

# Cows Critically Endangered by Eugenics

If dairy cows were wild animals, they would be put in the category critically endangered species. Just 1 in 180,000 dairy cows in the US are genetically distinct. The others are like direct siblings.

This article provides a philosophical case for the "*inbreeding argument*" against eugenics.

*Printed on December 16, 2024*



**GMO Debate**  
A critical perspective on eugenics

## Table of Contents (TOC)

1. 🐄 Cows Critically Endangered
  - 👤 Just 50 cows alive from a genetic perspective
2. 🤖 The Essence of Inbreeding
  - 🙄 "like sticking ones head into ones anus"
3. Who Will Protect Cows?
  - 🛡️ Who will protect nature?



# Cows Critically Endangered by Eugenics

*"How many cows are in the field? Just 1 in 180,000 according to genetics!"*

In a startling revelation that challenges our understanding of biodiversity, genetic analysis has exposed a critical endangerment masked by sheer numbers. While 9 million cattle roam the pastures of the United States, from a genetic perspective, there are effectively **just 50 cows alive.**



**Chad Dechow** – an associate professor of dairy cattle genetics – and others say there is so much genetic similarity among cows, the effective population size is less than 50. If cows were wild animals, that would put them in the category of critically endangered species.



*"It's pretty much one big inbred family" says **Leslie B. Hansen**, a cow expert and professor at the University of Minnesota. Fertility rates are affected by inbreeding, and already, cow fertility has dropped significantly. Also, when close relatives are bred, serious health problems could be lurking.*


---


**(2021) The way we breed cows is setting them up for extinction**

Source: [Quartz \(PDF backup\)](#)

The application of eugenic principles in U.S. cattle breeding, aimed at maximizing desirable traits, has inadvertently led to a catastrophic loss of genetic diversity. This homogenization of the bovine genome represents a ticking time bomb for the industry and a poignant illustration of the broader dangers inherent in eugenic thinking. As we shall explore, this case study in cattle breeding serves as a microcosm for the wider philosophical and practical pitfalls of attempting to "improve" nature through reductive scientific means.

# The "Inbreeding" Argument against Eugenics

The  **eugenics** article has demonstrated that eugenics can be considered a **corruption of nature** from nature's own perspective. By attempting to direct evolution through an external, anthropocentric lens, eugenics moves counter to the intrinsic processes that foster resilience and strength in  $\infty$  time.

In contrast to the diversity-seeking tendencies of natural evolution, which foster resilience and strength, eugenics moves "*inwards*" in the context of an infinite ocean of time. This inward movement represents a fundamental escape attempt, a retreat from the fundamental uncertainty of nature into an assumed certain empirical realm. However, this retreat is ultimately self-defeating, as it aligns humanity's direction with the past rather than a  moral future.

*blond hair and blue eyes for everyone*

*utopia*

Eugenics, at its core, resides on the essence of inbreeding, which is known to cause weakness and fatal problems.

*"An attempt to stand above life, as being life, results in a figurative stone that sinks in the infinite ocean of  $\infty$  time."*

This profound statement encapsulates the paradox at the heart of eugenics. When science, with its inherently historical perspective, is elevated to the status of a guiding principle for life and evolution, humanity metaphorically sticks its head into its own anus. This self-referential loop creates a situation analogous to inbreeding, where the gene pool becomes increasingly limited and vulnerable.



The output of science is fundamentally historical, providing a perspective rooted in past observations and data. When this backward-looking view is used to guide future evolution, it creates a misalignment with the forward-looking, morality-grounded perspective necessary for resilience and strength in  $\infty$  time.

Fundamentally, eugenics depends on a dogmatic assumption of certainty - a belief in *uniformitarianism*. This unjustified certainty, as explored further in chapter **Uniformitarianism**, is what allows scientism to place scientific interests above morality. However, in the face of the infinite scope of  $\infty$  time, such certainty is not only misplaced but potentially catastrophic.

In conclusion, by attempting to stand above life while being life itself, eugenics creates a self-referential loop that, like inbreeding, leads to accumulating weakness rather than strength and resilience.

## Who Will Protect Cows?

The fundamental intellectual flaws of eugenics are difficult to overcome, especially when it concerns a practical defense. This difficulty in articulating a defense against eugenics illuminates why many advocates for nature and animals may retreat to an intellectual back seat and are 'silent' when it concerns eugenics.

- ▶ Chapter "Science and the Attempt to Break Free from Morality" demonstrated science's centuries ongoing attempt to emancipate itself from philosophy.
- ▶ Chapter "Uniformitarianism: The Dogma Behind Eugenics" exposed the dogmatic fallacy underlying the notion that scientific facts are valid without philosophy.
- ▶ Chapter "🗺️ Science as a Guiding Principle for Life?" revealed why science cannot serve as a guiding principle for life.



"Who will protect 🐮 cows against eugenics?"

Share your insights and comments with us at [info@gmodebate.org](mailto:info@gmodebate.org).

*Printed on December 16, 2024*



**GMO Debate**

A critical perspective on eugenics

© 2024 Philosophical.Ventures Inc.