

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *New approaches to biofuels* between December 2009 and March 2010. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

spaice

QUESTIONS ANSWERED:

Question 1

ANSWER:

It is short-sighted and will introduce new, global, problems for future generations

Question 2

ANSWER:

Land usage - destroying existing agricultural land or wild habitat. Greed - abusing human rights, the environment, and fauna to boost production and profits.

Question 3

ANSWER:

Yes, Journals, science and environmental, specialist Web sites

Question 4

ANSWER:

The question assumes that biofuels are good which I fundamentally disagree with. If biofuels gave local security (food and infrastructure) to eliminate poverty I would support it; but it won't - it will be used to exploit workers, communities, and the environment to sate the greed of a few and the voracious appetites of wasteful countries.

Question 5

ANSWER:

lignocellulosic biofuels - as the least bad of a host of bad ideas

Question 6

ANSWER:

Biofuels will encourage more consumption - exactly as is happening now even though we know we are heading for catastrophe. The only responsible action is to curb excessive energy usage by punishing manufacturers obsessed with growth, consumption, and profit.

Question 7

ANSWER:

Biofuels will continue serve the rich in exploiting the poor it will not create a net gain in the welfare of local people - there is no evidence to the contrary and no governments are dealing with the corruption and immorality of the growers and fuel companies so Biofuels should not be encouraged.

Question 9

ANSWER:

No. Man has time and again fallen foul of his/her arrogance - we have absolutely no idea what will

happen in the future and there is a mass of evidence showing that genetic engineering already creates side effects. This is playing with the lives and futures of an entire planet so that a tiny few people can get rich - it is morally repugnant.