

The Secretary,  
House of Representative Standing  
Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs,  
Parliament House.

Att: Chairman, Scientific, Ethical and Regulatory Considerations  
Relevant to Cloning of Human Beings.

Dear Mr Andrews,

I wish to submit as an Indigenous Australian, (Kombumerri/Munaljahlai) a comment relating to the above topic. I am also a Research Fellow in the field of Indigenous Intellectual Property and Copyright.

There is only one segment of the Terms of Reference which I wish to refer to as I feel it is central to the issue and the way it is addressed.

The attachment will address No. 2 "Identify potential risks and benefits as well as the ethical considerations in approving the cloning of human beings.

Binnung walu

Christine Morris  
Research Fellow  
Australian Key Centre  
for Cultural and Media Policy  
Griffith University  
Nathan 4111

## CLONING

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

2. Identify potential risks and benefits as well as ethical considerations in approving the cloning of human beings.

Let me open my comments by first making the following point. If the future of the planet and its productivity is the central ethical benchmark – and I will first add that for an Indigenous person who lives by indigenous law, and who is obliged by that law to consider future generations; the ideal human of the future must be one who is environmentally sustainable in their economic and daily living practices. If this indeed were the benchmark then the present affluent and economically dominant human would not be considered a desirable template for a clone. This type of human would be considered as quite a destructive type with genetic tendencies towards individualism and exploitation of land. If this type of human became the most desirable type it would only be a matter of decades and not generations before the whole surface of the planet would be denuded and artificial structures would be constructed to facilitate the innate greed.

The other undesirable genetic tendency that these human have is that of their desire to stay eternally youthful, as promised by the promoters of the exploitation of the economic prospects of stem-cell research. There seems to be an abhorrent, and I am sure, genetic malfunction which does not seem to appreciate the aging process nor does it have any mature foresight to see that if 50 year olds look like 20 year olds there will be enormous social problems and in particular that relating to authority. Age, whether humans like it or not, does assist in the execution of authority in a society.

However, the above is purely speculation. My concerns I wish to voice relate more to the future inability of any government to stop the progress of market-driven research. Companies, such as Geron Corporation, who allude to the final discovery of the Fountain of Youth i.e. The reversal of the aging process, will not be hindered by national boundaries. Already institutions such as the Institute of Reproduction and Development, Monash University has imported stem-cell lines from Singapore even though they are banned in Australia.

It is quite frightening when one reads that 33 Nobel laureates in the US have written to the President pleading with him to support stem cell funding. Of course, I could be impertinent and say that many a Nobel Laureate would not pass the indigenous criteria for an ideal clone template.

After all they are the types who believe in the following

*The 'perfect baby,' of course, is the project not of the infertility doctors, but of the eugenic scientists and their supporters. "the right of every child to be born with a sound physical and mental constitution based on a sound genotype ..the inalienable right to a sound heritage'*

A criteria which only takes in the individual and his inalienable rights which in the future, if some multi national have their way; will only be the right to consume.

Also I could say they have a vested interest in replacing their own ailing body parts. I am not amazed that these shining lights of society, when offered something to continue their own personal status or field of specialty, do not embark upon a stream of thought that would soon see that the future generations, who are offered replacement parts for any part of their body, would soon lose their impetuosity to care for their health.

**THE SENSE OF THE THOU IN SELF AND NATURE WOULD CEASE TO EXIST IN THE GENETIC MEMORY OF SUCH GENE LINES.**

One only has to look at the modern car in which every part is replaceable by a modeled generic replica. This has decreased the opportunity for mechanics and vehicle designers to practice their craft. Mechanics replace parts rather than repair them, designers merely modify existing designs rather than create new designs. It is so terribly boring to look at the latest models of the Mercedes and the BMW and a Holden and barely be able to tell the difference other than the little emblem on the hood.

Disease and death are a natural part of the life process but abuse of the human body is a modern disease not brought about by nature but by consumerism. The natural processes of disease and death are not meant to be avoided and eliminated but rather incorporated as daily events.

However, if you cater for the consumer market by making replaceable parts so that the consumer does not have to enact any responsible behavior in relation to their spending, then you are catering for blatant exploitation of the consumer and you are not ethically carrying out your responsibility as a government to protect its citizens who do not have the time for such deliberations as this.

*Human nature becomes merely the last part of nature to succumb to the technological project, which turns all of nature into raw material at human disposal, to be homogenized by our rationalized technique according to the subjective prejudices of the day. (Kass, L. The Wisdom of Repugnance in Flesh of my Flesh*