

Eugenics has been the subject of several dystopian science-fiction novels and movies, from *Brave New World* to *Gattaca* and more recently *Star Trek*. They mostly depict a bleak future of humanity in which genetic determinism is taken to its extreme. Genetic engineering has been getting a bad reputation for valid but arguably, mostly historical reasons. Scientific progress has reached a point, however, where a serious engagement with the moral issues at stake has become unavoidable. In this paper, I critically examine the claim from Mehlman & Botkin (1998) that human enhancement will inevitably accentuate existing inequality in a free market and analyze whether prohibition is the optimal public policy for this objection as various sorts of egalitarians might, therefore, advise (Lamont and Favor, 2014). Of course, various moral theories will evaluate this claim, which I shall call the inequality-objection, differently. Yet, for the purposes of the present paper, I shall only consider whether the inequality-objection is a problem to the at least historically, dominant moral framework in policy-making, i.e. utilitarianism. The question then becomes, whether enhancement poses a threat to agents' well-being or not. In what follows I argue that the inequality-objection has several problems.

My criticism is structured as follows: In Section 2 I will attempt to bring the inequality-objection into formal argument structure and clarify terms that are unclear. In Section 3.1 I attack the claim that cognitive enhancements lead to inequality. In Section 3.2 I analyze how inequalities in access to enhancements could decrease well-being and if it is the case that the benefits from human enhancements do not actually outweigh the costs, which is what utilitarians should be concerned with. In Section 3.3 I argue that even if the inequality-objection is right in that inequality and a decrease in well-being is unavoidable, prohibition is unlikely to be the best possible policy-response in order to maximize well-being. Lastly, in Section 4 I will summarize my attacks on the argument and conclude that the inequality-objection does not sufficiently support the conclusion that human enhancement should be prohibited by policy-makers.

References

- Arneson, Richard, "Egalitarianism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)
- Battleday RM, Brem AK "Modafinil for cognitive neuroenhancement in healthy non-sleep-deprived subjects: A systematic review". *European Neuropsychopharmacology* . (November 2015). 25 (11): 1865–81.
- Bostrom, Nick & Roach, Rebecca "Ethical Issues in Human Enhancement" *New Waves in Applied Ethics* (2007), ed. Jesper Ryberg (Palgrave Macmillan).
- Bostrom, Nick "Human Genetic Enhancements: A Transhumanist Perspective", *Journal of Value Enquiry* , 37/4 (2003): 493-506
- Bostrom, Nick & Sandberg, Anders, "Cognitive Enhancement: Methods, Ethics, Regulatory Challenges" *Sci Eng Ethics* (2009) 15:311–341
- Heller, Jacob & Peterson, Christine, "Human Enhancement and Nanotechnology: A Foresight Nanotech Institute Policy Issues Brief" (2006), Foresight Nanotech Institute. Accessed on June 19, 2015: <http://www.foresight.org/policy/brief2.html>
- Lamont, Julian & Favor, Christi, "Distributive Justice", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2014

Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Accessed on June 19, 2015:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/justice-distributive>

Lin, Patrick & Allhoff, Fritz, "Against Unrestricted Human Enhancement" *Journal of Evolution and Technology* - Vol. 18 Issue 1 – May 2008 – pgs 35-41

Malinowski, P. & Shalamanova, L. "Meditation and Cognitive Ageing: the Role of Mindfulness Meditation in Building Cognitive Reserve" *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement* (2017) 1: 96.

Mehlman, Maxwell J. & Botkin, Jeffrey R. "Access to the Genome. The Challenge to Equality." (1998)

Parens, Erik "Is Better Always Good? The Enhancement Project" *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb. 1998), pp. S1-S17

Randall, D. C., Shneerson, J. M. & File S. E. "Cognitive effects of modafinil in student volunteers may depend on IQ." *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* (2005), 82(1), 133–139.

Savulescu, J., Sandberg, A. & Kahane, G. *Enhancing Human Capacities*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (2011).

Savulescu, J., "In defence of Procreative Beneficence" *J Med Ethics* (2007); 33:284-288.

Veit, Walter, "Procreative Beneficence and Genetic Enhancement". In: *KRITERION -- Journal of Philosophy*. URL: . (2018)