

# Human cloning argumentative essay

[Religion](#), [God](#)



Human cloning is defined as creating a genetically indistinguishable image of a human being. It can also be depicted as the asexual reproduction of new human beings, passing through all growth stages and is identical to an existing creature [1]. According to the physician Lewis Thomas, “ The cloning of human beings is on most lists of things to worry about in science.” [2] Human cloning has a major effect on all denominations in the world and there are many different opinions associated with it. Religious leaders and thinkers have critically reviewed the scientific projections and ethics of human cloning [2]. Their final opinions have mostly been influenced by the diverse choices and control of reproduction, machinery aid in reproduction and hereditary treatment to produce clones [3]. This paper seeks to highlight the risks and benefits of human cloning by critically appraising the important debates concerning it. It will do so through exploring the deterministic effects of cloning upon the quality of human existence, the neutral and impartial nature of technology, and the social constructivism that creates the animosity towards cloning, especially in regards to Christianity.

### **Risks involved in human cloning**

According to John Kilner, the president of the United States Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity, the most probable result of human cloning would be a disfigured being with dramatic imperfections and defects.

Doctors have thoroughly documented many risks associated with human cloning. Kilner is of the opinion that subjecting humans to cloning means taking on a risk of deliberately causing harm. The same problems that faced the animals would face cloned human beings. Scientists do not know the impact of cloning on the mental development of the subject. Factors such as

intelligence and frame of mind are crucial factors in determining the health of a person. Due to many unknown concerns, trying to clone humans is potentially hazardous and ethically reckless.

### **Expected benefits of human cloning**

Dr. Richard Reed, a famous scientist specializing in human cloning technology, suggests that it might help in turning around the aging process in humans. Scientists could also reverse or heal heart attacks by cloning healthy heart cells and injecting into parts of the heart that have been injured. [4]

Given the human stem cell breakthroughs of late, embryonic stem cells may be gestated to repair and replace damaged cells. Blending this information with human cloning technology, it will be possible to create tissue that will be accepted by different immune systems. It will cure diseases like Alzheimer's, diabetes and many more. [5] It will solve the problem of infertility among couples with no children. In the cosmetic surgery industry it will bring the problem of immune disease to an end. This new technology will bring about a great advancement in the area of medicine if people let go of their fears and embrace the benefits. [3]

### **Christian views on human cloning**

Theologians of high repute have started initial discussion concerning genetic manipulation and human cloning, including Charles Curran, Karl Rahner within Roman Catholicism, and Joseph Fletcher and Paul Ramsey on the Protestant side of the issue. [6] They had opposing views concerning this topic. According to Fletcher, human cloning was important in future

reproductive options and it was ethically justified for its many benefits. It was a preferable method of reproduction than the normal sexual reproductive method. “ Laboratory reproduction is radically human because it is deliberate, designed, chosen and willed.” Paul Ramsey was in favor of cloning, only that it could be used when there was risk to humanity and there was need for creation. [7]

In 1993, at George Washington University, there was an experiment on separation of human embryos. The Roman Catholic Church was opposed to this, as it was seen as unethical. [8] Protestants saw this as potentially beneficial to medical research and advocated for its regulation. Joseph Fletcher also stated that there should be an option for expanding the menu of human reproductive rights and choice, and cloning can provide that. According to the book of Genesis, human beings are made in the image of God. As a result, human life is to be valued, in lieu of being treated like a commodity that is bought and sold. This has caused some scientists to promote human cloning to be used in forming new replacement organs. [9] Theologians like Ramsey and McCormick objected human cloning because it was part of a form of reproductive technology. According to them, such technologies split the unitive and procreative aspects of human sexuality. [6] A statement was issued by the Vatican in its Instruction on Respect for Human Life that prohibited human cloning as both a scientific outcome and a technical proposal. Protestants appealed to fundamental theological ideologist in order to critique this process as well. [10]

According to the Nicene Creed of early Christianity, Jesus was the true image of God. According to the book of Psalms, it says “ For you created my inmost

being; you knit me together in my mother’s womb.” With this in mind, human cloning destroys human embryos and would clash with the Bible’s view of human life. They also argue that if humanity was created by God then humans are subject and accountable to God. God created man and made him responsible for Earth, making them accountable to it.

Oliver O’Donovan, an Anglican theologian, came up with implications for human cloning. According to him, human cloning is the scientific and technical method of human reproduction. When humanity is seen as raw material for construction, it eschews humanity’s natural development for artificial development. [11]

### **Conservative Evangelism views to human cloning**

The sanctity of life was addressed by the first evangelical author on human cloning, Kerby Anderson. [4] To him, one has the right to life. The sanctity of life is violated in two different ways. First of all, the embryo would be killed through the course of cloning research. Secondly, he believed that a clone had a soul and disregard for human life would redefine humanity as we knew it. [4] Society would treat the clone as a respiratory spare organ or tissue.

Cloning would be a cultural project to portray certain traits such as body appearance. From the book of Genesis there is a connection between marriage and parenthood. [11] Human cloning therefore breaks this connection. It also ruptures connections between parent and the child. The idea of a child being a gift changes to become a project as well as a projection of themselves. [12]

Southern Baptist scholars see human cloning as a different method of human procreation than has come before. It is seen as a direct genetic

customization of the human embryo. With cloning, human reproduction would not require a relationship in order to happen. Cloning has been related to embryonic death due to abnormalities. [10]

On February 2003, the United States House of Representatives voted for the second time to ban all types of human cloning. The act does not allow people to attempt human cloning or participate in cloning procedures. [3] Cardinal Anthony, the Bevilacqua chairman of the U. S. Bishop's Committee on Pro Life Activities, wanted the house to pass the bill.

### Conclusion

Human cloning is a serious issue. Religious views on cloning humans differ significantly as there are those that want it banned, as well as those who want restrictive regulation towards it. According to a survey, two out of three people do not see human cloning as morally acceptable. There is a potential of human risk and the removing the individual nature of humanity from the self. It may even lead to destruction of human life as we know it. The issue of cloning humans is very controversial; some people think that it is a miracle in which we should thank God, while others see it as a way for humans to play God. All in all, it should not be permitted to engage in human cloning, as it is immoral and unacceptable.

According to technological determinism, cloning should be legal because the technology exists for it to be made possible. However, technology is neutral, so it is up to the policymakers and the ethics of scientists to make the determination towards its morality. At the same time, social constructions such as Christianity and other organized religions abhor cloning, and as such their perspective will not change, despite the technology present.

## References

- [1] Annas, G. J. (2009). *Regulatory Models for Human Embryo Cloning*. New York: John-Wiley.
- [2] Silver, L. M. (2007). *Remaking Eden: Cloning and Beyond in a Brave New World*. New York: Avon Books.
- [3] Watson, James. D. (2001). *The DNA Story: A Documentary History of Gene Cloning*. San Francisco: Penguin Books.
- [4] Lewis, C. S. (2005). *The Abolition of Man*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- [5] Winston, Ronald. (2004). *The Promise of Cloning for Human Medicine*, *BMJ*, 31(7), 13-14.
- [6] Nakasone, R. Y. (2000). *Ethics of Enlightenment*. Fremont, CA: Dharma Cloud Publishers.
- [7] Homer-Dixon, Thomas. (2007). *The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity, and the Renewal of Civilization*. Toronto: Knopf Canada.
- [8] O'Rourke, K. D. & Philip, B. (2003). *Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teachings*. Washington DC: Freeman and Co.
- [9] Hyde, M. (2003). *Cloning and the New Genetics*. Hillside, NJ: Enslow Publishers, Inc.
- [10] Allmers, H. & Kenwright. S. (2001). *Ethics of Cloning*, *Lancet* 34 (11), 140 -147.
- [11] O'Donovan, O. (2004). *Begotten or Made?* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [12] Goyder, John.(2004). *Technology and Society: A Canadian Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.