

# The ethics debate surrounding stem cells essay

[Economics](#), [Budget](#)



These cells perform miraculous feats in terms of bringing a person back to wellness. Despite the extraordinary results SEES (embryonic stem) cells display, research fails to receive government funding based on statements made by conservative organizations. These bigoted groups make insistent claims that harvesting fetal tissue from a woman parallels murder. These outrageous notions hold untrue. To grant a woman permission to give her embryos up for research, her desire to donate must be entirely separate from a decision to terminate the pregnancy through abortion as discussed by John A. Robertson, Co-Chair of the Ethics Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine (Robertson).

The major controversy lies in what fetal tissues or human embryos ultimately symbolize. To put the idea into perspective, Doctor of Philosophy Michael J. Sanded says, " Consider an analogy: although every oak tree was once an acorn, it does not follow that acorns are oak trees, or that I should treat the loss of an acorn eaten by a squirrel in my front yard as the same kind of loss as the death of an oak tree felled by a storm. Despite their developmental continuity, acorns and oak trees are different kinds of things. So are human embryos and human beings. " (Sanded). Human embryos lack life experience or the development of emotions, intelligence, or memories.

These developing organisms have yet to be exposed to a world outside the womb walls, therefore do not constitute as living beings. Morals and ethics, as well as the lack of knowledge regarding the subject remain the most significant reasons for the halt in advancement of embryonic stem cell research. The issue lies in that people fail to possess the ability to determine when human life begins. Some argue that it is not until the time of birth, <https://assignbuster.com/the-ethics-debate-surrounding-stem-cells-essay/>

while others have committed to the idea that the moment of conception, life begins. The argument likely will never be settled. In a telephone survey conducted by Peter D. Hart Research Associates for the Civil Society Institute, between March 24 and 29 Of 2004, a total of 802 interviews were performed with registered voters in eighteen different states.

This study was conducted in order to determine what percentage of various demographics supported or rejected embryonic stem cell research. The results yielded that the individuals who received higher education (four or more years in college), people who hold a personal injection to the issue, those who strongly support medical research advancements, and voters who affiliate themselves with the Democratic Party tended to agree that embryonic stem cell research should be funded by the government. The results were found to be that 56% of college graduates supported, while 27% did not and that 65% of Democrats were for it while only 19% of the party were against it. (Peter D.

Hart Research Associates for the Civil Society Institute). It is evident that individuals who take the time to garner the information and educate themselves on such issues as embryonic stem cell research are the ones rightfully who support it. Religious and conservative lobbying organizations keep their minds closed and their mouths open when the topic of harvesting embryos comes about. What these groups fail to take into consideration is matters that greatly relate to abortion issues. If a woman were raped, likely she would want to donate her embryo, not because she mindlessly got pregnant and doesn't want the baby, but because that child would remain a

constant reminder Of what traumatically happened to her and perhaps she isn't ready to care for a child. This embryo as created in a time of terror, anger and pain. By giving up the child before it experienced life, the woman would be free to rid herself of the terrible occurrence and emotions associated with. Also, she would not need to stress over whether the child would spend its life in an orphanage or in an unloving home.

In such cases, the removal of the embryo should be encouraged in order to better someone else's life. The woman wouldn't have to raise an unwanted child and a patient in need could be cured of their illness. All parties involved would reap benefits. Lobbying organizations widely discredit the use of embryonic stem cells as they view the formation of a fertilized egg to possess the same life value as a grown adult. As long as this argument maintains throughout the world, advancements may fail to proceed. Through the testing that science performs, it has been determined that in the stage in which the embryos are harvested, ailments such as birth defects and cancer predispositions form and further develop with time. Oddly enough, embryonic stem cells (also referred to as pluripotent stem cells) hold the ability to reverse these pernicious conditions according to Dry.

Bethesda, MD Research Doctor (Bethesda). The list of people awaiting organ transplants in America grows greater each day. The amount of patients in need of organs incomparably outnumbers the supply available and most die during the wait.

Dry. Bethesda, MD (Bethesda) says, " Today, donated organs and tissues are often used to replace those that are diseased or destroyed. Unfortunately,

the number of people needing a transplant far exceeds the number of organs available for transplantation. plenteous stem cells Offer the possibility Of a renewable source of replacement cells and tissues to treat a myriad of sissies, conditions, and disabilities including Parkinson disease, metamorphic lateral sclerosis, spinal cord injury, burns, heart disease, diabetes, and arthritis. It seems that with the cure of such a vast array of diseases and disorders, embryonic stem cells would be sought after like gold, but this remains untrue. Through the decades many religious groups, most specifically Catholic, have protested against research involving embryonic stem cells.

As a part of these rallies, the groups have discovered a way to sway government officials thinking. In 2008 as reported by Journalist MelanieHunter, two pro-life groups staged a sit-out outside the California Department of Health and Human Services demanding research utilizing SEES cells be completely banned in an attempt to get through to President George W. Bush. Between 50 and 60 young members of the pro-life organization called “ Survivors” made public statements referring to themselves as “ survivors of the abortion holocaust”.

These group members proposed direct wishes to various workers who informed them they needed to pass the messages on to Washington, D. C. Themselves. The group did so, informing the president that f he arranged to support the federal funding of embryonic stem cell research, he would lose the votes Of a large percentage of Americans. With this in mind, Bush found it imperative to submit to their wishes in order to uphold his presidency. The

rally put a severe halt to the advancement and funding of further research (Hunter).

Many similar cases have arisen in recent years involving pro-lifers protesting medical research close-minded. During the presidency of Bill Clinton, a loophole was discovered to continue funding of embryonic stem cell research. Though it remains illegal and highly protested, dearly funded research has been banned but privately funded experimentation continues to thrive on.

With such hard-pressed opposition, it appears that funding for SEES cell research may never be recognized and appreciated as it rightfully deserves. As nearly every American supports and encourages cancer research, the budget in the past Fiscal Year reached \$4.8 billion as stated by the Nation Cancer Institute (Cancer Research Funding). Embryonic stem cell research receives about 5146.

1 million, barely a mere fraction to the cancer budget (NIH Stem Cell Research Funding, FEY 2002-2013). Though research has failed to make a breakthrough in curing cancer, embryonic stem cells have cured countless illnesses and disorders multiple times. Cancer research relies largely on animal testing, which kills millions of creatures each year, embryonic stem cell test only involve willing humans. Who's to say killing an animal to further bogus research is more ethical than harvesting an embryo that has never seen the light of day? Human embryos need to be harvested in order to save the lives of those who have created lives for themselves and have developed memories, emotions and ideas.