

OptimalHealthSecrets.Com
LIA Lifestyle Instruction Aid

abc18. A little Speculation now

By Dr. Victor Jean Ouellette

Modified March 6, 2008

This article is intended to be fun relaxing reading.

Two things are coming down on us. First is the complete understanding of the human gene code and along with this ability to modify it. This will likely happen in about 50 years or so and 1,000 years lifespans will then become the norm. Many ethical decisions will have to be made. For instance when it is clear that food consumption rusts out the body thus, limiting lifespan to 80 years or so. Will it be acceptable to modify the human genes to make obesity a thing of the past? Will it be acceptable to modify the body such that fat does not kill people off at the young age of 80 years rather than allowing them to live their complete life to say 1,000 years? Many people are going to want that modification and they are going to want it for their children as well.

This then brings up the idea that some threshold will have to be set for experimentation. Already, we are grappling with the concepts of drugs in sports. Do we allow drugs and end up with a new set of people with obvious abnormal characteristics obtained from drugs, but very effective for winning contests. Or, do we limit the drugs as we now do, to maintain humans as normal to us as possible. When 1,000 year lifespans come along the drug and sports issue is going to change isn't it? No longer will there be the fear that drugs will shorten the lifespan.

Okay, if we allow these types of drugs and we allow genetic modification for health reasons what happens when someone comes up the discovery that a fourth brain layered over top of the cerebral cortex can confer more powers to humans. This of course will be anew species that may have thought transfer or something like that. The new brain tissue would be a new organ that would confer new powers. The point is do we allow it? Do we allow that experimentation in the first place? The religious ethicists will be on one side of the debate using very old arguments that will not be seen to hold much weight because they will not be logical. The scientists will be on the other side using the scientific process and pure logic. Various newer groups like the modified Humanist groups will be in the middle.

All of the old style religions will die out as Janeism has. Does anyone recall Janeism? (An Emergence from Buddhism which was itself an emergence from Hinduism.) The Pantheist's idea being rejected by some as having a major logical flaw evolved into Panentheism without that flaw. However, a criticism on Panentheism read , "Your panentheism sounds like another apology for a Godellian universe where unprovable truth annoys us by its persistence." Lots of ideas, lots of people giving their 'two-cents' and lots of people rejecting it all.

Bottom line..... WE DON'T KNOW. No one does. And science will not tell us. Mind you science has rewarded us with great gains. Gains that were hard won fighting against religions that wanted (and still do) to keep all knowledge to themselves so they become the purveyors of that knowledge and thus, the income that comes from it.

Science cannot answer unanswerable questions. Some questions are not meant to be asked. If some poor soul decides to ask these unanswerable questions then more level headed people should step in and straighten them out. Circular questions should not be asked (Who or what created God? Who created that which created God? Who created that which created that which created God? ad infinitum) There is no end to this question so why are we beating our brains out asking it? Simple really, MONEY. Great amounts of money are to be made in the belief in magic (religion).

Democracy levels the playing field a bit because now people can group themselves and decide for themselves what they want to believe in or if they want to believe in anything at all. In the olden days when the churches ran everything life was terrible. The churches liked it that way and fought to keep it that way by killing people off who disagreed with them.

This brings up the point "Should we be listening to any religious based ethicists?" Good question. The question arises why we would want to listen to someone who cannot use logic and instead chooses to believe in magic. The facts are the majority of people cannot make up their minds on the God question. The vast majority of people cannot think clearly and logically. And, it might even be said that the vast majority of people do not want to think clearly. They just want to belong. They want to belong to anything that most others belong to. Okay, good sociological point there but, might there be a better way? Well, sometimes the better way is not always what people follow, as Microsoft has proven by having a clearly inferior product, but has managed to have most people using it.

We don't know what the near future has in store for us, but we do know that it will be exciting. Hopefully the scientific process and logical thinking will win out. But, it may not. When these new scientific discoveries start to come fast and furious, and lifespans begin to lengthen, there will be much work to be done in the religious/ethics field. Hope is the secret ingredient it would seem. But, 'hope' tangles with 'fear' when humans make decisions. We'll have to wait to see which becomes the more dominant.

Cognitive immaturity and insecurity seem to be prime ingredients in humans and very few appear to break away from this immaturity, even as adults. The ability to think clearly is a skill that needs to be learned and honed. Unfortunately, most humans choose to reject that learning and take the easy road of belief in something that is unproven. Feeling a sense of security within oneself is achieved by some, in the process of rejecting clear thinking in order to solve emotional dilemmas. Unfortunately, we think these dilemmas stem from the immaturity itself, as adults are unable to grapple with the difficulties of rejecting the magic and relying on themselves. Time will tell how we fair as the population crunch approaches.