

I would normally begin my answer by attempting to reaffirm that while the progress made in America regarding women's rights has been slow that there has at least still been progress. To a point that is true, women can own property without worrying about potentially being declared a witch and drug off to a stake. Women now can attempt to control their fertility, but, of course, the freedom to decide what a woman does with her womb is continuously under attack. Women now can work outside the home, but there most certainly is a glass ceiling in place, a realm where women struggle to reach and if they do so are under such harsh scrutiny that their male counterparts would not be subject to. What does this have to do with the question of women's anger and how it's gendered? Quite a bit! When we consider all the ways that women were treated as property and as lesser than, it becomes clear that even though more than 400 years have passed since *The Taming of the Shrew* was written, that the attempts to control and pacify women has only evolved into subtler means. You can no longer bridle your wife, but you can use other means to ensure her silence. You can no longer drag a woman through town and set her on a cucking stool, but you can drag her name through the media and attempt to demean her on a national level instead of just the scope of a town.

The selected works above were chosen because it shows a timeline of systematic abuse to women and how women have dealt with that abuse with a primary focus on their anger. To reiterate part of the question above, a woman's anger, much like her body, has been misconstrued and misrepresented to fit the patriarchal narrative that women are inherently flawed. Lutz writes in her book that the lesser valued gender is paired with qualities that are considered subhuman or undesirable amongst those in power. Lutz also comments on the way that a woman's anger is construed as being an intrinsic failing of Woman. That due to her nature,

she is more like an animal and lashes out unable to control herself like some sort of beast rather than like a man, whose anger, while not always appropriate, is considered situational.

The ability to construct, and manipulate, the very social structure is a powerful tool in keeping a full group of people under heel. Literally, in the case of *The Taming of the Shrew* when at the very end of the play Kathrina kneels in front of her husband after her dressing down of the other wives for failing to do their duty. In Boose's article, she mentions that many modern adaptations of the play try to find a way to soften the blow of seeing such an outspoken woman reduced to such a sliver of her former self. The reason is that because Shakespeare's play was meant to stir such controversy even when it was written. Not all men and most certainly not all women were disturbed by the production and without some sort of wink from Kathrina, or some other quiet gestures the sight of such patriarchal abuse is hard to stomach.

In the beginning of the play when we meet Kathrina and Bianca, Kathrina already has the reputation of being a shrew, but really her words are brutally honest and no nonsense when it comes to men that she does not have patience to deal with. She is angry. She is angry that her sister is beset by horny men, who will literally conspire with one another to attempt to sexually have Bianca and then her hand in marriage, she is angry that her father is putting her in a spot that requires her to be married before her younger sibling, and she is angry that she is so vulnerable. She is aware that her father's good graces is the only thing that stands between her and a wedding. Bianca, herself, also does not seem to be in want of a husband, but she is quieter about it and personality is considered to be desirable for this reason.

Critics of the play say that there must be some mutual attraction between Kathrina and Petruchio, but sexual attraction is not a pass for victim blaming. In the interaction between Petruchio and Kathrina before the wedding is decided, he states early that his way of handling

her will be to just simply do or say the opposite of whatever affect she is displaying to him. If she is angry he will disregard the anger and treat it as if she were being sweet. If she is sharp in tongue, he will thank her and treat it as if she had been kind. His interaction with her is blatantly dismissive and ingenuine, but it is not as if she is aware that he is out to marry her for her money and has a “plan” to train her out of her forward shrewness. This dismissal of her wants is just the beginning because when her father walks back in, he declares that she really is quite sweet in private and will continue to act shrewish amongst others because it is a game between them. Her father, who presumably has been waiting for someone to want to marry his troublesome daughter for some time, decides on the spot that the wedding will take place in a week. Her father is so willing to believe a man that he only barely has just met over his own daughter he has raised. I do not necessarily blame him for wanting his daughter married, as the assumption would be that they both would be married and why not this man who doesn't seem to mind his daughters attitude? Other critics have mentioned that this must be the first sign that Kathina is attracted to Petruchio because she has never listened to her father before anyway, so why now? Well, because her situation had changed. Perhaps, she senses that her father is running out of patience and this fellow doesn't seem so bad since he can keep up with her verbal sparring (the only sparring she can reasonably do), but this would still disregard that her original wish was to remain unwed. Given the options, I believe that she went with the most desirable option and figured that even if she were to be married, at least she would have some modicum of power given that married women were able to participate a bit more in property and consolidated some solid political power. This scene relates to the question of how anger is gendered because her anger is portrayed as surliness and not because of the precarious social balancing act Kathrina is attempting.

What follows is a tragedy and the legal abuse of a woman whose only crime was that she was outspoken. While she is not beaten, she is starved, isolated, and kept awake until at last she is so tired and hungry that she accepts her husband's gaslighting and taciturn anger. When he is mean to his servants, he declares that the reason is *for* Kathrina. When he strikes others he is not dragged away in chains nor is he sent to a pillory. No matter how outrageous he acts, there is no real repercussion. At first people comment about his actions and behavior in a negative light, but then his servants began to understand that he *must* have a plan for dealing with his wife and that is why he is acting as such.

The outcome of the play is as such, Kathrina wins her husband his bet about being most dutiful and launches into a long speech about how women who spend more time fighting do not do proper honor to their husbands who do all the heavy lifting and protecting so therefore deserve their subservience. Being outspoken does no one any good and it is proper to learn ones place. Petruchio earlier in the play makes the case that he is doing this to Kathrina for her own good, that if she does not learn to be submissive then she will have been alone and miserable, out of step with what was expected of gender roles and pariah. That with his training he has now rehabilitated her and trained her to go after socially acceptable subjects, like servants and other women. He also manages to deflect her anger because everytime she would begin to get angry, he would be angrier or have an outburst towards the servants or the tailor, or the priest. In this way, he was able to shock and shame her into bewildered silence. This is a common tactic for keeping a downtrodden group submissive. By redirecting her anger at those that are not men, or at least not those with any standing, he is keeping her from going to the source of what is causing her anger.

Adurey Lorde in her essay “The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism” she speaks about how anger can be used in a positive way. That anger allows women to understand one another and that keeping silent and suffering in silence keeps us from progressing forward. Kathrina’s brainwashing, to the point where she will accept her husband’s worldview over her own (such as when he says that the moon is bright when talking about the sun) and her abuse has lead her to a point where to avoid further abuse, she capitulates to Petruchio and turns that frustration and anger onto other women. To be fair, what more can she do? Boose’s article goes into great detail about the scold’s bridle and cucking stools and other horrific humiliating “punishments” that target women specifically. The typical crimes being: a scold, a whore, or a witch. When we translate that we see the truth, women being punished from exercising their tongue, their sexuality, and their ability to maintain their own land. Boose writes that a scold in the legal sense was a troublesome and angry woman that publicly rebelled against the accepted public norms. The punishment, gendered of course, usually relied on certain shaming practices like cucking stools where a woman would go to a ducking, also known as waterboarding. Or she may even see the use of a scold’s bridle, a literal bridle for a woman that may or may not knock out teeth and certainly could cut the mouth while used. Boose suggests that these practices were meant as a scapegoating for the community. Due to the uncertain political times of the reformation era, we see a lot of traditional social roles beginning to crumble and a way to fight back against that was to restore order to the roles expected of each gender.

While we see this abuse against women continue as we progress into more recent books, what is important to note is that the main sources for this abuse never leaves, it only evolves as society changes. The patriarchal power that needs women’s bodies to maintain their source of

power and define their masculinity remains all the way through to present day, but the way that is expressed has shifted.

This shift is visible when we look to Collin's *The Woman in White*. While scold's bridles fell out of fashion, throwing your unruly woman into a mental hospital was not. The nineteenth century gave rise to a whole new slew of ways to remove an unwanted woman from her home. Hysteria, being one, but also just in general nerves or really any reason could be enough to send a woman away. When Laura is sent to an asylum after her "death" (her half sister Anne Catherick is the one who has died and body is being shown as Laura's), without her sister being so invested in determining what Sir Glyde's secret was, she would never have been seen again. There was no real need to be had to send a woman away to an asylum. Laura is emotionally broken after her return and it is suggested that she never really recovered fully from the betrayal and the horrors that she suffered while in the asylum. Anne Catherick herself was a victim of being sent to an asylum when she learned of Sir Glyde's secret and to make sure no one would listen to her, even if she said anything, she was carted off to spend the rest of her days in an institution. And would have had she not been able to escape. Marian is the lynchpin that discovers her sister, the one detail that the Count disregarded in his careful plan. And it is Marian that gives us readers a wealth of examples that show how a woman's anger is gendered.

Marian is a well loved for her wit, her vivacious and devout protection of her sister, and for her complex relationship with being a woman. Her entries from her diary give us a first person perspective for much of the book, but it also gives a feminine perspective of what a woman struggled with in her daily life. She cares deeply for her sister Laura who she was raised alongside and seeing her sister being traded off from their uncle like livestock feels her with rage. With her sister she began to cry tears of rage because of how helpless she was to help keep

Laura from her unhappy marriage and she labels those tears as weak women's tears. Tears that she is ashamed to cry and her sister raises a handkerchief to block her face from view despite the two of them being alone. As Nelson pointed out above, a woman's ability to bear her sadness and pain quietly was, and is, considered a virtue of femininity which Marian's character seems to struggle with. She is shapely, but her face is described as "mannish". She feels deeply and often is forced to tears because the only other recourse would be physically lashing out which would result in her being torn away from her sister. For example, when she is living with Laura and her husband Sir Glyde, he makes a comment about the next time she is in a man's house that she would do well to not argue and take his wife's side. Her personal diary mentions how she startled to her feet in rage and would have struck in had she been a man. But she, having been raised amongst gentry knew better than to hit him and she would leave her sister defenseless in a home where the two sisters trusted no one.

Marian does not think highly of her gender, but is that because she, herself, is misogynistic, or because the acceptable ideals of femininity at the time period were so warped that they became unbearable to an intelligent and unattached woman? She rallies at her sister, questioning why women are meant to give so much of themselves to men, being torn away from their mothers and sisters and given to men who do not deserve the sacrifices made.

Of course Marian walks on eggshells so she can remain at her sister's side in her marriage, and Laura herself is terrified of both her husband and his friend Count Fosco. She attempts to be as perfect as possible, mild mannered and accepting of his behavior. She goes so far as to keep his secrets from her own sister because she feels that it is her duty. The time that we see her attempt to stand up for herself results in a huge fight. Her husband asks that she signs a document but will not tell her what it says because, as he states that due to her being a woman

she would not understand it. He is her husband and she should just trust him. Laura states that she would be happy to sign so long as he treated her with a minimum of respect and would just let her know what it was she was signing. Even if it was something bad she would still sign, she just wanted him to treat her like she was a human and not a receptacle for his anger and sexuality. When he lashes out in anger verbally, he accuses her of being the reason that she would try the patience of a Saint with her lack of trust.

Sir Glyde is portrayed as being incredibly temperamental when compared to Count Fosco, the main antagonist of the novel. He lashes out the minute he gets back from his trip and Marian tries to make herself feel better by thinking that it must be because its been such a long trip. Or when he abuses his servants later in the book, it must be because he's drunk. Even at the end of the novel when its revealed that he is a bastard and not actually a baronet at all, then the excuse morphs into, well of *course* he can't be expected to control himself, he's not even part of the gentry! On the other hand, Fosco, spends the whole book putting up with his anger and attempting to mitigate it by saying, "Gently, my friend, gently!" or "I remember that we are in the company of women". The fact that the Count is so easily able to deal with Glyde is because several times the Count is said to be a man that could tame anything. That if he married a tigress he would have a tamed tiger." The concept of him being a tamer of anything is echoed in the case of Elenore Fairlie who when she was 37 was a woman who was "ridiculous" but vivacious. Froward and full of opinions she is unrecognizable by her cousins when Marian sees her once more. Now she wears only drab dark colors and constantly is watching for her husband's approval. Count Fosco tells Glyde that animals, children, and women all need to be treated the same way and that if you let them get the better of your anger, then they win.

The concept that Count Fosco is gesturing to is the idea called “uptake”. For uptake to occur two or more people that are engaging in interaction must be receptive to one another’s emotions. When a person is angry and another person responds to it appropriately, that is uptake. By not responding to anger, or brushing it aside, you deny that person who is affecting anger their uptake thus rendering it ineffective and adrift. Marian was able to use her intelligence and will to ultimately help her sister, but it was not without the help of Walter, a man, because even though she was smart she did not have the capital on her own. Regardless, Walter at least gave her uptake and acknowledged her as a whole person which is why she was in favor of him marrying her sister after the whole fiasco with Glyde.

Now we turn to our final book in this selection which begs the question of what happens when a woman decides to use her anger to change her circumstances? This final question has to do with both the novel but also the concept that as bad as women have had it do to their gender, black women have had to endure that plus the intersectionality of also being black. The stereotype of angry black woman is played for laughs in movies and seemingly accepted as just being a *feature* of black women. Audrey Lorde speaks about how to use her anger to fight racism but also to acknowledge that yes, black women are full of pain and full of anger, but that does not mean that it is not useful. The only waste to be had is that if women stay silent out of fear of hurting one another with that anger. And instead of displaying that anger as being baseless or just a characteristic of being black and a woman, it is important to acknowledge where that anger stems from. It is much easier to brush off a black woman’s anger when society portrays it as a humorous display then it is when women all together giving uptake to that anger and using it as a force to organise and enact change.

In the novel *The Fifth Season* Essun, a woman of color, is after her husband who has kidnapped her daughter and murdered their son because they are orogenes, a person who can control kinetic energy. The book details her life from different points in time, when she was once named Damaya, and then Seyenite, and finally when she is Essun. As a child she was sold to the Fulcrum, the center that trains and houses orogenes as per the wishes of the ruling city, and learns from her guardian that she will be hurt if they determine there is a reason, but only if there is a reason. So, she throws her whole self into making sure there is no reason given. This rule is central to her being and she constantly believes herself to be not a person. Seyenite picks up this vein where she is given the “assignment” to travel with Alabaster a 10 ring orogene. But she knows immediately that the mission is actually for her to get pregnant with him and to produce more orogenes. This is not uncommon and it is expected to proceed through the ranks. But what is the prize that she seeks? Privacy, the ability to have some modicum of power over her life, and the ability to wield as much power that could be denoted to her. The parallels to slavery are not subtle, as the orogenes are considered by most of the world to be dangerous and not human, merely beings that with the right training and resources can be used to quell earthquakes and keep the human race hobbling along.

And Seyenite is willing enough to go along with this. She has internalized the narrative that this is what is best for her. They may hurt her at the Fulcrum but there is reason for it. That she is expected to be demure and polite at all times, but that is so that the public will know that the Fulcrum is trustworthy, look at how well mannered and well dressed all these orogenes are! There are several points of the novel where she wants to be angry, wants to lash out. But early in her training she learned to associate her anger with her power. That her power will instinctively seek to protect and therefore she can not get angry. In Ford’s article, there is a mention of this

type of posturing. She speaks about how Black people attempted to be as polite and put together as possible in an attempt to counteract the racist claims hurled at them. But it was never the clothes or the manners that spurned the hate and violence against black people. No matter how perfect a group attempts to be, the other oppressing force does not need provocation for their hate. The Black women part of the SNCC turned that anger into something useful by organizing sharecroppers in an attempt to combat racism.

But everything changes for Seyerite when she travels with Alabaster who opens her eyes to how much worse everything is than the lie that she had willingly swallowed. Finding out what happens to children who do not achieve power beyond a certain ring, what happens to those that do not follow precise order, those that dare to question or act out. By chance, she and Alabaster are able to escape the purview of the Fulcrum and attempt to live peacefully on an island with their chosen third partner. But when guardians catch wind of her, they lay siege to the island. In an act of desperation she kills her child so that he wouldn't suffer as she did and manages to escape once more.

Shattered beyond belief she assumes a new identity, one that will be who she needs to become to survive and but after 10 years a major quake is triggered by an orogene attempting to break the system. She finds that she needs to shed the mask of Essun so that she can save her daughter and re-familiarize herself with her rage. When she is trying to peacefully leave her village, several people attempt to kill her because they had identified her as an orogene (and despite the fact that she had saved them by protecting the village from the quake). She lashes out, angry at them but also angry in general. That this village produced that attitude that led her husband to killing their child out of fear. While they did not individually kill her son, they all had

a hand in it. She stops halfway through, but the key point is that she learns that her anger is a part of her and not something to fear. That her anger is legitimate and has a place in this new world.

Sometimes, we need anger. Sometimes, we need to break something so that it can be built better. Sometimes a wound needs to be reopened so that it can heal correctly. Telling a group of people that they can never be angry, that anger is a negative quality unbecoming of women is a form of abuse. Human beings use affect to communicate with others and emotions are a natural part of humanity.

## Question 2:

Within the last year, America has seen the rise of anti-vaccine rhetoric. It has been lingering in the eves for a while now, but with Covid 19, the flood gates have burst open for every inane paranoia. Bill Gates will inject you with nano technology and be able to watch your every move! You won't be able to have children or your genes have been manipulated, what if your kids are affected by the vaccine? One key theme in this paper so far has been scapegoating and projecting which is present here in the line of fears that people have about vaccines and in broader scope biotechnology in general. There is a legitimate fear of some of these veins of questioning but it is so bogged down in science fiction and propaganda that it's hard to see them as anything worth a legitimate response. For example, yes Bill Gates having anything to do with vaccines is scary, but that's more to do with the fact that one person is able to have so much sway over vaccine production and that the damages done to 3rd world countries where the vaccine is being produced.

This idea of Szollsy's projection is important to keep in mind because that is what the question is asking, why do people fear biotechnology? Projection is where we take parts of ourselves and attach them to other people and things. He uses the example of resilience, where someone might consider that a positive aspect of themselves, and it is attached to their country, thus nationalism. But this can also happen with negative aspects and a very fine example is *Frankenstein*.

I have so much to say about *Frankenstein* and not nearly enough time. The religious imagery, the racist subtext, the dogmatic anthropocentric view of the book is a potent combo. When we ask the question, why do people fear the creature? There are some immediate answers. Because he is unnatural in a natural world, because he is abnormal, because he is different, because he is undead (?). Because technology has gone too far! Because science unchecked has birthed a monster that kills the family of its creator and turns on humanity. And to be fair, there is some validity to the fear that unchecked science can create untold amounts of pain that should be avoided. But on the other hand it is projection.

Frankenstein begins his experiment with the intention of preventing death. One branch of biotechnology deals with the longevity of life and after his mother's death, the thought of preventing it is on Frankenstein's radar. He says that he isn't interested in money, but only the glory that comes with breaking through that curtain of mother nature and finding a way to rid humans of the corruptive force of death. But then half way through his narrative changes into something more akin to wanting to be worshipped. He believes that if he creates a new race then they will be beholden to him. And what is it that causes him to become so angry and to abandon this project after its finished? That the beautiful creation he envisioned is *ugly*. And to be sure, the description of it does not paint it in a flattering light, but what is truly interesting is what the

monster represents. It is not just that he is visually unattractive, but that he is an aversion to nature. He was not born to a woman, but to a man. He is a mix of undead and dead and walks the line between. What Frankenstein sees when he looks at the creature is a mirror that reflects back the ugly parts of humanity and himself. It is not as if Victor had never seen an ugly person, but in that moment when he looks upon the new life, he sees, in his opinion, the beginning of the end of humanity and the result of a single minded pursuit of science. His fears are that this being will someday return to kill not only him but all of humanity. Projection would state that what Frankenstein really is scared of is that *he* has already become a monster, trawling through graves and slaughterhouses, and that *he* has become tainted and ugly by what he has discovered.

When the creation requests a companion Frankenstein capitulates because he wishes to be free from the “chain” that connects him to his creation. But before he finishes, he destroys the second because he believes that the monster will go back on his word to leave the human race behind and will someday return and lay waste to them all. This is a common fear of biotechnology: the fear that we humans will someday create something that will grow beyond our control and wreak havoc. As if humans weren’t already quite capable of destroying ourselves.

The other problem stems from an early form of fear of gene therapy and artificial reproduction. The creature is already after only 6 years, able to speak after teaching himself and is capable of thoughts that question its existence and who it is in the world. It is stronger and faster than other humans and able to survive on a diet that would be considered to lean for a human. In the beginning he said that he found the world sublime, but the hatred of man corrupted him. Not one person showed him kindness in the novel, except for one single blind man. Is this not what the creature is reflecting though? Yes he is ugly, but he jumps into a river to save a

human who is drowning. He does chores for the De Lacey family in an attempt to ease their suffering and as a thank you for teaching him about language, albeit without their knowledge. Yes, he does murder, but is he wrong when he asks why should he have sympathy for mankind when they have no sympathy for him? Even when Frankenstein dies, the creation still weeps for him and then commits suicide. Frankenstein's story tells us that if we treat something or someone a certain way, it is valuable to examine where those fears and feelings are coming from. Are they something we have projected outward and feel the need to destroy it so that we can rid ourselves of the negative fears and anxieties we have inside, or are they really the threat we have determined them to be in our own heads?

Some people might look at Victor Frankenstein and think, well it didn't go well for him (and it is 99.9 percent his own fault), but at least he was attempting to contribute something to humanity with his experiment. This thought is not uncommon. How often have you heard of a new advancement in pharmaceuticals or in cancer research and then find out that the testing has been done on mice? Or dogs? That we hear that there is breakthrough in nanotechnology and prosthetics but they come at the cost of impoverished humans that allow themselves to be picked at and operated on for "science" because they are otherwise unable to afford the technology that will make their existence possible in a culture that is ableist? If Frankenstein was meant to be a cautionary tale, then *The Island of Dr. Moreau* is a tornado siren.

On this island that the main character Prendick finds himself brought to, he comes across "beast people". At first he believes that Dr. Moreau is turning humans into something half human, but then finds out that the reverse is actually the case. Through surgery and vivisection of the brain and body, with a sprinkle of brainwashing thrown in for spice, he is attempting to create humans.

One of the aspects that post humanism deals with is the question of humanity. What is human? What is a human being? Can they be made or do they just exist? If one begins as an animal can they become a human? Can I as a human be forced to “de-evolve”? Will I still be a human? Frankenstein was made of human parts (and some animal veins) but we could say that he was still human even if he wasn't viewed that way. But what about these animals that have been forced into odd shapes through an incredible amount of pain? Is it enough to change their shape into a human? Is it enough to pin and cut brain folds so that they are able to speak and comprehend?

Prendick believes no, that they are never human. In fact, before finding out they were animals all along he is terrified to the point of contemplating suicide so that he will not meet the same fate. Once he finds out that they are animals, while he isn't happy and feels pity for them, he has written them off. That is because on a sliding scale of *important* animals in pain are not really as worrisome as humans in pain. He disagrees with Dr. Moreau because he doesn't see the point to the experiments, and without a point it seems merely brutality for the sake of it. This type of science is a common fear as well. The idea of science that is cruel for the sake of it, or when the outcome is not worth the pain inflicted. We experience this now in modern medicine. Some sacrifices are allowed because the benefits to *humanity* are worthwhile enough for us to shrug. So long as we are distant enough from the sacrifice of the animal or the earth in question, it is out of place. And how could it not be? Middle class and poverty stricken people are struggling enough as it is to get through their day and to make ends meet under the yolk of capitalism that keeps them exhausted and compliant.

Dr. Moreau wants to create a human from an animal. Dennett writes about how humans are unique because we were able to offload much of our internal thinking onto our environment.

But he also mentions how one thing that sets us apart is our ability to convince others of something we want them to think and to hold secrets. In the wild, there is no benefit to many animals to develop the ability to keep secrets or to communicate to the level that humans have developed to. Much of mental processing done is perfectly suited to their environment. This does not mean that humans are so spectacular because they are humans, merely that we have evolved due to hundreds and hundreds of technological advances that we have put a use to. But, the reason I have brought this up is because it *does* suggest that the animals turned humanoid are just as human as we are. They have a “Sayer of law” who constantly speaks the laws given, and many of the laws are even more restrictive than “regular” humans would appreciate. They thrive together, speak to one another, but there are opportunities and *reasons* where one might want to keep secrets. For example, when the law is broken or when begins to “degenerate” back into animal, they are taken to the house of pain, or basically painfully recorrected. One of the rules is not to suck their water on all fours or to eat flesh. But the leopard man does just that and when he is caught by Prendick, he is guilty because he knows that he broke the self imposed law. When Dr. Moreau comes for the leopard man he runs and Prendick puts him down out of sympathy so that he will not be tortured further, but the hyena swine that has also eaten meat stays silent, keeping a secret and scapegoating so that it can remain hidden and alive for another day.

*The Island of Dr. Moreau*, racist imagery aside because we do not have the time, deals with the fear that animals are not so different from humans and that we humans are on the cusp of de-evolving the more we cling to modernity. The fear is also that we can be forced against our will into something that is not our true form via surgery and other types of advanced science. One day we may wake up on the surgery table and find ourselves being cut into something unrecognizable or we are being used in the next experiment for the sake of science. But also

there is a large thread of guilt at the idea of all of the animals and other parts of nature that have been stepped on as the road is paved for future modern invention. This fear is not without merit, as the Earth already almost at the point of no return in terms of climate change and so many animals have become extinct due to humans treating all and sundry as if it were for our pleasure alone. However, on the other hand, some species are being brought back from the brink of extinction through the means of artificial insemination and genetic engineering, or the potential revival of wholly extinct animals. Which of course opens a whole other can of worms, *Jurassic Park*.

The last book on this list is *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* which seems like a small departure from the topic. After all, the theme of the question is exploring the fears of biotechnology and determining the possible sources for that fear. So yes, this book is set in 2021 following a massive nuclear war and most humans have emigrated to other planets to escape the radiation fallout. But the concept of Dick's androids are unique because they are indistinguishable from humans pretty much down to the marrow. There are some tests that can be ran on the tissue and the spine and marrow, but for all intents and purposes they blend right in. And here is a major prime fear of science fiction horror, when it is impossible to tell us from *them*. Them, of course, could be a stand in for anything and that is the point. They are the designated despised subclass that is once again a scapegoat that becomes a receptacle for all of the anxiety and fear that humans feel for their own situation. The humans in DADOES are the once left behind on a dying planet, radiation degrading their genes, and even the animals are more likely to be mechanical than organic.

Iran is a perfect character for this discussion because she resents her husband, the main character, for being an android bounty hunter. He deflects his guilt by thinking of *them* as the

predators, but she calls him a murderer and argues with him at the beginning of the book. She has fiddled with her mood organ to find a setting that replicates depression because she feels that twice a month for 6 hours is enough time to ruminate on the situation of humanity and the emptiness she feels inside. Which is one of the primary projection that we humans offset, the fear of alienation, loneliness, and emptiness inside. An android is supposedly scary because it is pure logic and without empathy, but what does it say about the character's of Dick's book where they are using mood replicators, similar to the branch of biotechnology called neuropharma technology? The problems and fears over medication for mental illness are widespread but the humans in Dick's novel are able to dial their mood on command and how is that any different then the androids processors? All of those able to afford it also spend time with their empathy box, which allows them to share consciousness and watch a messiah like figure Mercer in his attempts to roll a boulder up a hill. Humans in this book have become so lonely due to most of the population being dead or emigrated that they live in have full apartments and *that's* apparently a large number. But isn't collective consciousness something that humans fear when it comes to biotechnology that may use nanites and other types of technology to link to internet? The fear then isn't that our brains will be able to suddenly connect to a bunch of other humans, but rather that we will lose the concept of self in the masses. But the empathy box provides these empty and lonely humans with a chance to be empathetic with one another, and supposedly androids can't do that.

Only a handful of tests are still useful ways of determining an android from a human and one of them is an *empathy* test. Which after reading Frankenstein makes me wonder how any humans ever pass, and that is precisely Deckard's problem in the book. The person he hoped was human, Luba Luft, was an android that and the human he hoped would be an android, Dresch (i

think is his name) turns out to be a human but one that has no problem with killing so long as he gets paid. And he cares about his pet squirrel, what a pinnacle of human empathy! But that is the problem isn't it? What do you do with a human that is less empathetic than an android? What about the androids that were given false memories, are just living their life as miserable as everybody else on the planet and then here comes a bounty hunter that yanks you off the street, gives you a 7 question empathy test and then blows your head off when you don't pass because you didn't feel the empathy with the fraction of second it takes to pass the test? Because that is the problem with Rachel, is that she *does* react to the test, but it is in Deckard's professional opinion, too late for a biological human response. But really, if that android *did* respond, does that mean that the feeling was any less real than a humans? In Morton's chapter, he states that humanity faintly exists and that we are spectral beings. He poses the question of proving that we are thinking versus processing, that we are emoting and behaving rather than acting. How is Iran experiencing depression if her mood was simulated? How does Deckard know that he cares about his electrical sheep rather than being programmed for it? These questions scare some people because it digs at their anthropocentric worldview that humans are somehow special because we decided to build skyscrapers and cars and harness electricity. It is by decentering the human that we are able to accept posthumanism and the idea that humans are a part of nature the way a horse or a plankton might be.

Allowing biotechnology to interact with our body does not strip of us our humanity because humanity is also a concept. What it means to be human is something that has changed for each generation and there has been quality arguments that by decentering humans or attempting to free ourselves as much as possible from anthropocentrism that we gain an appreciation for all humans as well as the world that we live on because then all things are

precious and deserve some level of respect. When Frankenstein's creature asks about whether or not he deserves a fair trial to please his case to his creator or when the animals turned human as over and over again "are we not men?", this brings into consciousness that there are plenty of beings that have been denied basic human rights for the sake of humanity itself. And it would be best that we quickly reconsider our narrow worldview of what being human means until we find that we are no longer the ones considered part of that collection.

Biotechnology *is* something that can be frightening. There is no denying that the unknown can make one apprehensive to journey into it. But I would rather suggest that we refocus where the fear and anxiety is coming from. Is the fear of the technology itself or the fear that those with money and power will use it against those of us more vulnerable? Am I afraid of my brain being able to sync with my computer, or am I afraid that the technology in place to keep me safe and protected will fail because corner were cut to save money? Am I afraid of a new experimental operation because it will alter my body, or am I scared because my whole life I've had a narrow view of what it meant to be something and now I'm no longer that? By acknowledging our habit of projection, we are able then address what our true fears are and develop ways to mitigate them for future developments.