



An Analysis of the Gory and Glory of Artificial Intelligence

Dr. Aarati Tyagi^{1*}, Dr.K.Manikyamba²

^{1}Associate Professor, School Of Legal Studies, Reva University*

²Research Scholar, School of Law, Sharda University

Email: ²manijagz@gmail.com

Corresponding Email: ^{1}aarti_tyagi@hotmail.com*

Received: 03 July 2022

Accepted: 18 September 2022

Published: 21 August 2022

Abstract: *In era of travel destinations planning to moon and mars Artificial Intelligence to overcome all the natural phenomena is not erratic. A time has come to thing of natural ways to sustain life. A time has come to know the benefits of Glory of Artificial Intelligence(AI) in the Gory of Life is an imperative aspect. The AI is to be protected under the Intellectual Property Rights(IPR). Laws pertaining to Anti-trust, anti-monopoly, IPR, National and International treaties to protect organic farming and varieties and so on are to brought in to effect to protect the Gory and Glory of Artificial Intelligence.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Human, Plant and Animal Species, IPR, Patent Rights.*

1. INTRODUCTION

I. Significance of Natural life:

The life is a corpus of mundane of divine replications. In medical terminology it is capability to reproduce generation after generation and in divine, it means a transitory truth. Yet, the undaunted belief of humanity is that life is a gift of the God, which is neither created nor destroyed by anyone. The evident fact of life is visible 'body' and imperceptible one is its 'soul'. A body is said to be in alive if it is able to reproduce and body without soul is said to be dead or out of the world. A human body is perishable whereas soul is imperishable as it is divine. The modern times science enthusiastically claims that 'Artificial Life' is possible to create imperishable human without death. The human can crown the 'Glory of God' by himself.

(a)Animals and creatures



The Christian faith asserts that God has taken six days to complete the creation of this nature, creatures including human race. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good".[1]

The Holy Book Bible further says that, "any fight to be the leading creature on the evolutionary scale cannot be seen as 'good.' God made everything perfect, meaning nothing can be improved upon, and that one kind did not evolve into a different kind. Each 'kind' was declared 'good' by God, God created and prepared everything in six literal days consisting of twenty-four hours each. He did not even have to take six days, but He did so for two reasons:-

1. To stress the order and logical relationship between each part of creation.
2. To provide man with a pattern for a six-day working week" (cornwallfreenews.com).

And so, "Insignificant mortals, who are as leaves are, and now flourish and grow warm with life, and feed on what the ground gives, and then again fade away and are dead". [2]

(b) Human Species

There were no problems either for Nature or for God from creatures, but the sixth day product i.e. human could confuse, confound and become a problem for both the nature and God, right from the beginning of the creation till this day. Man could subdue every thing in the nature, transgress every norm of nature and God.

There are numerous legends about the Muslim saints and other holy men who could talk to animals. However, for lack of authentication, they are taken generally as mere fables. There is one statement in the Qur'an Majeed, though, which proves that man had acquired the lore of speech with animals as early as the time of King Solomon.

Once it has been established that each species of animal is a "community" like the human community, it stands to reason that each and every creature on earth has, as its birth-right, a share in all the natural resources. In other words, each animal is a tenant-in-common on this Planet with human species.

II Patenting – an intellectual invasion/exploitation?

Patent, in the human literature, is a very simple and harmless word meaning "Obvious "or "easily recognizable". But this simple word has been converted into an atomic and explosive concept by crude intellect of perverted human species convincing the law to fall in line with it .In fact the term "Patent" being a simple and candid term connotes "an inkling to recognize an effort for common cause or welfare of all". This magnanimous beauty of our humane philosophy has been distorted by attributing legal sanctity to 'conservative human effort 'called invention. One may feel that no legal system would like to be guided by dehumanized contours of life, rights or privileges in regulating human behavior in an imbalanced and



unequal social and natural milieu. The scheme and object of “Patent System” is not to supplant the nature, but to supplement the sources of nature.

Are we – and all living beings – just survival machines, blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as ‘genes’ as Richard Dawkins states?

Are we incapable of knowing beyond the frames imposed to us by nature?

(a) Core concept of patent:

The patenting of living things or life forms, some of which have been made mandatory by the World Trade Organization, is unethical and also against the economic and social interests of developing countries.

The patenting of life forms has become the subject of a growing worldwide campaign by citizen groups, environmentalists, scientists, farmers’ organizations and also religious leaders. They believe that animals, plants, humans, micro-organisms and their parts such as genes and cells, should not be patentable as these life forms are creations of God and Nature. They also argue that life forms, even if they are genetically modified, are not inventions and thus do not meet the criteria of patentability. A debate has also been raging in the WTO, which is reviewing Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPs treaty, which deals with patenting of life forms. It allows countries not to patent plants and animals but makes the patenting of micro-organisms and microbiological processes compulsory, thus opening the road to the patenting of life. In relation to patenting of life forms, Kenya and the Africa Group believe that this is unethical and should not be allowed. This patenting also has serious implications for food security.

In the case of patents on biological materials, there is a case of ‘double irony’ in that patents are being granted over biological materials and the traditional knowledge of the use of such materials. This prevents access by developing countries to such biological resources and knowledge, which originated largely from the developing countries. In this context, the TRIPs Agreement has facilitated the flow of resources and technology from the South to the North.

Patent system was not an appropriate reward system for knowledge relating to biological materials. ‘The patent system was designed to protect mechanical inventions, and makes the distinction between mere discoveries and inventions. It is clear that biological materials are naturally occurring and can only be discoveries, and not inventions.

‘Patents confer monopolies over patented subject matter. In the cases of seeds and plant varieties, patents on such biological materials will have serious implications for agriculture and food security in the developing countries. The monopoly over biological resources and knowledge essential for agriculture, medicinal and other uses may be misappropriated and vest in individuals and corporations.’ The distinctions made in Article 27.3(b) (for example, between plants and animals, on the one hand, and micro-organisms, on the other) are artificial and were drafted with the aim of allowing and requiring micro-organisms and microbiological processes to be patentable.



“Scientifically, no such distinctions can be drawn, and therefore, all living organisms and living processes cannot be patentable”. There are four categories of patents on life forms and processes, which should be prohibited or banned. These are:

1. Patents based on bio-resources and knowledge of their use pirated from countries and indigenous communities, which do not satisfy the novelty or invention criteria;
2. Patents on discoveries, for example, micro-organisms, and cell lines, genomes, genes (including human cell lines and human genomes and sequences), which are all naturally occurring;
3. Patents on transgenic techniques and constructs, and transgenic plants, animals and micro-organisms (better known as genetically modified organisms); and
4. Patents on nuclear transplant cloning (for example, the techniques that produced Dolly the sheep).(3)

(b) Safeguard-Swag

“The arrogance of modern man and the attitude of majority of human population, the attitude of those in power, like those who run big corporations and governments, they say – “nature is there for us to exploit”. This is reflected in the intellectual property laws today. It is this attitude that allows people to go out and plunder the planet, strip the planet of its minerals, raw minerals and clean water, then dump polluted water back into the streams and oceans; to use clean air and return only toxic ways, jet-fuel exhaust, car exhaust and coal plant exhaust into the atmosphere”.

“We have a duty to take care of this planet. We have a duty not to own it or think that it is our intellectual property, but rather to respect and honor it. Today our corporations say – “we own the planet and we will take what we want. We will punish anybody else who tries to grow this plant because we own its intellectual property. Our modern world – our so called technologically advanced world – is so advanced that we think we own the trees, rivers, streams, oceans, the lands and the seeds and the genes sequences”. But we are in for big surprise here, because mother nature has a way of reminding people they are not in control, a way of correcting imbalances, we have been exploiting mother nature in a systematic, aggressive way for a couple of 100 years (Adams, 2010). “The economic analysis of law which has grown up, principally in the U.S., in the last 30 years is an attempt to offer a sophisticated scientific alternative to utilitarianism. ... How do you compare one person’s happiness with another’s? Problems like this had lead economists to try to make utility arguments more rigorous. The concept of value employed by economists is a truism: a thing has value (utility) for a person when that person values it.... The economic arguments turn on concepts like efficiency, superiority, optimality, allocation and distribution. The most basic notion in the economic analysis of law is efficiency or Pareto Optimality. The Pareto superiority standard applies only when there are no losers, but most social policies and most rules produce both winners and losers”. [5]



“ According to Ronald Dworkin, ‘Rights’ are not ‘Gifts’ from God. Their institution is “a complex and troublesome practice that makes the government’s job of securing the general benefit more difficult and more expensive and it would be a frivolous and wrongful practice unless it served some point”. (ibid p. 383)

(c) Cell for sale

Man plundered nature and traded with every conceivable material, be it small or big, precious or perishing, available in the nature, and still could not satiate his greed. He traded with his organs of the body, and finally his conscience too. He trades with eyes, ears, lips, throat, liver and every limb in the body. Beauty is bought and sold. Right from gigantic structure to seemingly inconspicuous cell, the basic unit of life. He paired the knowledge of science to replicate, duplicate and finally to complicate the pristine nature of man and his environment. Initially, invention was interesting, and subsequently it is curiously suspected to be bewildering and devastating. See the genius of human intellect – cloning and artificial creation –

Mr. Venter vivaciously vindicated and translated his dream into reality. Cloning humans no longer remains a fantasy of Science-Fiction authors. Cloning adult mammals is possible now and cloning humans is in the reach of science. It has become obvious once more how technological progress can force us to review our ethics again.

While no human has officially been cloned yet and some governments agreed to totally ban cloning of humans, many people like the idea of cloning themselves or "reviving" dead personalities. The process of cloning is often misunderstood due to insufficient scientific knowledge. Therefore the real problems of cloning are often forgotten and useful discussion does not result. (6)

Cloning is by no means a technology without danger. But we have become so used to being threatened by mass destruction weapons that smaller dangers are often ignored. People are afraid of armies or whole planets of clones, like described in [7] (external link, homepage dedicated to A. Huxley). While they are not impossible, these scenarios are very unlikely simply because of the expense of cloning. The problems of cloning are clearly less important than problems like unemployment, impoverishment and hunger. But they must not be forgotten on the way into the future.

Ethical implications of cloning humans, restrictions

Many groups have expressed their concern about the new ethical implications arisen from the possibility to clone humans. Some countries have proposed or already passed total bans to human cloning. But are these bans really total bans or do they just monopolize the knowledge? Large enterprises are rarely threatened by such laws, but smaller research groups will have problems with them. Therefore, the state or the industry lobbying it, depending on



one's point of view of politics, limit human cloning to those who can get around the laws: themselves.

It is clear that such possible monopolization of knowledge is not desirable, especially as it would require most of the activities regarding cloning to take place secretly. But is a total legalization of cloning desirable? Normal parents usually want their children to grow up healthy. They will register them with the local authorities and the born children are protected by the state from then on.

But a cloned human might be harmed by its own creator.

Violence against children by their own parents is often ignored, but the problem could become much worse with clones. Although violence is generally useless, private scientists might clone humans and treat them like guinea pigs.

Some kind of restriction is needed to prevent the loss of human rights for clones. The best way is probably not a total ban, but a limitation to certain purposes for cloning humans. For the treatment of cloned humans is determined by the purpose for which they have been cloned.

Possibilities, Problems and Dangers -Alternatives

- a) Asexual reproduction for infertile or same-sex couples
If the donator of the genome lives near the child or meets it later: Upbringing of the cloned child is much more difficult than upbringing of a "normal" child, social isolation of the child, psychical damage, identity crisis. Adoption, In-vitro fertilization
- b) Immortality, Smart Kids
Real immortality is not achieved, child's personality develops much different from donator. Genome doesn't necessarily transport the desired talent. Parental expectations are probably disappointed, child grows up in isolation. Normally born children with sufficient education, mind uploading, cryonics (for later uploading or longevity after restoration), knowledge preservation
- c) Physical/Biological research: Quantum Effects, growth , DNA etc.
Ethical rules for scientific research might be considered as unnecessary for clones. Volunteers (grown-up clones, twins)
- d) Sociological projects, Communities
Clones are used as test persons from the beginning of their lives, may develop totally desolate personality, high psychical damage and social isolation. The end is open. Computer simulations/internet scenarios, roleplaying, extrapolations from current knowledge, anthropology
- e) "Fun cloning": cloning humans for personal or public entertainment
Both: Mutations are created for more "fun". Personal: Risks for the child to live isolated or to grow up without loving parents are extremely high, risk of death/suicide. Public: Clones are used for "entertaining" (maybe even deadly) gameshows. Virtual housepets, computer games
- f) Medical experiments, effects of radiation, chemical substances, biological weapons



Humans are just guinea pigs, life loses its value. Possible next steps: disabled persons are used for medical "research", humans are valued and sorted into those who may exist and those who must not. Clones are generally considered as not lifeworthy. Computer simulations, tests on animals or organic structures, total stop of research in certain areas

III. Artificial Life – Supplantation or superficial

(a) Scientific wonders

Very recently, we came to know that three Indian-origin scientists are part of a team that has for the first time created a synthetic cell, controlled by man-made genetic instructions, which can also reproduce itself.

The 24-member team included Sanjay Vashee, Radha Krishnakumar and Prashanth P. Parmar. "This is the first synthetic cell that's been made," said lead researcher Craig Venter, unveiling the culmination of 15 years of research.

"We call it synthetic because the cell is totally derived from a synthetic chromosome, made with four bottles of chemicals on a chemical synthesizer, starting with information in a computer."(7)

Dr Craig Venter, a multi-millionaire pioneer in genetics, and his team have managed to make a completely new "synthetic" life form from a mix of chemicals. They manufactured a new chromosome from artificial DNA in a test tube, then transferred it into an empty cell and watched it multiply – the very definition of being alive.

The man-made single cell "creature", which is a modified version of one of the simplest bacteria on earth, proves that the technology works.

Now Dr Venter believes organism, nicknamed Synthia, will pave the way for more complex creatures that can transform environmental waste into clean fuel, vaccinate against disease and soak up pollution.

But his development has also triggered debate over the ethics of "playing god" and the dangers of the new technology could pose in terms of biological hazards and warfare.

"We are entering an era limited only by our imagination," he said announcing the research published in the journal Science.

Dr Venter, a pioneer of genetic code sequencing and his team at the J Craig Venter Institute in Rockville, Maryland, have been chasing the goal for more than 15 years at a cost of £30m.

(b) Robomatism or Roberomatism?

Would you like to create Frankenstein, Terminators and Universal and Robo Soldiers?

Pindar, a Greek Poet said -

"The animated figures stand
Adorning every public street



And seem to breathe in stone, or
move their marble feet."

(Pindar, Greek Poet, in his seventh Olympic Ode:)

The discovery of the Antikythera mechanism suggests that such rumoured animated statues had some grounding in contemporary mechanical technology.

The idea of artificial people dates at least as far back as the ancient legend of Cadmus, who sowed dragon teeth that turned into soldiers; and the myth of Pygmalion, whose statue of Galatea came to life. In classical mythology, the deformed god of metalwork (Vulcan or Hephaestus) created mechanical servants, ranging from intelligent, golden handmaidens to more utilitarian three-legged tables that could move about under their own power. Jewish legend tells of the Golem, an clay statue animated by Kabbalistic magic. Similarly, in the Younger Edda, Norse mythology tells of a clay giant, Mökkurkálfi or Mistcalf, constructed to aid the troll Hrungrnir in a duel with Thor, the God of Thunder.

The first recorded design of a humanoid robot was made by Leonardo da Vinci around the 1495. Da Vinci's notebooks, rediscovered in the 1950s, contained detailed drawings for a mechanical knight that was apparently able to sit up, wave its arms, and move its head and jaw. The design was likely based on his anatomical research recorded in the Vitruvian Man. It is not known whether or not he attempted to build the robot (see: Leonardo's robot).

The first known functioning robot was created in the 1738 by Jacques de Vaucanson, who made an android that played the flute, as well as a mechanical duck that reportedly ate and defecated. E.T.A. Hoffmann's 1817 short story "The Sandman" features a doll-like mechanical woman, and Edward S. Ellis' 1865 "Steam Man of the Prairies" expresses the American fascination with industrialization. A wave of stories about humanoid automatons culminated with the "Electric Man" by Luis Senarens in 1885.

Once technology advanced to the point where people foresaw mechanical creatures as more than toys, literary responses to the concept of robots reflected fears that humans would be replaced by their own creations. Frankenstein (1818), sometimes called the first science fiction novel, has become synonymous with this theme. When Capek's play RUR introduced the concept of an assembly line run by robots who try to build still more robots, the theme took on economic and philosophical overtones, further disseminated by the classic movie Metropolis (1927), and the popular Blade Runner (1982) and The Terminator (1984). With robots a reality and intelligent robots a likely prospect, a better understanding of interactions between robots and human is embodied in such modern films as Spielberg's A.I. (movie) (2001) and Proyas' I, Robot (2004).

Many consider the first robot in the modern sense to be a teleoperated boat, similar to a modern ROV, devised by Nikola Tesla and demonstrated at an 1898 exhibition in Madison Square Garden. Based on his patent 613,809 for "teleautomation", Tesla hoped to develop the "wireless torpedo" into an automated weapon system for the US Navy.



The first electronic autonomous robots were created by Grey Walter at Bristol University, England in 1948.

Contemporary uses of robots

Robots are being used today to do the tasks that are either too dirty, dangerous, difficult, repetitive or dull for humans. This usually takes the form of industrial robots used in manufacturing lines. Other applications include toxic waste cleanup, space exploration, mining, search and rescue, and mine finding. Manufacturing remains the primary market where robots are utilized. In particular, articulated robots, similar in motion capability to the human arm, are the most widely used. Applications include welding, painting and machine loading.

The automotive industry has taken full advantage of this new technology where robots have been programmed to replace human labor in many simple repetitive tasks. The wide adoption of such technologies, however, was delayed by the availability of cheap labour and high capital requirements of robotics. Robotic AGVs (Automated Guided Vehicles) and other autonomous delivery robots are beginning to be used in the industry, hospitals, laboratories, server facilities and other applications where risk, reliability and security are important concerns. Likewise, autonomously patrolling safety and security robots are appearing as part of the growing move toward automated buildings.

While robotic technology has achieved a certain amount of maturity, the social impact of these robots is largely unknown. The field of social robots is now emerging and investigates the relationship between robots and humans. A ludobot is an instance of a social robot dedicated to entertainment and companionship.(8)

When roboticists first attempted to mimic human and animal gaits, they discovered that it was incredibly difficult; requiring more computational power than what was available at the time. So, emphasis was shifted to other areas of research. Simple wheeled robots were used to conduct experiments in behavior, navigation, and path planning. These navigation techniques have now developed into commercially available autonomous robot control systems; the most sophisticated examples of autonomous navigation control systems now available include the commercial/industrial ARCS laser-based navigation system from ActivMedia/MobileRobots and the home/consumer-oriented VSLAM-based NorthStar system.

When engineers were ready to attempt walking robots again, they started small with hexapods and other multi-legged platforms. These robots mimicked insects and arthropods in both form and function. The trend towards these body types offer immense flexibility and proven adaptability to any environment. With more than four legs, these robots are statically stable which makes them easier to work with. Even though significant progress towards bipedal locomotion in robots has been made only recently, in just 4 years after the introduction of Asimo bipedal robots such as KHR-1 that cost only \$1300 became available.



Robot rights are the moral obligations of society towards its machines, similar to human rights or animal rights. These may include the right to life and liberty, freedom of thought and expression and equality before the law.[10] Institute for the Future[11)U.K. Department of Trade and Industry.[12)

A key issue is sentience, or the ability to feel pleasure and pain. For advocates of animal rights, sentience is the distinguishing feature that forces society to honor the rights of animals. Using an argument analogous to the one used by animal rights advocates, a computer program or robot that is able to feel pleasure and pain has rights. However, there is no universally accepted definition of sentience (or related aspects such as consciousness) for machines.

Experts disagree whether specific and detailed laws will be required soon or safely in the distant future.[13]McGlen reports that sufficiently humanoid appear by 2020Ravicrul sets the date at 2029.[14] However, most scientists suppose that at least 50 years may have to pass before any sufficiently advanced system exists.[15][16]

(c) Condemn unscrupulous science.

We should no doubt invite all advantageous and meritorious fruits which are good for the humanity at large, but should necessarily condemn such expeditious inventions that are diabolic to human existence, peace or happiness of the creatures.

Should cloning for human benefits or even human cloning itself be allowed in society today?

Some advantages to human cloning include

- a) Providing better research capabilities, to find cures to many present diseases
- b) Bringing back friends or relatives who have passed away by cloning an identical copy
- c) Providing children for women are single and do not wish to have artificial insemination
- d) The choice of physical characteristics.

Disadvantages

- a) Cloning is unethical
- b) Cloning reduces genetic diversity
- c) Human cloning could produce another Hitler etc.
- d) Human cloning is not at all natural.
- e) Human cloning would alter the very meaning of Humanity.

Trans National Companies As Controllers And Traders Of Life.

Changed and new life-forms can now be owned by multinational corporations, generation after generation. What is happening to private ownership of life-forms as a result of the GATT agreement? It would seem that the nature of profit-orientated multinationals threatens public health, and that independence and freedom are at risk.



We are here looking at what multinationals are doing with genetic engineering, with biotechnology, with the basic physiological building blocks of plant, animal and human life. This is a situation which threatens human independence and freedom. It is a situation in which the nature of profit-motivated and profit-orientated multinationals threatens human health and survival.

It is now possible to change the characteristics of a life-form by transferring selected basic building blocks, genes, from one variety to another, from one species to another. The source of the genes, of the genetic materials which are used, is either non-human or human.

The new life-forms which are created are sometimes called 'transgenic' and may be plants, animals or geneplasm. The 'genome' is the genetic material of an organism. As regards foodstuffs, there are those organisms which have themselves been genetically modified, and those which contain genetically modified organisms. There are also those from which the genetically modified organisms, which were used in producing them, have been removed.

The moral and ethical questions raised are of fundamental importance. Should we tinker with the basic building blocks of the planetary environment and of life itself? What are the risks and what may be the consequences to our way of living? Do we as human beings have the right to meddle with a set-up which took so long to produce us, when we have only existed for such a comparatively short time?

Are we risking the survival of humankind at a time of exponentially accelerating scientific and technical knowledge, when our human relationships, basic human rights, social care, human equality, freedom and independence, are so inadequate over much of the planet, leave so much to be desired?

Quite apart from the moral and ethical considerations involved in creating a new life-form, the public health risks are extremely high when tinkering with and changing in the twinkling of an eye, and on a massive scale, life-forms which have taken millions of years to evolve slowly by trial and error and by eliminating inadequate or mistaken change. Unpredictable are the resulting direct and indirect effects on the human being, which is the most complicated organism ever produced and which we do not fully understand.

Human-Animal Hybrids

Of great concern is the extent to which human biological material is being taken into private ownership. There have been patent applications for human genes and human cell lines. Human genes have been inserted into animals and there is the prospect of human-animal hybrids.

It seems that human embryos can be cloned. And, if unique or novel in some way, patented, cloned and sold?



It has also been reported that male mice have been modified to produce rat sperm, one species being used to modify another. It seems that this technique could, at least in theory, be used to make another animal produce human sperm.

It may be possible," writes one commentator, "to patent and to enslave human-animal hybrids who think and feel like humans but who lack constitutional protection ..."

2. SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. "Traditional plant and animal varieties need to be collected and propagated, country by country. And this needs to be done quickly and effectively. Far-seeing individuals and groups have already started, one example being the Irish Seed Savers Association. Such collections need to belong to the community. This means that each collection has to be run and controlled as a co-operative under rules which prevent it being taken over or dissolved by private interests, and that it has to be supported by ample public funds. Collections already being formed should be amply supported from public funds on the basis that they will be freely available".
2. "Collection, storage, propagation and distribution of seeds and animals needs to be nationalized, country by country, placing them under public ownership. The key objective of such enterprises should be service to the community. In this case the aims of nationalizing are
 - A. to prevent multinationals from gaining a monopoly-like stranglehold on this essential stage in food production,
 - B. to regain control of food production from multinationals and place it again in the hands of the elected representatives of the people.
 - C. And to ensure that a country's food production remains under the control of its elected representatives".
3. "It is essential to raise public awareness of all the issues involved, such as: Of all the issues involved in creating, patenting, owning, selling and using new life-forms of any kind or shape. Whenever international agreements and national or international legislation favour the operations of multinationals instead of serving local communities or people in general. Whenever corporate takeovers or mergers are against the national interest of any nation. Of the need for the right to know about, and to comment on, and participate in, all aspects of government and corporate decision taking".
4. "To concentrate agriculture and farming on traditional varieties grown organically combined with 'organic' animal farming. Particularly so since "reliance on inputs of inorganic fertilizer and pesticide was not sustainable ecologically or economically, due to rising costs, falling yields, soil deterioration and resistance to insecticides."
5. "Publicly owned and funded but co-operatively directed and managed farming research institutes. They need to belong to the community as their main objective should be to serve the community and not any kind of private interests, and they should be supported by ample public funds. They have to be run and controlled as co-operatives under rules which prevent them being taken over or dissolved by private interests. It may be that genetic modifications of plants or animals should only be researched and carried out in



such institutions, to ensure that public service, which is service to the community, takes precedence over, and is more important than, profit motivation and private profit, wealth and power over other people”.

6. “Ensure that no multinational misuses its power to obtain a determining or controlling interest, share or hold on its market”.
7. “To enforce existing anti-trust and anti-monopoly legislation nationally and internationally. And to install such legislation where it does not exist already”.
8. “We need to develop co-operative employee and customer owned co-operatives founded in such a way that they cannot be taken over by, or sold to, or divided or dispersed to become, profit-motivated entities. Neither must its own directors or management be able to change the co-operative service-orientated purpose of the co-operative enterprise towards profit-orientation”.
9. “We need also to consider the prospect and implications of human cloning and human-animal hybridization, and the implications of new life-forms being legally assigned to 'owners', to profit orientated multinational corporations”.

Community

What is needed is independent grassroots evaluation of such dangerous research and developments, at all stages from planning to application, in terms which are meaningful to the community.

Finally we appeal for SCIENCE WITH HUMANE FACE since life is not a dream but a practical reality.

3. REFERENCES

1. (Genesis 1:24-25).
2. (Homer, Century IX B.C. Greek Poet, The Iliad (Penguin Classics Deluxe Edition) (www.meaningsoflife.com).
3. Martin Khor Director of the Third World Network.-(<http://www.twinside.org.sg/title/2103.htm>) visited on 18-12-2010.
4. (Mike Adams, Corporate Greed, Intellectual Property Laws and the destruction of Human Civilizations – www.naturalnews.com/022096.html - visited on 19-12-2010)
5. Loyd’s introduction to Jurisprudence, ed. By MDA Freeman – 6th Edn (1994) P-374 & 375 – Sweet & Maxwell – London)
6. "Cloning - What It Is And Isn't"
7. Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World"
8. <http://www.zeenews.com/news628209.html>)
9. <http://www.solarnavigator.net/robots.htm>)
10. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition
11. ^ "Robots could demand legal rights". link=BBC News]. December 21, 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/6200005.stm>. Retrieved January 3, 2010.
12. ^ a b Henderson, Mark (April 24, 2007). "Human rights for robots? We're getting carried away". The Times Online.



<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/science/article1695546.ece>. Retrieved May 2, 2010.

13. ^ McGee, Glenn. "A Robot Code of Ethics". The Scientist. <http://www.the-scientist.com/2007/5/1/30/1/>.
14. ^ Kurzweil, Ray (2005). The Singularity is Near. Penguin Books. ISBN 0-670-03384-7.
15. ^ New World Technologies - NWT - Should we be worried by the rise of robots?
16. (*)Manfred Davidmann Creating, Patenting and Marketing of New Forms of Life (solhaam.org)