfectibility of mankind, the aim of so many noble spirits, is foredoomed by this principle.** The second is that man is a wild animal, and that doctrines drawn from the observation of domestic animals are quite inapplicable to him. The third principle is the non-inheritance of acquired characters, a principle familiar in animal biology, but all too seldom invoked in connection with human beings. If these, and any further principles as well, or any alternatives to them, were accepted, it might sometimes be possible through them to show up the absurdities of bad statesmanship, and certainly it would be the part of a wise statesman to work within their limitations, because only so could he hope to achieve success." [emphasis mine] - 206

"A history of the future is different from a history of the past, because it cannot in any sense be a narrative. It cannot say what will happen in anything like the same manner as past history says what did happen. All it can do is to say what things will be happening most of the time and in most places, but without being able to specify those times and those places. This it does through consideration of the laws of nature, **chief among which is the law of human nature.**" [emphasis mine] - 167

### **The Need to Change Human Nature**

As a avid eugenicist, C. G. Darwin believed "improvements" in the human species could only come about through the changing of mankind's hereditary nature.

**"But there is also the possibility of an internal revolution. This would come about if means were discovered of deliberately altering human nature itself...** here it must

suffice to say that the prospects do not seem at all good. There is first the extreme difficulty of making such changes, and the probability that most of them would be for the worse, and secondly, if by chance a revolutionary improvement should arise, it seems all too likely that the rest of mankind would not tolerate the supermen and would destroy them before ever they had the time to multiply. It is mainly the belief that there will be no revolutionary change in human nature that emboldened me to write this essay." [emphasis mine] - 56

"Still for the sake of the distant future something can be attempted more profitable than has been usual hitherto. **Attempts at improving the lot of mankind have all hitherto been directed toward improving his conditions, but not his nature, and as soon as the conditions lapse all is lost.** The only hope is to use our knowledge of biology in such a way that all would not be lost with the lapse of the conditions. The principles of heredity offer an anchor which will permanently fix any gains that there may be in the quality of mankind." [emphasis mine] - 208

"If the history of the future is not regarded as the automatic unfolding of a sequence of uncontrollable events - and few, of us would accept this inevitability - then anyone who has decided what measures are desirable for the **permanent** betterment of his fellows will naturally have to consider what is the best method of carrying his policy through. There are three levels at which he might work. The first and weakest is by direct conscious political action; his policy is likely to die with him and so to be ineffective. The second is by the creation of a creed, since this has the prospect of lasting for quite a number of generations, so that there is some prospect of really changing the world a little with it. The third would be by directly changing man's nature, working through the laws of biological heredity, and if this could be done for long enough it would be really effective. But even if we knew all about man's genes, which we certainly do not, a policy of this kind would be almost impossible to enforce even for a short time, and, since it would take many generations to carry it through, it would almost certainly be dropped long before any perceptive effects were achieved." [emphasis in original] - 114

## **The Structure and Function of Government**

What will the future structure and function of government be during the next million years?

"If transportation is easy, world conquest will be easier both for military reasons and because **the more uniform culture should make the world government more acceptable.**" [emphasis mine] - 193

"Widespread wealth can never be common in an overcrowded world, and so in most countries of the future the government will inevitably be autocratic or oligarchic; some will give good government and some bad, and the goodness or badness will depend much more on the personal merits of the rulers than it does in a more democratic country." - 194

"Whatever forms the government may take, there can be little doubt that the world will spontaneously divide itself into what I shall call provinces, that is to say regions, though with no permanently fixed boundaries, which possess some homogeneity of climate,

character and interests. I use the same word whether the different provinces are federated together, or whether they are what we should now call separate sovereign states. How large will these provinces tend to be? That will depend on the means of communication and transport, and so once again there arises the question of whether the fuel problem is solved wholly or partially or not at all. In the past the chief means of communication was the horse, and the countries of Europe are still mostly of a size adopted to suit this almost extinct means of transport, though some of the more newly formed ones do show a trace of the influence of the railway. None of them are really of a size suited to the motor-car or the aeroplane, or to present power production, whether by coal or water-power, which cuts right across the national boundaries.

If the fuel problem is solved completely, so that mechanical power and transportation is available in the future to a greater extent even than at present, then the provinces will be large; for example, the whole of Europe may well be one, and the whole of North America another...

Consider next what are likely to be usual relations between the provinces. It is too much to expect that there can ever be a permanent world government benevolently treating all of them on a perfect equality; such an institution could only work during the rare occasions of a world-wide golden age. **To think of it as possible at other times is a misunderstanding of the function of government in any practical sense of the term. If the only things that a government was required to do were what everybody, or nearly everybody, wanted, there would be no need for the government to exist at all, because the things would be done anyhow;** this would be the impracticable ideal of the anarchist. **But if there are to be starving margins of population in most parts of the world, mere benevolence cannot suffice.** There would inevitably be ill feeling and jealousy between the provinces, with each believing that it was not getting its fair share of the good things, and in fact, it would be like the state of affairs with which we are all too familiar. **If then there is ever to be a world government, it will have to function as government do now, in the sense that it will have to coerce a minority - and indeed it may often be a majority - into doing things they do not want to do.**" [emphasis mine] - 191

### **Civilization and a Universal Culture of Science**

"Civilization might, loosely speaking, be counted as a sort of domestication, in that it imposes on man conditions not at all typical of wild life." - 115

"Civilization has taught man how to live in dense crowds, and by that very fact those crowds are likely ultimately to constitute a majority of the world's population. Already there are many who prefer this crowded life, but there are others who do not, and these will gradually be eliminated. Life in the crowded conditions of cities has many unattractive features, but in the long run these may be overcome, **not so much by altering them, but simply by changing the human race into liking them.**" [emphasis mine] - 99

"To conclude, I have cited the past history of China as furnishing the type of an enduring civilization. It seems to provide a model to which the future history of the world may be

expected broadly to conform. The scale will of course be altogether vaster, and the variety of happenings cannot by any means be foreseen, but I believe that the underlying ground theme can be foreseen and that in a general way it will be rather like the history of the Chinese Empire. The regions of the world most of the time will be competing against one another. Occasionally - more rarely, than has been the case in China - they will be united by some strong arm into an uneasy world-government, which will endure for a period until it falls by the inevitable decay that finally destroys all dynasties. There will be periods when some of the provinces relapse into barbarism, but all the time civilization will survive in some of them. **It will survive because it will be based on a single universal culture, derived from the understanding of science; for it is only through this understanding that the multitudes can continue to live.** On this basic culture there will be overlaid other cultures, often possessing a greater emotional appeal, which will vary according to climate and race from one province to another. Most of the time and over most of the earth there will be severe pressure from excess populations, and there will be periodic famines. There will be a consequent callousness about the value of the individual's life, and often there will be cruelty to a degree of which we do not willingly think. **This however is only one side of the history. On the other side there will be vast stores of learning, far beyond anything we can now imagine, and the intellectual stature of man will rise to ever higher levels.** And sometimes new discoveries will for a time relieve the human race from its fears, and there will be golden ages, when man may for a time be free to create wonderful flowerings in science, philosophy and the arts." [emphasis mine] - 203

### **Globalization Leads to Slavery**

"As to the less successful members, the standard of living of any community living on its real earnings, as the communities of the future will have to do, is inevitably lower than that of one rapidly spending the savings of hundreds of millions of years as we are doing now. There will also be the frequent threat of starvation, which will operate against the least efficient members of every community with special force, so that it may be expected that the conditions of their work will be much more severe than at present. **Even now we see that a low standard of living in one country has the advantage in competing against a high standard in another.** If there is work to be done, and, of two men of equal quality, one is willing to do it for less pay than the other, in the long run it will be he who gets the work to do. Those who find the bad conditions supportable will be willing to work harder and for less reward; in a broad sense of the term they are more efficient than the others, because they get more done for less pay. There are of course many exceptions, for real skill will get its reward, but in the long run it is inevitable that the lower types of labour will have an exceedingly precarious life. One of the triumphs of our own golden age has been that slavery has been abolished over a great part of the earth. It is difficult to see how this condition can be maintained in the hard world of the future with its starving margins, and it is too to be feared that all too often a fraction of humanity will have to live in a state which, whatever it may be called, will be indistinguishable from slavery." [emphasis mine] - 189

### **Computers To Predict the Near Future**

"I am imagining that some new discovery should make the process far more precise for short-term planning. This might come about, for example, through the use of new high-speed counting machines, which in a short space of time might explore the consequences of alternative policies with a completeness that is far beyond anything that the human mind can aspire to achieve directly." - 55

A program currently underway at the Pentagon called the Sentient World Simulation attempts to do just that. From [an article](#) by Mark Beard:

"U.S defense, intel and homeland security officials are constructing a parallel world, on a computer, which the agencies will use to test propaganda messages and military strategies."

"Called the Sentient World Simulation, the program uses AI routines based upon the psychological theories of Marty Seligman, among others. (Seligman introduced the theory of "learned helplessness" in the 1960s, after shocking beagles until they cowered, urinating, on the bottom of their cages.)"

"Yank a country's water supply. Stage a military coup. SWS will tell you what happens next."

"The sim will feature an AR avatar for each person in the real world, based upon data collected about us from government records and the internet."

## **Conclusion**

The [next part](#) in this series will examine C. G. Darwin's views on the possibility of domesticating the whole of mankind. [Part 3](#) will look into the importance of creeds on the future history of mankind. The [second last part](#) in this series will examine C. G. Darwin's emphasis on the desirability of eugenics and ways of perpetuating "superior" genes in future generations. [Finally](#), I will examine the difficulties in controlling the size of the world population as described in *The Next Million Years*.

[1] Quotes from Charles Galton Darwin, *The Next Million Years* (1952).

Note: I first heard about this book from talks given by Alan Watt at [Cutting Through The Matrix.com](#), an individual well worth looking into.

# **Can Mankind be Domesticated?**

## **The Next Million Years Part 2**

*Brent Jessop* - [Knowledge Driven Revolution.com](#)

*March 10, 2008*

"The only imaginable way of overcoming these [sic] difficulties would be to set up a class of consultants who would prescribe what marriages were eugenically admissible and how large the consequent families should be. But this does not solve the difficulty; it only pushes it back a stage, for it leaves unanswered the question who are to be the consultants, and what principles are to guide them in settling the values of the different qualities of mankind. It comes back to just the difficulty I described in my fable, that a tame animal must have a master, and that **therefore though it might conceivably be possible to tame the majority of mankind, this could only be done by leaving untamed a minority of the population. Moreover, this minority would have to be the group possessing the most superior qualities of all.**" [emphasis mine] - Charles Galton Darwin, 1952 (p123)



Is it possible to domesticate humanity as a whole? Would we need a wild master race to watch over us? Charles Galton Darwin in his 1952 book *The Next Million Years* [1] attempts to answer these questions.

In this book C. G. Darwin (1887-1962) attempts to give a general outline of the "future history" of mankind. He was an English physicist and grandson of Charles Darwin of evolutionary fame. Despite being concerned about the over-population of the world he had four sons and one daughter with his wife Katharine Pember. The hypocrisy of this may seem odd, but the concern about over-population only refers to inferior breeds of humans

and not superior breeds like himself and his lineage. C.G. Darwin was a long time member and eventual president of the Eugenic Society (1953-59) which represented the belief system held among many of the political, scientific and aristocratic elites of his day and the present.

The [first part](#) in this series examined a variety of issues that C. G. Darwin envisions for the next million years of the future history of humanity including: the altering of human nature, the structure of government and the effects of globalization and computers.

## Can Mankind be Domesticated?

From *The Next Million Years*:

"Civilization might, loosely speaking, be counted as a sort of domestication, in that it imposes on man conditions not at all typical of wild life. It might then at least be argued that it is a false analogy to compare man to a wild animal, but that he should rather be compared to one which has been domesticated. I shall maintain that this analogy would be false, and that man is and will always continue to be essentially a wild and not a tame animal.

Before coming to this main theme it is important to notice that, if it were admissible to regard man as a domesticated animal, the whole time-scale of history would have to be radically altered. Thus though the geological evidence shows that it takes a million years to make a new wild species, we know that the various domesticated animals have been created in a very much shorter time. For example, the ancestors of the greyhound and the bulldog of ten thousand years ago would probably have been quite indistinguishable. If then man's characteristics could be similarly remoulded in so short a time, the whole future of history might be radically different. It would become impossible to forecast man's future after as short a period as ten thousand years, hardly longer than the span of known past history, instead of the million years which holds if he is a wild animal.

In the first place, it is necessary to be clear as to what is meant by a wild or a tame animal. We are apt sometimes to call an animal wild because it is dangerous to man, and to call it tame because it is harmless, but this is a slovenly way of speaking, and here I shall use the word "tame" simply as a synonym for "domesticated" which I think is its true meaning. **A tame animal then is one that does the will of a master**, and the savage watch-dog, trained to bite all intruders, is tamer than the friendly terrier which sometimes slips away to do its own private hunting. All tame animals owe their qualities to centuries of selective breeding, and it must always be remembered that the changes made in them owe nothing to the inheritance of acquired characters, but are due to the selection for breeding of those individual animals which show to the highest degree natural characteristics useful to their masters.

A chief feature in domesticated animals has been the creation of a great variety of breeds, each specialized for some particular purpose, either practical or aesthetic. Each breed far



excels its wild ancestry in the quality for which it has been bred, so that race-horses run faster than wild horses, dairy cows give much more milk than and wild cattle, and **the sheep-dog has even been bred to do skilfully the exact opposite of what the ancestral wolf would have done**. Now human families often show special qualities in which they excel their fellows, and in some cases these qualities seem to be hereditary - witness the musicians of the Bach family. If man is really a tame animal, there is no reason why breeds of man should not be created, say breeds of mathematicians or of professional runners, who should possess gifts far beyond anything we now know, and far beyond anything that their fellows could compete against. Certainly at the present time mankind is very far from this, but that would not exclude the possibility in the not so very distant future, if man really were a tame animal. I shall consider this question of special breeds later in the chapter in more detail; all the evidence seems to show that they will not arise, but to see this clearly, it is best to return to the prime feature of tameness, obedience to a master.

It is obvious that we in this country, with our passion for freedom, value wildness very highly, whereas in some lands, where the population are content to live under a much more strictly controlled rule of discipline, tameness may be more nearly acceptable. This question of taste is irrelevant however, for it might be that a tame race could achieve so much higher a degree of efficiency that it could master the wild ones, and so reduce them also to a state of tameness. I am going to maintain that this cannot happen, in that man is untameable. The reason involves a feature not often present in scientific arguments, and I will venture to introduce it by means of a fable." [emphasis mine] - 115

C.G Darwin's fable revolves around a highly intelligent, long living (ten-thousand years) "director" who breeds people for specialized tasks.

"Though this has only been presented as a fable, the experience with domesticated animals does show that the most astonishing improvements could be made in the various human faculties, if a similar course of continuous selection could be applied to man over as long a period of time. **The trouble is that for man this is not possible, because he has got to apply the selection to himself**, and that means that it is not merely a different problem, but a wholly different kind of problem. There is a fundamental difference between the subjective and the objective. Scientific progress has always succeeded only by regarding its themes of study objectively; even in the field of psychology progress has mainly come by the study of the minds of others, that is to say objectively, instead of by following the old barren course of introspection. The most severe critic of his own conduct can never judge his actions as if they were someone else's, and the selective breeding of other types of people would be no guide at all in the breeding of his own kind.

If the director had foreseen his death, he would have tried to produce a successor to himself. Since his profound belief in heredity had been so fully confirmed by the remarkable changes he had made in his subjects, he would naturally expect that it would be one of his own sons that would be best fitted to succeed him, but his difficulty would be just the same if he were trying to find a successor elsewhere. The matter is on quite a different footing from all his other decisions. For the others he could say: "I have improved all our breeds, by seeing which son improved on the qualities of his father. That is why I

select you." For his own successor the utmost he could say would be "I am selecting you in the hope that you may be a better director than I have been. But I have no idea how you will set about it, since, if I had known what I was failing in, I should have set it right myself." The targets in the two statements are quite different, for in one he knows what he is aiming at, in the other he does not. In one case the target is to make the man better, in the other to hope to make him as good. **One is the systematic breeding of tame animals, the other the unsystematic method of nature in the breeding of wild animals.**

This point is so important that before following it to its conclusion I will give another example, which has the advantage of not being fabulous. In their studies of how to improve the human race the eugenists have very naturally considered both ends of their problem, the increase in the good qualities of humanity and the elimination of the bad qualities. Their chief effort has gone, quite rightly at first, into the easy part of the problem, and they have spent most of their energy in pointing out the disastrous tendencies of the present policy of directly encouraging the breeding of the feeble-minded. This is undoubtedly useful work, but it is comparatively easy, since these feeble-minded can be regarded objectively by their superiors, and so might become amenable to the same sort of control as is applicable to domestic animals. This restraint of the breeding of the feeble-minded is important, and it must never be neglected, but it cannot be regarded as a really effective way of improving the human race. If by analogy one wished to improve the breed of racehorses, one might accomplish a little by always slaughtering the horse that finished last in every race, but it would be a much slower process than the actual one of sending the winner to the stud farm.

Conscious of this criticism, eugenists have often attempted to define what are the good characteristics which should be positively encouraged, instead of only the negative ones that must be discouraged, but the results are disappointing. Lists of meritorious qualities such as good health, good physique, high intelligence, good family history, are compiled, and those possessing them are told that they should breed, but the statements lead nowhere in practice, for no one can be expected to assess his own merits and demerits in a balance way. How, for example, is a man to weigh his own good health or good ability against a heredity made dubious, say, by an uncle who was insane, or again how is he to strike a balance between considerable artistic gifts - as he thinks - together with a good family record, but quite bad health. **It is clearly beyond anyone to decide these things for himself**, and even then the matter is only half settled, since similar judgments are needed for both partners to the marriage. However helpful the literature may be which can be consulted, it is evident that subjective judgments on such matters are too difficult; with the best will in the world they would very often be made wrongly, because, however sincerely he tries, no man can be a good judge in his own case." [emphasis mine] - 120

### **Could Man be Turned Into an Ant?**

"These examples suggest the impossibility of taming mankind as a whole, but before accepting the principle fully, it is proper to examine a case where the exact contrary has happened; this is in the insect civilization of the ants or termites. In applying the same term, civilization, to both ants and men, it is hardly necessary to say that I am drawing an

analogy between things which are really of a very different quality. All species of ants live in cities, and some species have developed agriculture, others animal husbandry; but all these practices are purely instinctive and individual to each species. **On the other hand human civilization is an acquired character, based on education**, and so is not inherent in man's nature. Nevertheless it may be worth while to follow out the analogy a little further. Admitting the different sense of the words, it may be said that all species of ants have made the third revolution, the invention of cities, that some have made the second, agriculture, none the first or fourth, fire and science; but they have all added another revolution of their own, the complete control of the problem of sex. The ants' nest has no rulers at all, for the queen is hardly more than an egg-laying mechanism, and they seem to get on perfectly well without civil servants or lawyers or captains of industry.

Why cannot man set up a community like an ants' nest? This would be the ideal of the anarchist, and hitherto it has held no promise at all of success, **but with the help of recent and probable future biological discoveries, some sort of imitation by man of the ants' nest cannot be quite excluded from consideration**. Thus the control of the numbers of the two sexes may become possible, and with the knowledge of the various sexual hormones **it might also become possible to free the majority of mankind from the urgency of sexual impulse**, so that they could live contented celibate lives, instead of the unsatisfied celibate lives that are the compulsory lot of such a large fraction of the present population of the world. If these discoveries should be made - and this is really by no means impossible - man would be able to carry out the sex revolution which is the typical characteristic of the insect civilizations. The detail would of course have to be quite different, for instead of one queen there would have to be large numbers of fertile women to renew the population, whereas there might be one king, literally the father of his country. Also it is probable that on account of their greater physical strength, it would be the men who would be the workers." - [emphasis mine] 125

### **What About a Master Breed?**

"In order to create such specialist breeds there would have to be a master breed at the summit, and this would be a totally different kind of thing from all the other breeds, because it would have to create itself." - 130

"At every turn the argument leads back to this question of the master breed. Nothing can be done in the way of changing man from a wild into a tame animal without first creating such a breed, but most people are entirely inconsistent in their ideas of what they want created. On the one hand they feel that all the world's problems would be solved if only there were a wise and good man who would tell everybody what to do, but on the other hand they bitterly resent being themselves told what to do. As to which of these motives would prevail, it seems at least probable that it would be the resentment, so that if the breed should arise in any manner, it would be extirpated before it could ever become well established. It is, however, imaginable, that there might be a part of the world in which the breed was accepted, and that this part should gain a superiority over the rest of the world, because it could develop various suitable breeds of specialists under the control and direction of the master breed, and by the exercise of the skills of these specialists it might

overcome the other nations. So it is appropriate to look a little further into the matter.

Imagine that through new discoveries in biology, say by suitably controlled doses of X-rays, it becomes possible to modify the genes in any desired direction, so that heritable changes can be produced in the qualities of some members of the human race. I may say I do not believe this is ever likely to be practicable, but that does not matter as far as concerns the present argument. The first success might be in some physical attribute, for example, by making a breed with longer and stronger legs so that it could jump a good deal higher than anyone can at present. But passing to more important matters, there might be created a breed which could think more abstractly, say a breed of mathematicians, or one that could think more judiciously, say a breed of higher civil servants. These would be of great value, but they would not be the master breed, and the question arises of a more precise prescription for what the qualities of the master breed are to be.

It is usually best to build on what one already has, rather than to start from nothing. So the natural procedure would be to begin with existing rulers, since these have already established themselves as acceptable to at least a good many of their fellow creatures. One would collect together, say, a hundred of the most important present rulers - among them of course should be included a good many who exert secret influence without holding any overt office - and tell them to get on with the business of settling what the master breed should be. It is impossible to believe that any such body of men would ever reach agreement on any subject whatever; so this plan fails.

In the search for the qualities of the master breed the next idea might be to appeal to the wisdom of our forefathers. Plato in his **Republic** [emphasis in original] devotes much attention to this very subject. Why not then find a Plato, give him his group of recruits, and let him educate them for thirty years according to his prescription - though perhaps fortifying it by the findings of modern educational theory; the result should be the master breed. But this will not do either, for Plato was not educating the master breed, he was educating the civil servant breed. It is not about these that there is any difficulty; it is the finding of someone to fill the role of Plato himself. It all comes back to the point that we do not know in the remotest degree what we want; for I do not count as an answer the one that would usually be proposed, which would be that the type required should be good and wise, while at the same time showing a special favour for the particular enthusiasms of the proposer. The reason for the impossibility of making a prescription for the master breed is that it is not a breed at all; to call it so is to change the sense of the word. Breeds are specialized for particular purposes, **but the essence of masters is that they must not be specialized. They have to be able to deal with totally unforeseen conditions, and this is a quality of wild, not of tame, life. No prescription for the master breed is possible.**

In these considerations I have been assuming the licence of supposing that we might be able really to change human nature in a heritable manner, and this is far beyond all probability. Returning now to more practical considerations, there seems no likelihood whatever of a master breed arising. All through history the most formidable difficulty of every ruler has been the selection of his successor, and the best intentions have been nearly always disappointed. Indeed it is notably surprising how very seldom the choice has been

well made. The immediate cause of these failures, has been the difficulty of the subjective judgments on the basis of which the choice must be made, but fundamentally they have arisen from a cause in the deep nature of mankind. Of all animals man is the most ready to try experiments and there are always candidates - far too many candidates - who regard themselves as fit members for the master breed. This quality is a characteristic of a wild animal, and it will always prevent man from domesticating himself. He will always prevent the creation of the master breed, through which alone the rest of man could be domesticated. The evolution of the human race will not be accomplished in the ten thousand years of tame animals, but in the million years of wild animals, because man is and will always continue to be a wild animal." [emphasis mine] - 130

"It always comes back to the same point, that to carry out any policy systematically in such a way as permanently to influence the human race, there would have to be a master breed of humanity, not itself exposed to the conditions it is inducing in the rest. The master breed, being wild animals, would be subject to all the fashions, tastes and passions of humanity as we know it, and so would never have the constancy to establish for generation after generation a consistent policy which could materially alter the nature of mankind." - 184

### **Conclusion**

The [next part](#) in this series will look into the importance of creeds on the future history of mankind. The [second last part](#) in this series will examine C. G. Darwin's emphasis on the desirability of eugenics and ways of perpetuating "superior" genes in future generations. [Finally, I will examine](#) the difficulties in controlling the size of the world population as described in *The Next Million Years*.

[1] Quotes from Charles Galton Darwin, *The Next Million Years* (1952).

# **The Importance of Creeds in Shaping the Future**

## **The Next Million Years Part 3**

*Brent Jessop* - [Knowledge Driven Revolution.com](http://KnowledgeDrivenRevolution.com)  
*March 17, 2008*



"In part the result arises from two very general characteristics of mankind, the tendency of the child to imitate what it sees going on round it, and the tendency of parents to want to teach their children." - Charles Galton Darwin, 1952 (p102)

The way we interpret the world, our creed, is partly derived from our personal experiences but is usually dominated by the creed of our parents and the impact of education. Popular creeds have been a major driving force for the entire history of the world. Naturally then, if creeds could be developed or manipulated the future course of history would also be altered.

Charles Galton Darwin's 1952 book *The Next Million Years* [1] attempts to give a general outline of the "future history" of mankind by using the "law of human nature". C.G. Darwin (1887-1962) was an English physicist and grandson of Charles Darwin of evolutionary fame. Despite being concerned about the over-population of the world he had four sons and one daughter with his wife Katharine Pember. The hypocrisy of this may seem odd, but the concern about over-population only refers to inferior breeds of humans and not superior breeds like himself and his lineage. C.G. Darwin was a long time member and eventual president of the Eugenic Society (1953-59) which represented the belief system held among many of the political, scientific and aristocratic elites of his day and the present.

### **What is a Creed?**

From *The Next Million Years*:

"Turning now away from these narrower questions of biological heredity, consider the larger question of how education, in the widest sense, has affected and will affect history. Every man builds up a world of thought, directing his conduct, **which is partly formed from his own experience, but even more of it is acquired from his teachers, and in**

**later life from friends and acquaintances, or from books.** I shall use the word **creed** [emphasis in original] to denote a set of tenets acquired in this general manner. I mean the word in an entirely colourless sense, with no question arising of whether the creed is true or untrue, moral or immoral. It is merely a body of philosophical thought - whether it is reasonable or unreasonable philosophy - which is strongly held and used as a main guide to conduct." [emphasis mine] - 104

"Those [creeds] we hold firmly appear to us to have the inevitability of the propositions of formal logic. **Anyone who does not happen to share our creeds is at the least regarded as an illogical fool, but more frequently as a perversely wicked person.** It is this that has led to most of the terrible series of persecutions that have blackened the records of history.

Creeds often arouse the most fanatical devotion. It is enthusiasm for his creed that has created the martyr, and, if we happen to share his creed, the martyr is regarded as one of the noblest of humanity. But the matter is not as simple as that, for this judgment has usually been prejudiced by the fact that we do sympathize with the martyr's creed, and it is necessary to look at the subject without this prejudice. The martyr is driven to make the ultimate sacrifice by his enthusiasm for his creed, but this enthusiasm has usually been evoked by the counter-enthusiasm of his persecutors, the majority in power, who hold an opposite creed with equal fervour. **For every man who is willing to die for his faith there will be ten men who are willing to kill for their faith.** The ten feel that they are actuated by the same motive, the pure hatred of evil, as that of the martyr, and the main difference is only that for weak human nature the role of the persecutor is easier than the role of the persecuted. **But that there is no very great difference between the two is shown by many examples in history, for when the persecuted party has gained the upper hand, it has usually indulged in counter-persecution on a scale equal to that which it had itself suffered.**" [emphasis mine] - 107

"Another feature of creeds seems to be rather general. **Though the majority of a population, say something like nine-tenths, accept their creed implicitly and regard it as part of the law of nature, there is always a small minority who do not.** Most people - call them the sheep - follow the ideas of their leaders unquestioningly, but this minority - the goats - **goes by contraries, and disbelieves anything just because those around them believe it.** The goats are often not very pleasant people, but they are usually above the average of intelligence. **It is probably the corroding influence of the goats that gradually saps the vitality of a creed by its cumulative infection,** and indeed there may well be a proportionality between the number of goats in a community and the life span of the creed of the sheep in that community." [emphasis mine] - 112

The above paragraph highlights perfectly why the dialectic technique works so well in society. The bulk of the population, C. G. Darwin's sheep, blindly follow without questioning anything. The bulk of the remainder, C. G. Darwin's goats, just as blindly follow anything that is contrary to the sheep. Neither group examines or attempts to understand any situation and both are equally apart of the problem. Sheep and goats alike have to learn to lead themselves and not blindly follow before any positive changes will

occur.

Continuing from the quote above:

"In future history the constancy of human nature makes it certain that man will continue to be dominated by enthusiasm for creeds of one kind or another; **he will persecute and be persecuted again and again for the sake of ideas**, some of which to later ages will seem of no importance, and even unintelligible. **But there is one much more valuable aspect of creeds that must be noticed. They serve to give a continuity to policy far greater than can usually be attained by intellectual conviction.** There are many cases in history of enlightened statesmen who have devoted their lives to carrying through some measure for the general good. They may have succeeded, only to find that the next generation neglects all they have done, so that it becomes undone again in favour of some other quite different way of benefiting humanity. The intellectual adoption of a policy thus often hardly survives for more than a single generation, and this is too short a period for such a policy to overcome the tremendous effects of pure chance. **But if the policy can arouse enough enthusiasm to be incorporated in a creed, then there is at least a prospect that it will continue for something like ten generations**, and that is long enough to give a fair probability that it will prevail over the operations of pure chance. **Thus a creed may have the rudiment of the quality, possessed by the genes of mankind, of being able to produce a permanent effect on humanity.**

If the history of the future is not regarded as the automatic unfolding of a sequence of uncontrollable events - and few, of us would accept this inevitability - then anyone who has decided what measures are desirable for the **permanent** [emphasis in original] betterment of his fellows will naturally have to consider what is the best method of carrying his policy through. There are three levels at which he might work. The first and weakest is by direct conscious political action; his policy is likely to die with him and so to be ineffective. The second is by the creation of a creed, since this has the prospect of lasting for quite a number of generations, so that there is some prospect of really changing the world a little with it. The third would be by directly changing man's nature, working through the laws of biological heredity, and if this could be done for long enough it would be really effective. But even if we knew all about man's genes, which we certainly do not, a policy of this kind would be almost impossible to enforce even for a short time, and, since it would take many generations to carry it through, it would almost certainly be dropped long before any perceptive effects were achieved. **That is why creeds are so tremendously important for the future; a creed gives the best practical hope that a policy will endure well beyond the life of its author, and so it gives the best practical hope that man can have for really controlling his future fate.**" [emphasis mine] - 113

### **The Truth of a Creed**

"It will be noticed that I have not said anything at all about what is the fundamental question in regard to any creed, and that is whether it is true or false. **For one who wants to believe in a creed its truth is all that matters...**" [emphasis mine] - 108



"In the past there have been creeds, such, for example, as the belief in magic or divination, which have been very widely accepted, but we now know them to have been quite absurdly false. Yet they have exerted the very greatest influence on human history. **The species homo has not changed, and there are still very many who are only too eager to believe in such things - not by any means all of them confined to the less advanced civilizations - and it must be expected that this tendency will continue to recur again and again.**" [emphasis mine] - 108

The degree that any creeds, regardless of its absurdity, can be developed using modern forms of education was elaborated on by Bertrand Russell. Among other things, Russell operated an [experimental school in the late 1920's](#) with his second wife Dora Black.

From Bertrand Russell's 1952 book *The Impact of Science on Society* [2] :

This subject [mass psychology/education] will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship. Anaxagoras maintained that snow is black, but no one believed him. The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakeable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark grey." - 40

For more about Bertrand Russell's view on Mass Psychology and Education please read [this article](#).

## **Eugenics Creed**

It should come as little surprise that C. G. Darwin, president of the Eugenics Society, would see the superiority of a creed for intelligent people based on the premise of eugenics. Which of course, is his creed.

"The detailed march of history will depend a great deal on the creeds held by the various branches of the human race. It cannot be presumed with any confidence that purely superstitious creeds will always be rejected by civilized communities, in view of the extraordinary credulity shown even now by many reputedly educated people. It is true that there may not be many at the present time, whose actions are guided by an inspection of the entrails of a sacrificial bull, but the progress has not been very great, for there are still many believers in palmistry and astrology. **It is to be expected then that in the future, as in the past, there will be superstitions which will notably affect the course of history,** and some of them, such as ancestor-worship, will have direct effects on the development of the human species. **But superstitious creeds will hardly be held by the highly intelligent, and it is precisely the creed of these that matters. Is it possible that there**

**should arise a eugenic creed, which - perhaps working through what I have called the method of unconscious selection - should concern itself with the improvement of the inherent nature of man, instead of resting content with merely giving him good but impermanent acquired characters?** Without such a creed man's nature will only be changed through the blind operation of natural selection; with it he might aspire to do something towards really changing his destiny." [emphasis mine] - 202

## Conclusion

The [next part](#) in this series will examine C. G. Darwin's emphasis on the desirability of eugenics and ways of perpetuating "superior" genes in future generations. Finally, I will examine the difficulties in [controlling the size of the world population](#) as described in *The Next Million Years*.

[1] Quotes from Charles Galton Darwin, *The Next Million Years* (1952).

[2] Quotes from Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* (1952). ISBN 0-415-10906-X

# Eugenics and the Survival of Mankind

## The Next Million Years Part 4

Brent Jessop - [Knowledge Driven Revolution.com](http://KnowledgeDrivenRevolution.com)

March 24, 2008

"When homo sapiens is changing, it will not be by the whole race gaining simultaneously whatever qualities better fit it for survival, but rather by certain types of mankind proving superior to the rest in survival value, so that they contribute a larger proportion to the later generations, and in so doing drag the average qualities of humanity in the same direction." - Charles Galton Darwin, 1952 (p96)

Charles Galton Darwin's 1952 book *The Next Million Years* [1] attempts to give a general outline of the "future history" of mankind by using the "law of human nature". C.G. Darwin (1887-1962) was an English physicist and grandson of Charles Darwin of evolutionary fame. Despite being concerned about the over-population of the world he had four sons and one daughter with his wife Katharine Pember. The hypocrisy of this may seem odd, but the concern about over-population only refers to inferior breeds of humans and not superior breeds like himself and his lineage. C.G. Darwin was a long time member and eventual president of the Eugenic Society (1953-59) which represented the belief system held among many of the political, scientific and aristocratic elites of his day and the present.



### **Some Eugenic Basics**

From *The Next Million Years*.

"Therefore in so far as it is possible to look beyond the brute question of survival and to make subjective estimates of value about the future human race, I shall rate as admirable any improvement that in the course of the ages should develop in the intellect of mankind, and any improvement in his sense of devotion to his fellow man. A combination of the two qualities is best of all, but if it is necessary to select between them, I should assign first place to intelligence." - 44

"General intelligence should always be of value, particularly the unspecialized intelligence that is adaptable to many varieties of purpose; so with some confidence it may be expected that man will become cleverer than he is now. It is by no means so clear that he will become morally better as well, since in a highly competitive world, the sinner has many advantages over the saint. That is disappointing, but it must be remembered that moral codes have differed a good deal at different periods in history..." - 98

### **A Darwin on Social Darwinism**

Social Darwinism - made famous by the Nazi eugenics programs - is promoted in *The Next Million Years*.

"There are many other qualities, which help survival - and I shall be content to mention only a few of them, some estimable and some the reverse. We value intelligence, honest, capacity for leadership, and other similar qualities, and we mark our approval by selecting their possessors for promotion. A man is promoted on account of his individual merits, without any thought about the consequences for the distant future. In a less abnormal world than the present, his increased prosperity should lead to the man's having a larger family than those of the less prosperous, so that the good qualities inherited from him should gradually become diffused throughout the population in later generations. At the present time the exact opposite happens all too often, in that he is likely to have a smaller family than the average; in fact success in life is at present antagonistic to success in survival." 93

"...but still it is interesting to see how it [selective breeding] would apply to humanity, when considerations induced from ethics are for the moment forgotten. A philanthropic dictator wants to perfect the innate moral qualities of the human race; how should he go about it? Following the example of the dog trainer, he will devote all his attention to the good children, and he will neglect the worse ones, doing all he can to see that they do not succeed in life, and above all that they are not permitted to hand on their inferior qualities to later generations. Actually all too often philanthropic effort goes in exactly the opposite direction, into curing the faults of the worst, without recognizing that the acquired characters so induced are quite impermanent. In saying this I am thinking of the long-range policy, and I do not in the least want to belittle the self-sacrificing work that is done by so many noble workers in improving the conduct of the worse elements of the population. It may be justified as being a good in itself, and moreover the existence of criminals perturbs very seriously the life of the rest of the community, so that everyone benefits if this nuisance is removed. **Still it is proper to note, that the policy of paying most attention to the inferior types is the most inefficient way possible of achieving the perfectibility of the human race.**" [emphasis mine] - 103

"So it is surely a justifiable claim that those selected for promotion are rather more likely to have superior qualities than those who were not so selected. Now man, like every other animal, does tend to pass on his natural qualities to his offspring; there is no certainty about it, but there is a somewhat better chance that the sons of the promoted candidate will be abler than those of his unsuccessful rivals. Since there will always be need for as many able people as possible, the encouragement of the promoted man to have children increases the chance that we shall find them in the next generation. The argument may be pushed further still. **There is a good deal of evidence that some men's ability is more intimately incorporated in their heredity than it is for others. Thus there have been men of pre-eminent ability, risen from the ranks, whose descendants have sunk back in a generation or two, whereas there are families where generation after generation goes on producing men of very good ability. Clearly the probability of producing able men is rather greater in a family that has shown that it can do so over several generations.**" [emphasis mine] - 137

"...it is indisputable that the more prosperous members of the community are not producing their share of the next generation, so that selection is now operating against the prosperous. As an example, if the list of candidates is examined, who are applying for any office of high or even mediocre importance, it will be found that something like nine-tenths of them have either no children, or one, or two. Of course, if everyone had exactly two children, and both these children married and had exactly two more, the population would be exactly steady, but as things are, it is a fair guess that, in each thirty years of a generation, this part of our population is reducing itself to something between a half and two-thirds. This signifies that within a century, there will at most be quarter as many people of this type as there are now. There will of course be some compensation by the rise from other levels, but, as I have pointed out, to found our hopes on them is to take a worse instead of a better chance. The whole thing is a catastrophe which it is now almost too late to prevent." - 140

### **Aiding the Process: Unconscious Selection**

"To conclude the chapter I return to the narrower question of the tendency of civilization to eliminate its ablest people. This has happened in the past, and is certainly happening now, and if it is always to happen, it signifies a recurrent degeneration of all civilizations, only to be renewed by the incursion of barbarians who have not suffered similarly. If any civilized country could overcome this effect, so that it alone retained both its ability and its civilization, it would certainly become the leading nation of the world. Man is a wild animal, and cannot accomplish this by using the methods of the animal breeder, but may he not be able to devise something that would go beyond the long-drawn-out automatic processes of Natural Selection? I think he can. A cruder and simpler method must be used than the animal breeder's. Something might be accomplished on the line of what is called "Unconscious Selection" in the **Origin of Species** [emphasis in original].

Unconscious Selection signifies that the farmer, who has no intention whatever of improving his herd, will naturally select his best and not his worst animals to breed from, and in consequence he will find that in fact he does improve the herd. As I have pointed out, we are all the time assessing the rival merits of individuals for promotion; they are each chosen for some special purpose, but like the unconscious selection of the farmer, the choice does mark the promoted person as being superior to the average. **Any country that could devise a method whereby the promoted were strongly encouraged to have more children than the rest, would find itself soon excelling in the world.** It would only be a rough and ready method, with many defects; for example, from the point of view of heredity women are as important as men, but it would not so often be easy to take their qualities into account. Furthermore the method would be extremely subject to fashions - in which it would resemble the animal breeder's method - for at one time greatest value would be given to the arts, at another to military skill, and at another to administrative ability and so on. However, ability is not usually a very specialized quality, and the effect would be to preserve high ability in general, and thereby to increase it, since the abler people would be contributing more, instead of less, than their share to the next generation.

**A nation might consciously adopt such a policy, or it might be that an economic policy adopted for quite other reasons should have this unintended result. Whatever way it**

**came about, if it could last for even a few generations, the effect would begin to show.** But humanity is capricious [sic] and subject to the passions of the immediate present, and it is hardly likely that any country, whether democracy or autocracy, would follow such a policy long enough for it to really tell. The best hope for it to endure would be that it should become attached to a creed, and it would not matter very much whether the creed was reasonable or unreasonable, provided that it produced the effect. Either ancestor-worship, or a belief in the sinfulness of birth-control, would at least place the promoted on an equality with the unpromoted, and with their superior ability this would give them the advantage. But since the matter concerns the more intelligent, a reasonable creed would have a better appeal than a mere superstition. Such a creed might be one which inculcated in those who were promoted the duty of having more children than their fellows, as an act benefiting the human race. The prospect of such a creed arising does not seem very hopeful, but if by its means any country can even partly solve the problem, it will lead the world, and it will be doing so through the method of "Unconscious Selection." [emphasis mine] - 152

### **Aiding the Process: Altering Mankind**

"...medical science might succeed in materially lengthening life without senility, though in a world of overcrowded population it is not very clear what would be gained. **Looking a little deeper there is the possibility of substantially altering the intellectual and moral natures of individuals by some sort of hormonal injections;** already great effects have been produced in animals. Finally, as the most curious speculation of all, it is not quite impossible that it may one day be feasible to select in advance the sex of each child that is to be born. Whether the decision is made by the parents, or by their rulers, this suggests that probability of a great unbalance in the populations of the world." [emphasis mine] - 76

The idea of using injection to alter mankind was also promoted by Bertrand Russell in his 1952 book *The Impact of Science on Society* [2] :

"Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so." - 61

For more on Bertrand Russell's views on the scientific breeding of humans, please read [this previous article](#).

Returning to *The Next Million Years*:

"If a dictator should ever aspire to bring about some really permanent change in humanity, he could do it if, and only if, he knew how to alter some of the human genes, for only so could the changed quality become anchored as a fixed character of the race." - 82

C. G. Darwin goes on to state that he does not believe that the direct scientific manipulation of genes will ever be possible but recent advances in genetics has made this a very likely possibility.

### **Parasitic Elite**

"It is always necessary to remember that nature itself is quite non-moral, and that there are many qualities which we by no means admire, which nevertheless are often regrettably effective in the struggle for life. All through the animal kingdom one of the most successful roles is that of the parasite, and there are states of human society where such a parasite as the professional beggar is as successful as anyone else. Something of the kind is unfortunately true in Britain just now. The people we are really encouraging are not those that we think we are for a great many of the people who get good promotion are contributing less than their share to the next generation. At present the most efficient way for a man to survive in Britain is to be almost half-witted, completely irresponsible and spending a lot of time in prison, where his health is far better looked after than outside; on coming out with restored health he is ready to beget many further children quite promiscuously, and these "problem children" are then beautifully cared for by the various charitable societies and agencies, until such time as they have grown old enough to carry on the good work for themselves. It is this parasitic type that is at present most favoured in our country; if nothing is done, a point will come where the parasite will kill its host by exhaustion and then of course itself perish miserably and contemptibly through having no one to support it. ..." - 93

Not surprisingly, C. G. Darwin never contemplated the parasitic attributes of him and his fellow elite.

### **Conclusion**

The [final part](#) in this series will examine the difficulties in controlling the size of the world population as described in C. G. Darwin's *The Next Million Years*.

[1] Quotes from Charles Galton Darwin, *The Next Million Years* (1952).

[2] Quotes from Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* (1952). ISBN 0-415-10906-X

# **Over-Population and the Sanctity of Life**

## **The Next Million Years Part 5**

Brent Jessop - [Knowledge Driven Revolution.com](http://KnowledgeDrivenRevolution.com)

March 31, 2008



Can the size of the world population be properly managed by a powerful world government? Are we doomed to multiply until the Malthusian breaks are applied? Are we forever going to have a "starving margin" within our societies? These questions are answered by an elite.

Charles Galton Darwin's 1952 book *The Next Million Years* [1] attempts to give a general outline of the "future history" of mankind. C.G. Darwin (1887-1962) was an English physicist and grandson of Charles Darwin of evolutionary fame. Despite being concerned about the over-population of the world he had four sons and one daughter with his wife Katharine Pember. The hypocrisy of this may seem odd, but the concern about over-population only refers to inferior breeds of humans and not superior breeds like himself and his lineage. C.G. Darwin was a long time member and eventual president of the Eugenic Society (1953-59) which represented the belief system held among many of the political, scientific and aristocratic elites of his day and the present.

### **World Wide Limitation of Population Size**

From *The Next Million Years*.



"I have already shown the short-term difficulties which seem to make it sure that no spontaneous process will avoid the menace of over-population. Is it possible that the statesmen of all countries, perceiving these dangers, should combine together to make and enforce a world-wide policy of limitation? It would have to be world-wide, because if any nation were recalcitrant, its population would increase relatively to the rest, so that sooner or later it would dominate the others. That the prospects of such a world-wide policy are not good is witnessed by the total failure hitherto achieved in the far easier problem of military disarmament. How would the nations settle the respective numbers admissible for their populations? The only principle that would have a chance of acceptance would be to **base the numbers on existing populations**, and then the question arises why one particular set of proportions between the various countries should be frozen constant for all time. Since the aim of the policy is to retain world-wide prosperity, **every single country would be faced with the problem of taking care of its own limitation**, and, as has been seen, this would not come about spontaneously. Even if a government could devise an effective method, it would be an odious task for the rulers to have to enforce it, and there can be no doubt they would often evade doing so. With the best of goodwill, it would be hard to enforce the limitation because of the gradualness of the increase, for the rulers could always excuse themselves by the argument that the slight illegal increase of this year was accidental and would next year be compensated by a corresponding decrease, so that action might be postponed, and sometimes it would be postponed too long.

It is clear from all this that the world policy would need to be supported by international sanctions, and the only ultimate sanction must be war. Present methods of warfare would not be nearly murderous enough to reduce populations seriously, and even so they would take a nearly equal toll of victims from the unoffending nations. So after the war the question would arise of how to reduce the excess population of the offending nation. It is not possible to be humane in this, but the most humane method would seem to be infanticide together with the sterilization of a fraction of the adult population. Such sterilization could now be done without the brutal methods practised in the past, but it would certainly be vehemently resisted." [emphasis mine] – 148

Bertrand Russell in his 1952 book *The Impact of Science of Society* [2] offers a very similar situation but proposed that this [international authority should have total control of the food supply](#).

From *The Impact of Science on Society*:

"To deal with this problem [increasing population and decreasing food supplies] it will be necessary to find ways of preventing an increase in world population. If this is to be done otherwise than by wars, pestilence, and famines, it will demand a powerful international authority. **This authority should deal out the world's food to the various nations in proportion to their population** at the time of the establishment of the authority. If any nation subsequently increased its population it **should not on that account receive any more food**. The motive for not increasing population would therefore be very compelling. What method of preventing an increase might be preferred should be left to each state to decide." [emphasis mine] - 124

## **Enforcement of Population Control and the Development of Creeds of Resistance**

One of the problems anticipated by Charles Galton Darwin with the strict enforcement of population control is that of the development of an opposition creed.

"Even worse difficulties, however, would arise than those I have so far contemplated. I have been assuming that the policy of limitation was accepted by the majority on broad rational grounds, but it is quite certain that in a very short time it would encounter fanatical opposition. Even though the procreative instinct has not the violence of the sexual instinct, yet it is an emotion possessed by many people, and as such it will be particularly liable to get incorporated in creeds. There are already creeds that maintain the wrongfulness of birth-control, though there is at present no very strong emotion associated with them. **But if there were to be any enforcement of birth-control by authority, it is certain that many new creeds would spring up** which would regard the practice as sinful, and the tenet would be held with an enthusiasm not to be overcome by the efforts of rational persuasion. **There are many creeds, which we hold to be unwise, which we can admit and leave alone, because their effects are mainly to damage their believers. This could not be one of them, since the believers would automatically gain an undue share of the next generation.** Persecution would be the only recourse against such a creed, and the massacre of the innocents or the blood of the martyrs would water the seed of the faith. It is not of course true, as is sometimes maintained by religious devotees, that persecution always fails to extinguish a faith - for example the Arian heresy was much persecuted by the orthodox church, and there are no Arians now - but there is no doubt that persecution is a great encourager, and it is fairly sure that not all such creeds would be extinguished. Once again the effort to produce comfortable prosperity would call for a brutality that is just the kind of thing it is trying to avoid." [emphasis mine] - 150

More on the importance of creeds [here](#).

## **The Starving Margin and the Sanctity of Human Life**

"The central feature of human history must always be the pressure of population. Man, the wild animal, will obey the law of life and will tend to multiply until he is limited by the means of subsistence. This is the normal condition of the world, and it carries the consequence that the final check on population is by starvation. There will be a fraction of humanity, a **starving margin**, who have got to die simply because not enough food can be grown to keep them alive. The death may be directly due to intermittent famines, or to diseases caused by malnutrition, or it may be due to warfare; for when a country is dying of starvation and sees, or thinks it sees, a neighbouring country with plenty to eat, it would be beyond most human nature to accept certain passive death instead of possible active death. The central question for humanity is the problem of the starving margin." [emphasis in original] - 170

"The social sense of any community, and its immediate practical interest, **will not tolerate living in contact with the sufferings of its own starving margin...**" [emphasis mine] - 173

"In connection with the recent wonderful advances in medical science, this is the place to mention a matter that will very soon indeed be of immediate importance. Since in the normal condition of the world there will be a margin of every population on the verge of starvation, it seems likely **that there will have to be a revision of the doctrine of the sanctity of the individual human life**. In the old days the doctors were under the obligation of doing all they could to preserve any life, though they had no great success in their efforts; now it is hardly too much to say that most diseases have come under control, or anyhow to judge by recent progress most of them soon will. But is the world the better for having a large number of healthy people dying of starvation, rather than letting them die of malaria? One of the justified boasts of recent times has been the great decrease that medicine has made in infant mortality. Whereas in the old days a mother might bear ten children and have only two survive, now she may bear only three and she will be regarded as vary unlucky if all do not survive. But the difficulty in the world is going to be that the number of people born is too great for the food supplies, so that a fraction must die anyhow; may it not be better that they should die in infancy? **The truth is that all our present codes about the sanctity of human life are based on the security of life as it is at present, and once that is gone they will inevitably be revised, and the revision will probably shock most of our present opinion.**" [emphasis mine] - 185

[1] Quotes from Charles Galton Darwin, *The Next Million Years* (1952).

[2] Quotes from Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* (1952). ISBN 0-415-10906-X

Note: I first heard about this book from talks given by Alan Watt at [Cutting Through The Matrix.com](http://Cutting Through The Matrix.com), an individual well worth looking into.



**KNOWLEDGE DRIVEN REVOLUTION**