

Where We Oppose US Foreign Policy

We cheered when the US confronted and defeated the Taliban, and then Saddam Hussein. We fully support the US-led War on Terror. We endorsed America's opposition to European anti-GM-food measures and President Bush's assertion that they were based on **"unfounded, unscientific fears"**, and we likewise side with the US on the issue of the **Kyoto Protocol**. Yet there is a respect in which we now find ourselves vehemently and conscientiously opposing US foreign policy.

The US is now pushing for a UN Resolution to **ban human cloning**. Why? The Bush Administration thinks that even newly fertilised eggs deserve to be treated like human beings because **"We should not as a society grow life to destroy it, and that's exactly what's taking place"**. This appalling equivocation between the different meanings of the word 'life' is, like the other arguments presented in defence of this policy, so crude that *simplisme* hardly begins to describe it. **We** think that newly fertilised eggs can't think and that destroying them during medical research is morally unproblematic. Further legal impediments to such research will lead to the deaths of thinking human beings and so is a **terrible evil**. This policy was bad enough when it was limited to the United States. A ban throughout the world would be a catastrophe.

Thu, 09/25/2003 - 23:44 | [permalink](#)

Luckily...

We are fortunate in this case that a UN resolution would not actually amount to a global ban.

~Woty

<http://woty.davidsj.com>

by **Woty** on Fri, 09/26/2003 - 02:29 | [reply](#)

Picking and choosing

Certainly the resolution is not a positive move, but who is it likely to attract in the form of specific countries that would oppose it? Who has the most to gain from exploring and exploiting a technology that is banned in America?

Given the present US stand on GM-Food, it would be a

tough/hypocritical position to take if they refused to allow the benefits derived from cloning and its spinoff technologies into the country when it becomes convenient, or when the people make an informed choice.

This is business versus morals; which one do you think wins the higher % of coin tosses?

Howard

by [Howard Frank](#) on Sun, 09/28/2003 - 20:38 | [reply](#)

Concider

Vegitarians who are for abortion... they can depersonalize a human genus, but not a pork chop...

That aside, it's not quite like intentionally making a life which runs a high risk of being malformed, in pain, diminished from what it could be - that's more than merely regrettable, or something to avoid - it's wilfully harming a person.

It really isnt all that hard to dope out - the moral absolutes are limited to simply not causing pain.....

by a reader on Mon, 09/29/2003 - 22:34 | [reply](#)

Business vs. Morals?

Howard Frank wrote:

'This is business versus morals; which one do you think wins the higher % of coin tosses?'

Er, what? Could you explain a little further why you think it's business vs morals?

Also, businesses really aren't any worse than anyone else on average morally speaking, imo, since they are groups of people who come together to make money by providing a product or service. One might as well ask 'Out of morality and people who wins most of the time?' Even if you were to pose the question as business vs. moral improvements I don't think it would make much more sense.

Another problem with your question is that it's the wrong question. The appropriate question to ask in most cases is not whether a given person or group makes the right decision most of the time, it is instead whether they are able and willing to correct mistakes when they realise they have made them. It's a bit like asking whether scientists are right or wrong about factual matters most of the time.

Finally, when a person or group is trying to decide between right and wrong they don't use a coin toss, they think.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Tue, 09/30/2003 - 00:34 | [reply](#)

Lobbying.

I agree entirely with the World on the issue of the immorality of such a ban and feel strongly enough about it to want to sign up to any organisation that resists such action.

Whilst so-called "pro-lifers" have a very public face and a group to sign up to, what are genuine pro-lifers to do?

Anyone got any ideas?

by a reader on Sun, 10/05/2003 - 13:20 | [reply](#)

Bush is an idiot

I'm ashamed to be an American and I'm scared to death of Bush.

by a reader on Wed, 10/08/2003 - 05:11 | [reply](#)

Ashamed to be an American?

I hear this a lot.

It always strikes me as strange that one's pride in being an american can be pinned to the actions of the current president.

Should I have been ashamed to be an american if a foolish, technocratic, enviro-idiot like Gore had been elected?

Presidents come and go. Their mistakes don't change what being an american is all about. America is about individual liberty. I'm proud to be a part of that tradition.

If you're ashamed to be an american then maybe you should just be ashamed to be *you*.

Bush has made many mistakes; but he's gotten the crucial things right. While I think it's foolish to be guided by religious faith (as I think is is on the human cloning issue), he's certainly *not* an idiot.

Gil

by **Gil** on Wed, 10/08/2003 - 18:42 | [reply](#)