

Morals and ethics of cloning

[Sociology](#), [Ethics](#)



Regardless of what our future holds, it will be based on the decisions we make today. Those decisions can be made using the Utilitarian Theory which states that we are doing good for the greatest number of people. Using Rule Utilitarianism " which maintains that a behavioral code or rule is morally right if the consequences of adopting that rule are more favorable than unfavorable to everyone. (IEP)" is justifiably noted that if a consensus is formed on the basis of rules that govern cloning, and these rules are broken, the appropriate punishment will result.

This is because cloning a human will not benefit the society as a whole; it would do more harm than good. We all have rules that govern our society over what is right or wrong and we know that these rules are set forth to maintain order. We have laws because it benefits the majority of the people.

Principles of Consequences state that when looking at the end result, the correct action will be the action that produces the greatest amount of happiness (Utilitarianism). To decide if human cloning produces the greatest amount of happiness we have one question still in need of an answer is " Are human embryos really human?" Well, the term 'human' preceding the term 'embryo' should adequately answer the question.

The embryos are cloned from human tissue, contain human DNA, thus there is likely a 100 percent chance that the embryos are indeed human, as opposed to being tadpole embryos. Therefore, biologically speaking a clone is no less a human than you or I. And using that human for tissue simply because he/she was cloned rather than conceived does not validate the notion, nor skip around the moral and ethical implications of taking the life of

another human being. Death is not a happy occasion therefore it does not produce the greatest amount of happiness to the majority of the population.

Cloning is the process of taking cells from a donor, placing them in a culture dish where the nutrients are minimal, so the cells stop dividing and switch their "active genes". The cells are then put next to an unfertilized egg. The nucleus is sucked out of the egg leaving an empty egg cell containing all the cellular machinery necessary to produce an embryo. An electric shock is used to fuse the egg and cell together. A second shock is then used to mimic the act of fertilization and help begin cell division. After the egg has successfully moved to the stage of an embryo it is then placed in to the uterus of a surrogate mother. When born, all the genes are the same as the donor of the cell.

In 1997 Dr. Ian Wilmut, a British scientist successfully cloned a sheep named Dolly. This turned the scientific world upside-down. The success of the experiment is considered by all as an amazing achievement in science. However, ethics and morals must surface to regulate cloning. It is understood that individuality is the most important part of life. Individuality is given to a person at birth and considered a right they will have for rest of their life.

There is also a fear that the clone may only be produced to live the life of the clone, thus causing severe emotional damage as well pain and suffering for the clone. The progression of the clone may be limited, the advance in idea development will slowly die off. Evolution could come to a halt, because with clones, diversity will be limited and there will not be as many advances in

society. The cells, in all humans, will all be the same and there will not be a process of natural selection and diversity.

Another controversial question facing the cloning process is: How will the clones be treated? The emotions of the clones need to be taken in to consideration; after all they are humans too. " What is common to these various views, however, is a shared understanding that being a 'person' is different from being the manipulated 'object' of other peoples desires and expectations"(Biomedical Ethics). People, as clones, will be studied, prodded, and poked which in turn will cause much unwanted anxiety and emotional distress.

There will also be problems with relationships between parents and the clone for understandable reasons. It will bring up a lot of unwelcome stress for the clone when one " parent" is an anonymous donor of an egg and the other is Dr. Frankenstein. Some may argue that a child is a child and the parents should love their child unconditionally. However, the bond between the clone and the parents who care for the clone may have awkward encounters. The love and affection that is provided for most children will not be the same due to the fact that the clone is considered to be more of an experiment rather than a child. Another argument may be that artificial insemination has already taken the step of engineering babies. However, artificial insemination is used for parents who can not have children but feel they could provide a loving environment for them.

Despite the abundant differences and backgrounds of the world today all most people agree that coitus (sex) is the naturally preferred way to conceive a child. With the cloning process the necessity to have coitus will

<https://assignbuster.com/morals-and-ethics-of-cloning/>

not be needed. " Is there something about the individual that is lost when the mystical act of conceiving a person becomes standardized into a mere act of photocopying one" (Time)?

The parent's will not have to conceive a child, just order one from a catalog and have it arrive next day air. It will take away the personal feeling and romance that having " a child of your own" creates. Part of the bliss of having a child is the mystery behind it. Is it a boy? A girl? Who does it look like? Cloning will take away from the pleasures that have been happening for countless years and the elements of surprise will fade in to mail order babies.

Another very touchy issue is the question of, is the medical world taking too much control? It is stated by scientists that if they are allowed to clone people, one won't have to worry about organ donations or blood drives in order for people to survive. The scientists will simply clone an organ and replace the faulty one in the human. As simple as this seems, the issue of who they can use to clone comes up. Finding the ideal person to clone is hard enough, now try to get one with the right blood type, size, and gender.

The numbers decrease and it seems as if the scientists would have to clone someone for each person. If this is true, would the clones be stored somewhere, or able to roam around the world until they were needed to fill their role? Once again the rights of the clones come up and the thought of clone farms creates a sort of " yuck" factor for everyone.

According to Time Magazine, " Out of 277 tries, the researchers eventually produced only 29 embryos that survived longer than six days" out of the

remaining 29 only one survived and was born. The percentage is very low leaving people wondering if it is even worth the time and effort put in. " Some clones may indeed be growing old before their time"(U. S. News). The research states that the clones will not live a whole life due to the one cell that has been cloned is older and effects the rest of the clones cells making them advance prematurely. Instead of using science to lengthen the life of a human cloning will decrease the length of life by half.

Scientists need to reconsider how they are manipulating the world. Based on the information provided through the research, doctors should step back and take a look at the morals and ethics of cloning humans and evaluate if it is really worth the risk doctors are taking.

The bad consequences out way the good, therefore we cannot assume that the benefit of human cloning will solve life's problems. To this day we have yet to find a cure for the common cold. This is because most diseases have a way of surviving, as did the human race during the ice age. Everything finds a way to adapt to it's environment and if the benefits major benefit for cloning is to cure diseases, then we are at a loss. The fight for life " survival of the fittest" can sum it up.

If we result to cloning as a means for reproduction, then who is to say that our bodies might not adapt to this, only allowing for this type of reproduction? Only then will we realize that in our effort to gain knowledge and power over every other living thing, did we fail. Everything on this earth has to be in perfect balance, and when we continue to tamper withMother Nature, she finds a way to fight back. For example, the ozone layer is being depleted because of chemical agents produced and released into the

<https://assignbuster.com/morals-and-ethics-of-cloning/>

atmosphere by man. As a result, the ozone layer can longer protect our skin as it used too, causing more cases of skin cancer every year. I believe that if you push someone, or in this case, something (Mother Nature) hard enough, she will push back. We need to take things as they are given to us, the good and the bad. When we try to beat the odd, sometimes the odds beat us.

Bibliography

Biomedical Ethics Opposing Viewpoints. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc, 1998

Cloning (1998). How to Clone a Human (Version 1. 1). [On-line] Biofact November 8, 1999. Available: <http://www.biofact.com/cloning/human.html>

Cloning (1998). Human Cloning Plans. [On-line] NPR November 8, 1999 Available

" Dolly, Polly, Gene-send in the clones" Science News. January 23, 1997. pp. 127

Cloning (1999). Should Cloning Be Banned? [On-line] Reasons November 5, 1999 Available: <http://www.reasons.com/biclone.html>

Kluger, Jeffrey. " Goodbye, Dolly" Time June 7, 1999. pp. 70

Nash, J. " The Age of Cloning" Time March 10, 1999. pp. 60-75

Macklin, Ruth. " Human cloning? Don't just say no". U. S. News & World Report. March 10, 1997. pp. 64

Couzin, Jennifer " What's Killing The Clones?" U. S. News & World Report.
May24, 1999. pp. 65