

## **Eeny, Meeny, Miny, Moe...**

*One Fish, Two Fish, Red Fish, Blue Fish*. Aside from being a lovable children's author (and a drunk - seeing TWO fish), he was unfortunate, the good "Doctor" Theodor Seuss Geisel suffered from a disorder not exclusive, but most costly, to humans.

Similarly, when approached about favourite artists, contemporary or otherwise, people will jump to Renaissancical artists such as Michelangelo or da Vinci, (post-)impressionists including Monet and van Gogh, or surrealists like Dali and Magritte. Timeless masterpieces ranging from da Vinci's "Mona Lisa" to Dali's "The Great Masturbator." Each and every renowned artist throughout history has employed a palette of some sort or another, from dull and depressing, to happy and psychedelic. However, each of these artists, despite their fame, whether pre- or post-humous, needlessly suffered the same affliction as 7.230 billion (approximation as of 29 March, 2015) people on the planet: colour vision.

Recently, scandalously, a simple photograph of a dress overwhelmed misshapen, second-rate, nocturnal internet (mainstream social network) addicts. The innocent photograph caused an uproar centred around a single question, "what colour is this dress?" A powerful dissension, comparable to the Papal Schism within the Catholic Church, tore the American social scene to shreds as childhood friends gouged at eyes in a childish attempt to enlighten their victims to the true colour of the dress - it is black and blue. This short-lived, but influential, social fixation - a fixation almost exclusive to America and Western Europe - left in its wake many implications. Some social, "do I even know these people anymore?" Some philosophical, "what is right and what is wrong?" And some actually meaningful, "what is colour and its reality?" After the dust of the social reconstruction period had settled, many realized that there was a definite issue with human perception and social constructs, centred around colour.

Such obsession with colour has deprived the members of the human race of their rightful place as the supreme beings on, and of, Earth. The peacock, alongside many tropical birds, employ bright colours for the sake of mating. The natural principle being the more flamboyant and overwhelming the male's

colour scheme, the more likely they would be to mate. Colour vision also benefits predatory animals in that it allows them to discern between potentially poisonous and harmless prey. This practice also benefits the prey by allowing them to propagate their species. But colour vision also presents greater risks to creatures from all walks of life. Animals “gifted” with such an ability are more prone to the distractions of the vibrant palette of a pink dewy sunrise peering over the horizon and asinine shiny objects like cell phones and diamonds. Human beings, unlike other creatures able to discern colour, are not some of God's failed experiments - like the platypus - but rather the pinnacle of evolution and creation, developed to rule over the lesser species such as frogs and dolphins and of course, the platypus.

This undeniable despotic throne atop which humanity has wedged its bloated decaying self is made possible by the human race's unique combination of both foresight and “self”-deprecation. By exercising prudence, people are able to draw intelligent conclusions from individual or collective observations - the basis for scientific discourse. And through degradative practices, humanity ensures its eternal, and rightful, “*Platz an der Sonne.*” But to survive, not only as the supreme species, but as one of any and all species suffering the incessant groans of Mother Gaia seeing her children burned by the dozens, an active change in either the human psyche or the human state of being must be undergone, for now, and forever.

In such a pursuit, humanity must look to the theoretical (and powerfully controversial, but necessary) field of transgenics, the subjects of which are considered genetically modified organisms. It is the process of introducing an exogenous gene, whether to that individual or that species, to a local gene pool in the desperate pursuit of propagated self-apotheosis. In order to ensure that the desired phenotype is expressed, gene promoters and gene suppressors must be imported alongside the desirable genotype. For example, if the biological fetus of a set of parents that both have brown eyes - a dominant gene, were manipulated to also hold the recessive gene for blue eyes, the child would still have brown eyes; however,

if promoters and suppressors were incorporated properly, the child would be guaranteed (unnatural) blue eyes.

Branching on a similar tangent, I propose that the gene dictating cone monochromacy in most animals, and a few thousand lucky humans, be spliced into the human genome alongside promoters for the gene and suppressors for the far more dominant genotype dictating colour vision. Given proper enforcement, which should not be difficult to muster, the entire generation subsequent to this arrogant one, will be born with the gift of monochromacy, the way it should have been. (This transgenic process only needs be done to the immediate few generations of the human race, once incorporated into the gene pool as the only gene dictating cone development, or lack thereof, it will be a permanent part of the human genome.)

This does, however, leave all 7.234 billion (approximation as of 29 March, 2015) humans currently living on the planet. Instead of worrying, there is a solution: inflicted monochromacy, referred to as cerebral achromatopsia. This form of monochromacy, yielding the same visual consequences as transgenic cone monochromacy, is caused by damage to the cerebral cortex. Such damage can be achieved by a simple detour of blood to a part of the ventral occipitotemporal cortex. This will, inevitably, lead to some headaches, but there has not been a single historical instance when medicine corporations have not piled atop one another to sell their misappropriated wares.

Once successfully executed in the entire human population - both current and incoming - uniform monochromacy will be achieved, human vision should be reduced to shades of grey, if my calculations are correct - which they always are, lets face it, I am a literature major - it will be exactly fifty. This universal monochromacy will put a final end to the massive social “under”tones of racial super- and inferiority. The social disregard for the suffering of any human due simply to the concentration of melanin in their skin will cease. And it will be as a direct result of monochromacy, because, as everyone knows, ignoring a problem means that the problem will solve itself or simply stop, no?

Monochromacy, after generations of theory and experimentation, is a possibility. Space is no longer the final frontier, but rather... equality. Proudly will the human race be able to plant the amalgamated flag consisting of grey, grey, and grey on the graves of our racially insensitive ancestors and embrace the fact that race-based hatred has ended, and that now there only exists gender-, religion-, sexual orientation-, socioeconomic class-, culture-, and age-based prejudice. But as Plato's ghost sang, "wat then?"

I, for one, hope to see such a social utopia - such a "city upon a hill" - erected within my fleeting lifetime.