**2) Discuss the differences between Western and Indigenous Australian conceptions of time and how they are important for practices of care, responsibility, reconciliation.**

The Western conception of time is teleological, which means that the past is considered as the occurrences “behind” us that need to be overcome, the future presents the occurrences that are yet to come to be dealt with, and the present moment is only a transition point towards the future. The Aboriginal conception of time is quite contradictory – according do it, people do not “face” the future, but the *past*, for which they have full *responsibility*. That means that people have continuative responsibility to take care of the precedent, just as the present that is the consequence of the past, and this present is again responsible to what comes next, the future generations. Indigenous Australians also consider country as a “multidimensional matrix of relationships” – people, plants, animals, soil etc. are all connected, and therefore all have an interest in taking care of the country as spoiling it means spoiling themselves.

The countries are also distinctive, and every country produces its own human beings that are then responsible for it. The actual question is “how to” inherit in order to *reconcile* with the past (a very actual question in Australia, where the colonization practises of the past meet with needed justice for the Indigenous Australians), but also with non-humans and newly created beings, both technological and organic. We need to find an alternative to Western practise of “violence and progress”, find a way of taking care of the past but also the beings we create (through cloning, genetic engineering, bioelectronics etc., because we are responsible for those (as their creators). This new way of “responsible and caring” inheritance will help us to achieve multi-species reconciliation.

**4) What are the specific effects of low-level radiation and what is the significance of randomness and indeterminacy?**

According to the linear curve of radiation effects, the damage of low-level radiation is considered relatively insignificant as its effects are supposed to be small. However, some scientists suggest an alternative, „supralinear“ curve, in which small doses of radiation produce much higher effects then the linear curve predicts. This model presupposes that low doses of radiation can disrupt biological functioning, which is a field that is not well examined (even the “official discourse” scientists have not determined the mechanisms of the cell damage by radiation yet.) According to Busby (p. 24), cell development plays a critical role in determining the size of impact of radiation on the cell, because the vulnerability of the cell is significantly heightened during the replication times, therefore the effect of radiation depends on the state mode of the cell given in the precise moment.

The effect of randomness also occurs – the waves of artificial radiation are rather random and discontinuous, which means that the particles are not distributed evenly and we cannot predict the effect the radiation will have. And according to Cornelia, it is enough to be hit by one particle to suffer its effect when it is in the wrong place in the wrong time. Cornelia also noticed how some places with higher levels of radioactivity were not as damaged as places with lower level of radioactivity, which led her to a realization of importance of other factors than mere radioactivity – e.g the meteorological and topographical characteristics of the given place, the distinctive “radioactive cocktail” from each nuclear plant and so on. This means that bodies and land intersect together in unique combinations that influence the effect of radiation on each of them, and this contingency (= randomness) hence plays an important role in the effect of radiation. It also means that every characteristic exists in a unique environment and its expression depends on this environment, which means that when we study the relationships between objects, we will most likely not find a “perfect” cause and effect relation, making it hard to determine the exact effects of radiation.

**6) Is nuclear radiation a form of transcorporeality? Is there a relation between plastic flesh and radioactive cell mutation?**

Yes, it is, because it shows how the material world (here, Busby lists the example of ingested radioactive food and drinks, p. 24) can transform our bodies – similarly like when we breathe in some particles of burning plastic. Both of those particles interact with our bodies on a molecular level, and on this level, suddenly the division between us and the nature/world outside disappears. In this way, the particles transform our body, our “flesh”. And similarly like the radioactive particles, the plastic particles can cause mutation (or other aberrations) that lead to cancer (as is the case of workers from plastic factories along the Mississippi river mentioned in Nancy Tuana’s text *Viscious Porosity*).