In ,of course. […] by editing the dna

Entertainment, Journalism

In the world today scientists have made many different discoveries, such as some of the few major discoveries like the light bulb, electricity, or even micro waves (not the kitchen appliance but the scientific waves).

Through history mankind has worked hard for the future of this world, and it’s future generation. Though some things like cancer and disease have affected mankind in bad ways, like causing death or illness preventing one from enjoying life. Would it not be great if we could just fix humans in a way where we don’t have to worry about disease, sickness, or cancer forever? Scientist have wondered the same thing and have worked on an idea for helping future generations for some years, one of their ideas that they have come to, is to start at the beginning, to start at the embryo where a child begins to form and become a person.

The idea is to genetically modify the embryo, meaning changing its genes, there they can take away the bad genes, insert new ones, and even change the embryo’s future appearance if the parent would want that. Than those genes will be passed down to future generations and the bad ones will be gone forever. Though the question in all of this is, should we be able to genetically modify embryos? One side says yes, for the benefit of future generations. The other side says no, for what will happen to failures and it could end up causing future problems in our society. Would we want to continue with risk such as that? From one perspective some say we should genetically modify embryos. One person who agrees with this is Antonio Regalado, in his article “ Engineering the Perfect Baby” he wrote, ” I waited for a chance to ask my real questions: Can any of this be done to

human beings? Can we improve the human gene pool? … Yang didn't hesitate. Yes , of course. .

.. By editing the DNA of these cells or the embryo itself, it could be possible to correct disease genes and pass those genetic fixes to future generations." He is basically saying we can help future generations if we go on with this type of work. He can be a trusted source because he is qualified in this and went to college to study science and journalism.

He could lose some credibility because he does write MIT and might be being paid to write it the way he did write it. His argument is a good one because he presents both sides and shows where he is getting his information from. Another person or website that agrees is Reuters, in their article " Genetically modified human embryos should be allowed …

" they said, " is essential to gain basic understanding of the biology of early embryo's and should be permitted " He's saying that with future research and more understanding of the embryo we could genetically modify embryos. They can be trusted because they are telling us where the information is coming from. Though the question is who wrote it and can they be trusted, but it doesn't tell us so it could be questionable. Though the argument is strong he is telling us where the information came from and who said the information. So should we genetically modify embryos for the benefit of future generations? These few are saying that the pro's or outcome of genetically engineering embryos would be that it could help in the future of decreasing diseases and sickness for future generations to come after more research of course.

The other side however disagrees with the fact of genetically modifying embryos. One person who argues against it is Stuart A. Newman, in his article ” Don’t Try to Engineer Human Embryos ” he wrote, “.

.. eugenics poses societal risks of the most disturbing kind .

.. widely discussed scenario anticipates humanity eventually segregating into genetic castes…” Newman is basically saying if we do this then it could separate society into parts, making things worse instead of better. He can be a credible source because one of his expertise is in social and culture aspects. Though he can be lowered as a credible source because he is writing for people called CRG (Council for Responsible Genetics) and could be going by their view of the situation. To support his argument though he does present the other side of why they think it’s a good idea to genetically engineer embryos. On the other hand he has a fallacy of ad hominem at a point in his article, he wrote, ” Advocates of such a future includes scientist such as Lee Silver and James Watson. It is unfortunate that prominent members of such a profession … argue in favor of using genetic engineering to divide humanity into separate and unequal castes…” (Newman) Instead of focusing on the argument at this point he goes on to how they use their image to support genetic engineering and only focusing on that he thinks their making the wrong decisions instead of stating why they think that.

Another source is written by Wynne Parry, who was present in New York where experts were debating on banning genetic engineering in the US. She wrote in her article ” Designing Life: Should Babies Be Genetically Engineered ” , ” Sheldon Krimsky, a philosopher at Tufts University , ‘ But in

hundreds of thousands of trials that failed, we simply discarded the results of the unwanted crop or animal ‘ … making pinpoint genetic modifications, only to ‘ discard the results when they don’t work out? ‘ Krimsky asked.” In this article Parry writes how Krimsky thinks it would be wrong because of the embryos that would be tested on and if they fail will be discarded. This source can be credible because Parry writes mainly on science and knows what she is doing and Krimsky is skilled in science. On the other hand Krimsky is a teacher at a school and Parry is writing for a certain website so is most likely being paid. Though Parry’s article is strong she presents both sides in her article and where her information is coming from. Though in the quote that can be seen as generalization because Krimsky is saying because of unwanted results of one thing, and that it also means things like embryos and other objects genetically modified would be discarded as well.

Though because plants and other didn’t succeed at first doesn’t mean genetically modifying embryos will fail at first, but she does have a good point that there is a chance of failure at first and that basically people will be getting thrown away into the trash. These two people are saying that the cons of genetically engineering embryos would be splitting society apart and discarding failed test that would have potentially been a person. After considering the statements and reasons on both sides I have decided that genetically modifying embryos is a bad idea and agree with the side saying it should not be allowed or done. I have noticed all parts and that it could be a good idea but there are things like society, failures, and things like rights that need to be considered in all of this.

The person I agree with most is Stuart Newman. How he mentions in his article how it could “ mess up society and split us up, especially into parts for those who could afford the genetic engineering on their embryos compared to those who don’t have the profit to change theirs ” (Newman) Even though he does have a fallacy of ad hominem against someone he has a great point on the way society could change for the worse, I also agree with him because he studies social and culture aspects. I do see how if we were to genetically engineer embryos we could better benefit society and make it to where those who would end up with cancer would not have to be frightened of death and could enjoy all of life’s enjoyments, but I think we should just be natural about it and live life instead of changing things in humans who haven’t even developed and have a say in what they want to happen to themselves. I also feel that our individuality would be taken, that which makes us all different in some way. Newman, Stuart. “ Don’t Try to Engineer Human Embryos.

” CRG. July 25, 2000. Oct. 29, 2017.

http://www. councilforresponsiblegenetics. org/viewpage. aspx? pageid= 107Parry, Wynne. ” Designing Life: Should Babies Be Genetically Engineered.” Live Science. Feb.

18, 2013. Oct 28, 2017. https://www. livescience.

com/27206-genetic-engineering-babies-debate. htmlRegalado, Antonio. “ Engineering the Perfect Baby.

” MIT. March 5, 2015. Nov.

1, 2017. https://www. technologyreview. com/s/535661/engineering-the-perfect-baby/Reuters. “ Genetically modified human embryos should be allowed, expert group says.” TheGuardian.

Sept. 10, 2015. Oct. 29, 2017. https://www. theguardian. com/science/2015/sep/10/genetically-modified-human-embryos-should-be-allowed-expert-group-says