

# A persuasive essay for the use of stem cells for research essay sample

[Family](#), [Abortion](#)



Many people have not been fully informed on the topic of human pluripotent stem cell research. Most American have heard a lot on one side, and very little on the other. Hence, they have not and can not fully evaluate the facts and can only give snap decisions, according to [religioustolerance. com](http://religioustolerance.com). Having heard extensive lectures on both sides, I believe that embryonic stem cell research shows great promise in bettering the medical and scientific community. I agree with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (also known as the AAAS) when they believe that stem cell research should be legally and ethically accepted.

Using stem cell could reduce the dependence on organ donations and transplantations. In a survey posted on [religioustolerance. com](http://religioustolerance.com), a little more than seventy percent of all Americans support the question, “ Do you favor the use of existing stem cells in research to cure ot treat dozens of serious diseases such as Alzheimer’s, diabetes, heart disease, and Parkinson’s disease?” Don’t you think that it would good idea to help cure diseases? Well, most of the people in the United States do, too. There has to be something good about curing people.

What exactly are stem cells? The Center for Bioethics and Human dignity states that the difination of them cell are the vital cells from whick all of the two hundred ten different kinds of tissue in the human body originate. And why are some people saying that it is not morally right? Most arguments on the topic of trem cell research are that to obtain stem cells, a scientist or embryologist must extract the cells from a human embryo. After the cells are extracted, the embryo is unable to grow and ultimately dies. Some scientists

that work for the American Association for the Advancement of Science believe that stem cell research can co-exist with the Supreme Court's 1973 legalization of abortion. The same survey that was posted on [religioustolerance.com](http://religioustolerance.com), states that before hearing all sides of the stem cell argument, most people who consider themselves pro-lifers, strongly opposed embryonic stem cell research.

After they took the time to hear the supporting sides, fifty-six percent of those pro-lifers now were in support of stem cell research. How many other people oppose stem cell research just because they haven't heard the supporting side? As Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research chairperson, Lawrence Soler says, " This survey shows beyond a doubt that the American people have a strong sense of the promise of embryonic stem cell research and that they want it to go forward." Having looked at all the statistics, myself, I strongly agree with all that this CAMR chairperson states.

There are many people who think that stem cell research should be used because it can help treat people who are suffering from some disease. These people believe that scientists should find alternative ways to obtain stem cells, other than extracting them from an embryo. Scientists and embryologists have been considering many options for this question.

According to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, stem cells can be removed from adult subjects without harming them. Adult stem cells are extremely hard to remove. They are also severely limited in quantity and they appear to be extraordinarily limited in their usefulness.

Another process that has been considered and tested is to remove the stem cells that are found in umbilical cords from newborn babies. The extraction of these cells has no risk of harming anybody or anything, according to the AAAS. "Okay, then what's the problem with it?", you might ask. The downside to this method is that the stem cells in the umbilical cord are no longer considered embryonic and are now adult. Because of this, they have the same problems as scientists do with adult stem cells. They are hard to obtain, and are limited in quality and quantity.

In a statement from the AAAS, it has been suggested that a scientist or embryologist might try to receive stem cells from aborted embryos. This is a good idea, but the possibility of donating the fetus for stem cell research might encourage more women to have abortions. It may also justify abortions that otherwise could not be justified. It is an existing law which permits researchers to use fetal tissue obtained from elective abortions. This law requires that the abortions are performed for reasons which are entirely unrelated to the researchers objectives. In order to get stem cells from an aborted fetus, it must only be up to one month old. Most women do not know until at least the first month. If it is any older, the stem cells have already started the process of forming into other cells. Also, knowledge cannot, currently, be obtained from cadaveric fetal tissue.

I agree with the AAAS when they say that they believe that the use of stem cells derived from a fetus should be acceptable, but with limitations.

Scientists accepting the fetuses should be certain that the decision to have an abortion was different than the decision to donate the fetus. A person

who would be able to donate their aborted fetus for separate means, should be acceptable. But the commercialization of or the selling of a fetus should not only be unacceptable, but also illegal.

Yet another option that has been explored is using in-vitro embryos. Stem cells can be extracted from these embryos that are left over. In-vitro is a fertilization process for couples who are having difficulties conceiving a child. When the woman who uses the option is finally impregnated, she no longer needs the others that have been prepared for her. They have extra embryos due to the fact that if one embryo fails, they can try another one. Right now, there are many such embryos. What kind of problem would someone have from using this form of stem cell extraction? The problem with using the in-vitro method, says the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is that scientists are not allowed to use the embryos until the mother's full pregnancy has passed. Thus, not all of these embryos are available at all times. They never know exactly when they are going to need a specific embryo.

The 195th General Assembly in 1983, discourages the "development of human embryos and their use for experimentation, except in those cases of clearly demonstrable benefit where no other substitute could accomplish the same end." As the preceding states, the only way to get the end result our embryologists and scientists want is to use embryonic stem cells. All other attempts had at least one variable that would not allow the experiment to work. Extensive research has indicated that stem cell research continues to develop very rapidly. As stated by Connis Mack, former senator, "Many

Americans feel that this research hold enormous promise for saving lives and that we should view this from a personal view, rather than a political one because it is not a pro-life, pro-choice issue, I agree. Tens of millions of Americans-and my family and I are among them-know the pain and loss of cancer and other life-threatening illnesses. This research gives us great hope and it deserves our support.”