

engineers. Whereas old-style pastoralists - he claims - had to identify their creatures' natural ends and work with them, new-style biotech engineers work out where the profit lies and then mould the animal to suit.) Note that this is a *virtue ethical* line of argument, one which picks up on the worry that some biotechnologists are 'playing God'. He believes that these criticisms say something about the genetic engineers, that they have certain vices. He believes that they lack humility (their desire of imposing their will onto the world) and have anthropocentric hubris (the vice).

However, despite this, philosophers believe that there are pro tanto reasons, which outweigh the vice of hubris. For instance, the alleviation of pain created by the meat industry.

FREY AND WELLMAN, CH.26

With the scientific advancement in genetic engineering, the opportunity of avoiding diseases is accompanied by the possibility to design our progeny so that their traits are artificially increased. What was once at the hands of God or the natural lottery is now under our control. We shall explore the ethics of this.

GENETIC ENGINEERING TO AVOID DISEASES

WRONGFUL LIFE

Diseases such as Tay Sachs are so awful that it makes the life of the affected person so unbearable that it may be worse than if they had lived at all. However, some philosophers believe this argument is incoherent, because comparing one existing with a devastating disease with one not existing is incomparable.

WRONGFUL DISABILITY (NON-IDENTITY PROBLEM)

In this case, the disability can only be prevented by not being born but the disability does not make the life of the individual unbearable. In this case would it be better to live or not?

THE DISABILITY RIGHTS CHALLENGE TO THE PREVENTION OF DISABILITIES

The main objection from a disability rights movement is that genetic engineering to prevent disability sends the message that disabled people are not wanted and should be eliminated. This alludes to eugenic movements of the Nazis in which they killed disabled people.

Moreover, disabled people say they lead happy lives, and the main injustice comes from social impediments. A number of social studies show that disabled people rate their standard of life higher than non-disabled people. Therefore, for disabled people are satisfied with their lives, what is the reason to try and avoid them?

However, several points are relevant. If they had the choice to not be disabled then most would not be. Moreover, even though many say they have a good standard of life, serious diseases such as blindness and mental illness generally have a lower standard of life. Some argue that everyone has a burden in their life, trying to remove them would be misplaced perfectionism. However, it seems justified that we would try to avoid some burdens, especially significant ones. Lastly, though the process of measuring your standard of life is complex. For instance, a woman in a developing country may be happy but she is still a victim of gender bias where she is not able to have the same privileges as males.

Therefore, there are good reasons for attempting to avoid disability and believing that it makes one believe that they are not full moral agents with all the same privileges as non-disabled people is a mistake.