

# International Journal of Human Sciences Research

## THE ANTHROPOCENE SOCIETY AND THE EUGENIC IDEAL: WHAT HAS NOT CHANGED SO FAR

---

*Rafaela Batista Carvalho de Pina*

Post-graduated in Neuropsychopedagogy and in Environmental Education, Teacher of the municipal network of Campos dos Goytacazes and State of Rio de Janeiro  
Campos dos Goytacazes – RJ  
<https://lattes.cnpq.br/1348222344297500>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



© This work integrates the work: EC Wenceslau & ML Ponte (eds.). Sustainability - articulating concept of knowledge and practices. São José do Rio Preto, SP: Reconnecta Soluções, 201.

**Abstract:** The society of the Anthropocene is marked by technology and by the way of acting of the man who sees himself as the center of power on the planet. The article seeks to analyze the course of eugenics practices over time in society and the necessary intervention anchored in the principles of ethics and human dignity. Theoretical references of authors who base their research on the core of the proposed theme were used. The reflection on the behavior of Anthropocene society and the propagation of eugenics in a camouflaged way in human biotechnology focuses on the ideal of eugenics in a sophisticated way through the attempts of the search for human genetic improvement. The use of eugenic practices left deep marks on society and it is of great importance to study how this practice can be disseminated until today and its implications.

**Keywords** (Anthropocene. Eugenics. Humanity. Technique)

## INTRODUCTION

Man's survival instinct throughout history has always fostered his learning how to be in community. Action in the environment was fundamental in the events that marked the development of societies and, above all, the consolidation of the main social organizations such as the cultural pluralism of the Ancient Age, the driving energy of hydraulic mills in the Middle Ages and the revolution in work activities. Important landmarks that contributed to the first tests of the use of technologies in the improvement of the means of production. Man saw himself thus separated from nature, extracting from it the maximum of his needs.

Man is the only one capable of adapting in such a complex way to the environment by creating technologies; shaping and impacting nature according to their interests in the bias of social artifacts. From ceramics to monumental constructions, from soil cultivation to

shipbuilding. From textiles to war machines, from measuring time to astronomy: tools, techniques and objects remained essentially the same for long periods of time (JONAS, 2014).

A priori, great transformations occurred in the Modern Age and took place amidst the innovative ideals of the Enlightenment. The apogee of the great navigations, the telescope by Galileo Galilei, the heliocentric theory of Nicolaus Copernicus placed Science under a new point of view of observation and investigative method, the functioning of the world and of all nature. Francis Bacon's concept that knowledge is power also endorsed the new guiding paradigms of this period. Men, from the development of technique, become "masters and possessors of nature" (DESCARTES, 1973).

In the course of this complex phenomenon and undoubtedly the appropriation of the best techniques, the Industrial Revolution emerged in England, causing profound changes in the social, political and economic configuration of societies. Technological progress and new relations of power and domination, typically engendered in the capitalist way, were outlined. The man who previously elaborated his conceptions forged in the concept of divine creation starts to concentrate in his own hands the power to act and manipulate his own life. Thus, the triumph of Homo Faber occurs through the central place that technology occupies at the end of human life (JONAS, 2006).

## DEVELOPMENT

Man's action has always been a substantial cause of profound changes in the course of the planet in its vital processes of homeostasis and balance. In the search for a more avid understanding of the changes that the Earth has been suffering over time, several experts postulate a new concept regarding a new

geological epoch, the Anthropocene. It is important to emphasize the protagonism of humanity never seen in any other historical moment in order to drastically alter the functioning and natural metabolism of the planet by promoting intense global changes, of an intense and irreversible nature.

### **ANTHROPOCENE AND THE PREMISE OF AN IMMINENT COLLAPSE**

The term Anthropocene was first proposed by the Dutch chemist Paul Crutzen. Specialist in atmospheric chemistry, Nobel Prize winner in 1995 for his studies on the ozone layer. His research has focused on how human activity triggers profound changes in greenhouse gas emissions and global temperature rises. Economist and professor of Sustainable Development at the Earth Institute at Columbia University, Jeffrey Sachs (2008, p. 101), refers in his book ``Economía para un planeta abarrotado``, contributing to clarify its meaning:

The Nobel Prize in Chemistry Paul Crutzen designated the our time as the Anthropocene, an era in which the Earth is dominated by humans because the volume of human activities is now so great that it has disrupted all fundamental systems for the sustainability of life.

The creation of this term projects society's gaze to the understanding that man has redefined his position in nature in order to place himself as a priority along with his interests that converge to an exploratory action of an objectified reality of the planet. The man who a priori must build a relationship of dependence and belonging with nature in an exercise of prudence and responsibility - a premise that the German philosopher Hans Jonas brings with an intimate conceptual vision, foolishly prefers to act as if he were the holder of his power in a dimension

forged in the chaos and devastation of environmental resources. Climate changes; ocean acidification; imbalance of ecosystems; the loss of biodiversity are just some of the innumerable damages that the Earth has been suffering at the hands of a humanity that lives without preserving the vital conditions of its species and of the entire biosphere. According to LATOUR (2020), society is currently facing the tragic effects of a global health crisis. The explosion of social inequalities, ecological collapse, climate denialism, and even the relaxation of government regulations trigger a deep crisis across the planet.

For all these reasons, the introduction of the term Anthropocene is often associated with a situation of authentic planetary emergency that humanity has to face today BYBEE (1991) as a result of recent and harmful behavior on the part of the human species. The Anthropocene is not configured as the result of recent changes in human behavior, but as a consequence of anthropic action itself during millennia of manipulation and exploitation of Mother Earth. The Anthropocene envisions a historic-geological moment where the planet agonizes in its full vulnerability, in the face of the inconsequential behavior of humanity that seems to have reached the limit of what nature can withstand.

The new era of the Anthropocene characterizes the planet in a condition of extreme vulnerability. Man's action over recent times - so to speak, over the last millennia has been so destructive that the risks of a global collapse are imminent, a true planetary emergency. All ecosystems are threatened, including the very survival of the human species. SACHS (2008, p.87): "One thing is certain: the current trajectory of human activity is not sustainable". Faced with the emergence of the current planetary crisis, many actions have been organized in an attempt to combat the destruction of

natural resources. The first major landmark conference on the environment was the 1972 Stockholm Conference; all data are in the final report of the meeting. In April 1987, the Brundtland Commission, as it became known, our common future” – which brings the concept of sustainable development into public discourse. According to the report, sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio 92) took place in Rio de Janeiro. Ten years later, in 2002, Rio+10 took place in Johannesburg, South Africa, and in 2012, again in Rio de Janeiro, the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio+20, took place. Finally, in September 2015, the Sustainable Development Summit took place in New York, at UN headquarters. At this meeting, all UN countries defined the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as part of a new sustainable development agenda that must finalize the work of the millennium development goals - MDGs and leave no one behind. With a deadline of 2030, but with work starting now, this agenda is known as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

However, despite many initiatives and events that prioritize the concern of human action on the planet, a recent 168-page report by the United Nations released in February 2021 warns about climate change, the loss of biodiversity and pollution, which humans are destroying the Earth and making it an increasingly uninhabitable planet. To reverse this tragic path, the world needs to implement urgent and dramatic changes in society, the economy and people’s daily lives. “Without nature’s help, we will not thrive, or even survive,” said UN Secretary-General António Guterres.

For too long, we have been waging a meaningless, suicidal war against nature. The result is three interlinked environmental crises: climate disruption, biodiversity loss and pollution threaten our viability as a species.

In step with this scenario, of extreme asymmetry between man and nature, there is the incessant human interest in technological development and the massive investment in the improvement of techniques that starts to emerge the role of man in the achievement of unimaginable feats: the development of industrial apparatus, space travel, medical research, artificial intelligence, computer technology, the globalized world, interconnected by social networks. Man has never been so connected in accessing information. Paradoxically, he has never been so oblivious to his own weaknesses. At the same time that he avidly develops so many technologies, he is faced with the consequences of natural disasters (which could be avoided) with actions of predictability; the suffering caused by conflicts, wars and intolerance; the scene of hunger and misery stamped much closer than one imagines. Lack of access to basic sanitation and health conditions.

The COVID19 Pandemic is a concrete example that brought to the world not only human vulnerability in the face of the overwhelming power of a virus, but also exposed the chronicity of problems that plague society and that were potentiated in the chaos of the disease. Social inequalities, the lack of assertive public policies and the very lack of empathy with others mean that many resources do not reach everyone. Many countries across the planet still do not have their population vaccinated. Meanwhile, new variants emerge, more people get sick and thousands of lives fail to be saved. Anthropocene society presents man as the center of power, but also exposes his total lack of responsibility – in the explicit consequence

of his social ills.

This is the new way of perceiving the universal human condition – a completely perverse universality (wicked universality) is true, but it is the only one we have, since the precedent of globalization seems to disappear from the horizon. The new universality consists in feeling that the soil is about to give way (LATOURET, 2020). The lack of responsibility, closely intertwined in a feedback system, is the basis of the problems and their conjunctural causes - consumerism in excess, the emission of pollutants that generate climate change and the degradation of ecosystems, social inequality, violence.

As it was seen, the behavior of Anthropocene society points to a human action based (mostly) on choices and directions lacking responsibility, opening precedents for the creation of theories and ideologies that do not contemplate the well-being of the planet, much less of humanity itself. A fertile ground for movements that were part of society and that, until today, promote values contrary to equity, respect for diversity and human dignity, leaving deep scars in the recent history of society.

### **EUGENICS ARISES: A SEGREGATORY SCIENCE**

As exposed so far, the contemporaneity of human life is potentially marked by intense technological progress. The Anthropocene focuses on the imminent advance of technoscience, in which man begins to master techniques at a level never before imagined. Since Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity, studies on evolution by Lamarck and Charles Darwin have revolutionized the direction of scientific research, revealing to the world the notorious importance of an area of knowledge on the rise, Biotechnology.

It is in this context of vigorous progress in science and the ambivalence of technology

influencing the direction of society and new currents of thought that the concept of Eugenics is given. Conceived by Francis Galton, in 1883, a wealthy heir from a bastard family in London. The publication of the book "Origin of Species", by his cousin, the naturalist Charles Darwin, would have been the inspiration for the formulation of his theory, which sought to select people based on their genetic characteristics. Darwin, in turn, never mentioned in his publication the study of the behavior of human beings to support the theory of the prime. With the purpose of applying the presuppositions of natural selection in the human species, Francis Galton in 1883, combining two Greek expressions, coined the term "eugenics" or "well born" (BLACK, 2003, p. 56).

For Galton, the transmission of characteristics was not limited only to physical aspects, but also to intellectual skills and talents (GALTON, 1892, p. 6). For him, poverty and disease were hereditarily defined markers, as well as people's physical traits. He associated characteristics such as skull size, nose shape, height, descent and economic conditions of each individual as genetic determinants of a higher class. In his understanding, in a clear allusion to the principles of natural selection, science must prioritize the survival of the most suitable bloodlines. This group was represented by rich, wealthy, blue-eyed, and light-haired families. To the detriment of less suitable lineages, considered a hindrance to society: the poor, the handicapped, the smaller, so-called unfit. For Galton, for the sake of "the good of society" it was better that these individuals did not procreate in order not to generate an inept offspring.

Although the concept of eugenics is unacceptable and abominable, at the time it was created it received many supporters, including other nations who agreed with this ideology of extreme discrimination, such



as the United States and Germany, which stamped the horror of wars with the explicit practice of eugenics by exterminating millions of people. In addition to suffering passive euthanasia and deaths in gas chambers, allowing the hygiene objectives to be quickly achieved (GONÇALVES, 2006). Men, women and children lost their lives because they were expendable according to the Nazi model of horror. It is estimated that, due to eugenic practices, about six million people died in concentration camps during World War II (UN, 2014). In the practice of many entities at the time, the castration of more than 64,000 Americans considered evolutionarily “unfit” as alcoholics, schizophrenics and epileptics was also a terrifying scenario for this ideology in society at the time.

From the perspective of selection of characteristics and the prerogatives of determining the formation of genetic castes, eugenics ended up creating two classifications in its concept of segregation. Positive eugenics, with the aim of modify the somatic and mental functions of the human being, such as memory, intelligence, as well as determine characteristics, promoting the reproduction of fitter individuals with characteristics considered superior. Negative eugenics, with the aim of preventing the reproduction of undesirable individuals: bearers of diseases, malformations, with characteristics considered inferior to society. Negative eugenics is distinguished, on the one hand, from positive eugenics by the difference between preferences to be avoided, subject to generalization, and, on the other hand, thanks to non-generalizable optimization preferences (HABERMAS, 2001).

Galton proposed categorizing the people most worthy of living and procreating, also organizing selective marriages based on a hereditary science. Everything to guarantee the purity of the bloodlines. According to

him, those not endowed with the “superior” genes must not have the right to be born. Thus, the concepts of positive and negative eugenics based on the object of segregation make it impossible to define clear boundaries between both currents. In a very emphatic way, eugenics tried to use heredity as an instrument of exclusion and sterilization of those considered weaker: blacks, disabled people, immigrants and all vulnerable groups. The same genetics seeks to reject his theory by proving that there is no division of races and that genetically there are no superior or inferior genes, but a single humanity in its various individualities.

## EUGENIC TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN GENETICS

Although eugenics has been unmasked and deeply criticized, having been abolished even from genetic books and conferences, its precepts have not yet disappeared. Eugenic ideas still survive, camouflaged in many cases under the label of “human genetics”. As a science in favor of the good of humanity in order to promote the improvement of the human species in the face of concrete situations in society. The techniques: GIFT (Gamete Intrafallopian Transfer), ZIFT (Zygote Intrafallopian Transfer), ICSI (Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection) and IVF (In Vitro Fertilization) or IVF (in vitro fertilization) (SÁ, NAVES, 2018, p. 138 -139) awaken humanity’s attention to the potential and imminent risk of a new eugenics based on old ideologies. Similarities with Galton’s theory are certainly not coincidental.

SCHRAMM (2005, p.1) in a more technical sense, eugenics is a generic term from the 19th century, which indicates the science that studies the most favorable conditions for the reproduction and improvement of the human species; eugenetics represents the contemporary form of eugenics, a

technoscience born in the 1970s, from the encounter between genetics, molecular biology and genetic engineering; eugenics indicates the ideological and “utopian” form of eugenetics, that is, the conviction that it is possible to replace “bad” genes with “good” genes and create a new species of humanity freed from its malaise and suffering. Based on this concept, society is faced with the maximum of the technological aspect in which it is possible, through scientific advances, to activate or deactivate genes in favor of the cure of diseases, malformations and the most diverse conditions that involve human health.

In the fullness of research and application of increasingly modern devices, research in Human Genetics acquires extreme relevance in the scientific, economic and social environment. The second half of the 20th century saw the use of a technique that would revolutionize genetic research, especially the human genome. This is CRISPR-Cas9, short for regularly interspersed short palindromic repeats. In 1987, researcher Yoshizumi Ishino and collaborators from the University of Osaka (Japan) identified a peculiar locus (region) in the genome of the bacterium *Escherichia coli*, consisting of repeated sequences and interspersed spacers of unknown function.

In 1993, microbiologist at the University of Alicante, Spain, Francisco Mojica identified peculiar repetitive DNA sequences in the genome of the archaeon *Haloferax* and later showed that similar sequences were common in prokaryotes and compatible genetic materials in phages, viruses that infect bacteria. In short, it can be seen that CRISPR is a natural process of the biological functioning of bacterial organisms in nature. Years later, in 2005, Mojica also hypothesized that such sequences were part of a microbial immune system. With Ruud Janssen at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands, Mojica created the acronym CRISPR.

In 2012, the French Emmanuelle Charpentier and the American Jennifer Doudna published their experiments showing that the CRISPR – Cas9 system could cut isolated DNA and how the Cas9 enzyme could be instructed to cut predefined DNA sequences. Due to the great relevance of the published work, the pair of researchers received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 2020. In an interview given years before, in 2016, Doudna explained that the technique could also be used for various purposes, including curing harmful health conditions such as sickle cell anemia, cancer and degenerative diseases.

For the first time in history, human beings have within their reach the possibility of rewriting the genetic code of their species both in the diseased cells of the body and in the eggs and sperm that will result in future generations. It is about granting man power over life and how it will be in accordance with the provision of his needs. The creation of a superman, if it is no longer a fantastic image, is no longer an inviolable taboo. The crisis of social institutions, moral nihilism and the lag suffered by religious ideals in modern times are equivalent to the growth of possibilities to alter the “main and fundamental keys in which life will have to trace its melody for future generations” (SDD, 121) (OLIVEIRA, 2013).

For now, the technique raises a great discussion about its application in humans, involving many ethical, moral and also safety issues. There is still no specific regulation for this purpose, which is prohibited in all countries that carry out studies in human embryology and that have the necessary technical capacity to carry out such research.

However, in November 2018, biophysicist He Jiankui caused a great impact in the world scientific community by announcing the editing of the genes of two embryos,

of two twin girls. This event, which caused great controversy around the world, was possible using the Crispr-Cas9 technique, and according to Jiankui, it occurred safely. At the International Conference on Gene Editing in Hong Kong the same year, Jiankui explained that his goal was not to cure or prevent hereditary diseases, but to try to create the trait to resist possible infections by the AIDS virus. The experiments that led to the generation of babies with a 'customized' genome by Crispr-Cas9 are not included in an official publication critically reviewed by the scientific community, the gold standard of reliability and veracity for modern science,

One of the major issues involving the regulation of the application of the CRISPR method concerns the possibility of using its mechanism to extrapolate the therapeutic perspective and start to be used to edit genes indiscriminately. CRISPR is therefore one of the most important challenges presented by ethics and genetic research at present.

This way, it becomes urgent to think about the directions that the application of this type of technology can reach. The point to be reflected is to know exactly the limits of the technique. From what stage does CRISPR become a eugenics instrument in the sense of seeking a perfect human being, based on social standards and stereotypes. Thus, succumbing and altering what man has as most valuable and what also identifies him as human – which is the genetic heritage.

Conceiving the idea that gene editing, especially the CRISPR technique, will not be just a way of human selection is to trigger a causal dialogue about its action in the scientific environment. We have, as an example, scientific research that is moving towards carrying out prenatal tests that detect genetic diseases in embryos. At the same time that its application can revolutionize the quality of life of people with such precise technologies,

it can also be a devastating weapon with the power to act maleficently on the right to life and human dignity itself.

Science seeks, in its principles, to prevent abuses being imposed on those who use the CRISPR technique, based on its implications, analyzing the moral consequences that may arise from its use (SGANZERLA, PESSINI, 2020). Modern man pursues the new, but after conquering such a good, he quickly becomes bored with it; insatiable, he pursues new yearnings always guided by the eternal 'postponement of satisfaction' (BAUMAN, 2001, p. 37).

Another issue regarding the so-called practice of "Human Genetics" concerns couples seeking reproductive insemination techniques. The demand for this type of technique has increased exponentially in recent decades is a factor that has drawn attention. The news that most Brazilians resort to semen banks in the United States generated a lot of discussion about racism and eugenics. In a country as mixed as Brazil, this type of pattern is sought abroad. Between 2011 and 2016, US semen imports for artificial insemination in Brazil grew by 2,625%. Preliminary data for 2017 already indicate that growth continues. But what most draws attention in these data from the National Health Surveillance Agency (ANVISA) is the profile of the chosen donors: 95% of them are white, 52% have blue eyes,

These data generate a lot of discussion about the standards established by society disseminated by the media and advertising as being ideal and superior. Western aesthetic culture still greatly influences the rest of the world and the overvaluation of the "Johnson baby" that still remains the object of desire for many parents. And that's really scary. The fact is that the intention to banish contingency and control the genetic characteristics of children "diminishes designer parents and corrupts the experience of fatherhood as a social practice



governed by precepts of unconditional love” (SANDEL, 2018, p. 93). Her critique is thus

Given the above, it is necessary for man to act in accordance with the framework of ethics and responsibility in handling all the technology that he has developed so far and for what will still come. It is evident that technoscience concentrates in human hands an unimaginable power and that, paradoxically, this same power makes man lose control over his actions, making man a product of his own technique. With the advents and tormenting novelties, soon parents who can pay for the service will be able to buy the genes of their future children choosing aesthetic and intelligence attributes, a true genetic supermarket. The free market for genetic improvement will deepen the chasm between the upper and lower strata of our society,

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The limit that can be given to gene editing techniques is of paramount importance for their effectiveness to be adequately achieved, in favor of a legitimate purpose in society. According to JONAS (2006), in which ethics, in general, have something to say about the subject of technique, or that technique is subject to ethical considerations, here is something that follows from the simple fact that it is an exercise of the human power, and every form of human action is subject to moral evaluation. It is also obvious that the same power can be used for good and for evil, and that in its exercise, compliance with or violation of ethical norms can occur.

Recent events in history still have major repercussions and must put society on alert about possible sophisticated eugenics. Due to gene editing events, humanity has been witnessing a eugenics trial disguised in innovative scientific discourses at the service of human well-being (MAI, ANGERAMI,

2006). Thus, seeing himself and the world as free terrain for his own experiments, homo Faber finds himself free to recreate his own image from the absence of a predefined image, whether in religious or ontological form. of a nature of its own or any other constituent metaphysical rubbish (OLIVEIRA 2013).

The ethical void opened by the impactful action of modern technoscience accredits the emergence of an ethics with powers and pretensions capable of regulating a new course of action, perhaps a new ethics secured on imperative bases (urgency of a new ethical imperative and that of responsibility and care) capable of making human action responsible in contemporary times for existing and future beings and on human and extra-human levels. It is in this sense that JONAS (2006) argues in favor of the urgency of a new ethical imperative based on precaution and responsibility (FONSECA, 2014).

Gene editing opens up the possibility for man to control his own biological evolution, thus causing the blurring of the boundaries between what was conceived naturally and what was manufactured by his action. Only an ethic that makes society responsible for fulfilling its role of pointing out values and ends as engendered objectives and means as what they really are in its epistemology without transforming them into ends in themselves. The manifestation of its planetary scope and the depth of its commitment can reveal the ethical principles from which it is possible to deduce the new obligations of the new power, the heuristic of fear. Only with the foresight of man's disfigurement, we arrive at the concept of man to be preserved (JONAS, 2006, p. 21).

To guide the necessary guidelines for the understanding of this whole theme, important documents were elaborated, such as the Universal Declaration of Genome and Human Rights in 1997, the International Declaration

of Human Genetic Data in 2003 and the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights in 2005 (UNESCO, 2020). Armed with the same objective, these documents act as regulatory frameworks in order to address emerging ethical challenges, providing a multidisciplinary and multicultural reflection on the ethics of science and technology. What characterizes and must guide the conduct of this technoscience is exactly the purposes for which its use is intended and the critical reflection of what are the necessary limits so that man does not lose the reins of his evolution. Moderate precautionary principles make it possible to reconcile our interests in progress and technological innovation in pursuit of maximizing human well-being with precautions against catastrophic risks (SUNSTEIN, 2005; AZEVEDO, 2012).

From a philosophical point of view, it must be noted that gene editing techniques change the conception of what is natural and what is socially constructed, as they involve a redefinition of what was previously limited to the domain of nature, without any intervention by the individual or of society, with no possibility of intervention in this conjecture. An ontological question is observed here, in the sense that the human being presents himself as a “builder” of his own species and instills his values in his own genetic construction. There is no such thing as a model of perfection – the one so desired by society. Respect for human identity is at least non-negotiable and must be anchored in the ethical principles that govern life.

According to BEESON (2000), in this process, we are seriously distorting the historical purpose of medicine as a cure. We are creating a society in which disability is increasingly stigmatized and, as a result, human imperfection of any kind becomes less and less tolerated and less likely to be accepted as a normal variation of humanity. In

an intrinsic view, if society increasingly seeks a genetic pattern that is alien to their real humanity, people with disabilities become increasingly vulnerable and devalued in their right to full identity.

The criticism that society needs to unleash is about the consequences of a world guided by liberal eugenics. Eugenic interventions aimed at improvement reduce ethical freedom to the extent that they link the interested party to the rejected, but irreversible, intentions of third parties, preventing him from the spontaneous self-perception of being the undivided author of his own life (HABERMAS, 2003, p. 63). Almost two centuries after Galton's ideas and his measurements in the search for human excellence, is society not also aiming for the same model of humanity? Why resort to and feed an ideal of superiority that reinforces inequality, racism and prejudice against differences? Many questions that Anthropocene society needs to answer and resolve.

Thus, ontological responsibility for the idea of man is essential in understanding this new paradigm. The role of metaphysics as a guide for this new ethics to extract from the Being a new reiterated subject of its conduct regarding the projections of the future of humanity. The more man advances in the development of technique, the more he craves that continuous retroactive effect which contributes to the increase of his ambitions. For this, it is imperative that there be prudence and responsibility in his actions so that, in the name of a technology used without limits, man himself does not lose his genesis of what defines him in the framework of all his complexity.

In the midst of this structure largely characterized by the development of technology, a society that is extremely toxic, full of patterns and stereotypes, needs to deconstruct itself from old engendered

concepts. People are failing to recognize themselves as authors of their own lives in this pace of edited humanity. “The uniqueness of each human being means that at every birth something totally new emerges and, potentially, capable of doing something unprecedented” (ARENDETT, 2010, p. 219-226).

In the development of the airs of the Anthropocene that man can become aware of his responsibility before the future and his next generations; to live in a dignified and balanced way, recognizing its own limits, respecting that so avid power that it holds in its hands, and that differentiates it from all other species. May it be possible to look at life and reflect on the importance of its diversity. It is no longer possible, in the paradox of a technoscience, to tolerate the selection of people based on their appearance or social status. The risks conferred on humanity and the freedom it offers to become mere products of technology are, in short, very high. To deal with the impact of technology, human beings need to live a character forged in the ethics of responsibility, recognizing the human genome as something non-transferable and irrevocable and which therefore characterizes us as a species and gives us legitimacy. As seen so far, behind the Anthropocene society there is much more of eugenics than one can imagine.

## **THANKS**

In carrying out this work, I thank God for giving me health and strength to persevere in research and academic activities. My family for their daily encouragement and encouragement. To my advisor professor João Almeida who always believed in my potential and has contributed substantially to my resumption of studies.

## REFERENCES

- ARENDDT, Hannah. A condição humana. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010.
- AZEVEDO, Marco Antonio. The precautionary principle, and some implications of its use on the risk and safety of new biotechnologies and human body reengineering. In: DOMINGUES, Ivan (org.). Biotechnologies and the human condition. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2012.
- BAUMAN, Z. Modernidade líquida. Tradução Plínio Dentzien. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.
- BLACK, E. A guerra contra os fracos. Tradução T. Magalhães. São Paulo: A Girafa, 2003.
- BEESON, D. "Social and ethical challenges of prenatal diagnosis". *Medical Ethics Newsletter*. Lahey Clinic, winter/2000.
- UNESCO. Declaração Universal de Bioética e Direitos Humanos, 2020. <https://pt.unesco.org/fieldoffice/brasil/expertise/ethics-brazil>. Acesso em 20 Jul.2021.
- DESCARTES, René. Discurso do método. Rio de Janeiro: Abril Cultural. 1973.
- DOUDNA J. Genome-editing revolution: my whirlwind year with CRISPR. *Nature* [Internet]. 2015. Acesso 12 Out. 2021. Disponível: <https://go.nature.com/2NAI8bM>
- FONSECA, F. O Pensamento Bioético de Hans Jonas: Filosofia e civilização tecnológica. Ed. IFS, 2014.
- GALTON, F. Hereditary talent and character. *Macmillan's Magazine*, 12, p. 157-66, 318-27, 1865.
- GONÇALVES, Antonio Baptista. A eugenia de Hitler e o racismo na ciência. *Prática Jurídica*, 2006.
- JONAS, Hans. O Princípio da Responsabilidade: ensaio de uma ética para uma civilização tecnológica. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC Rio, 2006.
- JONAS, H. Técnica, Medicina e Ética. Sobre a prática do princípio Responsabilidade. São Paulo: Ed. Paulus, 2014.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen. Die Zukunft der menschlichen Natur. Auf dem Weg zu einer liberalen Eugenik? Frankfurt a/Main: Suhrkamp, 2001.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen. The future of human nature. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2003.
- LATOUR, Bruno. Onde aterrar? Como se orientar politicamente no antropoceno. Rio de Janeiro: Bazar do tempo, 2020.
- Lilian Mai & Emília L. Angerami, "Eugenia Positiva e Negativa: Significados e Contradições," *Revista Latino Americana de Enfermagem* 14, nº 2 (2006): 252.
- OLIVEIRA, J. O homem como objeto da técnica segundo Hans Jonas: o desafio da biotecnologia. 2013. Acesso em 06 Set. 2021. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.7443/problemata.v4i2.16966>.
- ONU, 2021. ONU e o meio ambiente. Acesso em 12 Jan.2021. Disponível em: <https://brasil.un.org/>.
- SÁ, Maria de Fátima Freire de; NAVES, Bruno Torquato de Oliveira. Bioética e Biodireito. 4. ed. Belo Horizonte, MG: Del Rey, 2018.
- SANDEL, Michael. Contra a perfeição: ética na era da engenharia genética. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2018.
- SCHAAR, J. *Legitimacy in the Modern State*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1981.
- SINGER, Peter. Fazendo compras no supermercado genético. Piracicaba. Impulso, 2004.
- SBRA, 2018. Na mídia, importação de sêmen dos EUA para o Brasil causa polêmica. Disponível em: <https://sbra.com.br/>. Acesso em 12 Jan. 2021.

VILCHES, A., PRAIA, J. y GIL- PÉREZ, D. (2008). O Antropoceno: Entre o risco e a oportunidade, Educação. Temas e Problemas, p. 41-66.