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Cloning has been going on in the natural world for thousands of years. A clone is simply one living thing made from another, leading to two organisms with the number of genes. In that sense, identical twins are clones, because they have identical DNA. Sometimes, plants are self-pollinated, producing seeds and eventually more plants with the same genetic code. When earthworms are cut in half, they regenerate the missing parts of their bodies, leading to two worms with the same set of genes. Any organism that reproduces asexually; produces a clone. Ever since the conception of cloning, the creation of engineered animals provided a major stepping stone for the process of cloning cells and even humans. the ability to intentionally create a clone in the animal kingdom by working on the cellular level is a very recent development. From sheep to monkeys, scientist have made great strides in the past few years in cloning mammals. The possibilities and benefits of cloning are endless, and it is a Science worth pursuing. Benefits from saving endangered animals, growing replaceable organs for humans, or even developing regenerative cells for sick humans. The Roadblock and the question to cloning is just one concern. Is it ethical?

In this day and age where technology drives society, biological technology is one of the ones on the for-front. Step by step science has gotten to the point where Scientist are now capable to clone a human being. Controversy over the process is high. Many blockades are in place to limit the growth and usage of this technology due to many reasons, the main being ethical concerns from society and anti-cloning groups. Scientists believe the technology for human cloning, at least a limited type of cloning for now which is semi ethical is available. Starting small with animal or human stem cells or even pushing the boundaries, by experimenting with human reproductive biology that provides technical means for cloning humans. Many scientists who work with cloned animals say that the procedure is difficult and dangerous and unethical to try on humans. Issue’s ranging from encouraging the process of cloning until a successful clone is made, while discarding failed embryos. Turning human beings and clones into commodities and human rights issues for clones. Assault against god’s design, etc. The issues relating to ethics are endless on topic of cloning. (All. org). To get around these issues have led scientists to bend some rules while experimenting with the technology. Developing emerging technologies that can be directly applicable to the potential of human cloning, such as experimenting with small animals such as mice or stem cells of other animals. (http://www. scientificamerican. com/article. cfm? id= study-suggests-cloned-mic)

In order to make a fully justified decision on whether human cloning is ethical or not, one must be exposed to the background of the subject. To start, a clone is an exact replica of an organism, cell, or gene. The process itself is done asexually with the use of a cell from the original human. It is then placed inside a female capable of bearing a child and is then born as a clone. Along with this comes questions of whether or not it is right to clone a human being based on different facts and opinions of small groups or communities (buzzle. com/articles/human-cloning/).

The technology of cloning is not quite developed enough for a doctor to be certain that an experiment will be successful. In Scotland, the first sheep was cloned and was named Dolly. It took over 250 tries before they were successful in creating the successful clone.( buzzle. com/articles/human-cloning) When this news reached the world, immediate polls showed that the majority of the world were against the idea of cloning humans. Those who support cloning research replied by saying, the public based their opinions on fallacies of the news media and misunderstandings of the process, therefore, could not comprehend the whole concept Those in favor of cloning might say it can push forward medical research. For example, with cloning technology it may be possible to learn how to replace old cells with new ones. Help fight certain diseases, etc. This could lead to a longer life for individuals.

With enough research scientists could create clones to act as donors. Basically Shells of human beings with organs. Human shells without brains that can be harvested for their organs. Organs such as Hearts, lungs, livers, kidneys, etc. Some scientists even say that human cloning may eventually reverse heart attack through simple cloning methods that involve stem cells from human embryos. This accomplishment would take place by injecting healthy heart cells into damaged heart tissue. In addition, cloning could help improve psychological and human family life. For example, if a couple lost a child they loved dearly and could not reproduce naturally, cloning that child could be an alternative. In this way, the parents would have the chance to love the clone just as much as the original child. (http://www. geneticsandsociety. org/)

On the other hand, those against cloning would say that it is wrong for a doctor to harm a clone. If this were allowed, eventually we would compromise the individual. Clones would become second-class citizens. Cloning strips humanity from natural reproduction by leaving a clone with only one parent. In addition, there would be a decline in genetic diversity. In other words, if some day we all have the same genetic makeup and lose the technology of cloning, we would have to resort back to natural reproduction. This would cause problems because it has the same effect as inbreeding. In the same way, clones would feel like they had lost their individuality. For example, their genetic makeup would be known. Also, there could be negative psychological effects that will impact the family and society. For instance, if a clone finds out that he or she has no biological father it may suppress the clone’s feeling of equality among other naturally born people. Also, there is a chance that the mother or the clone may become sterile. Among all of these there are too many risks for the bearing mothers and embryos. Eventually, it would turn into a routine to destroy human embryos in the process of cloning.

According to Religious groups contend that cloning does not respect the fact that humans have souls and it robs clones of their humanity. God intended the power to create humans to be practiced between a man and a woman in the boundaries of marriage and natural means. Doing otherwise is going against the work of God into human hands. This means that humans lack the authority to make decisions about creating or destroying a life. In addition, humans do not have enough knowledge or power to control outcomes of certain events. However, others believe religion has no place in the debate. Atheists or agnostic argue, interpreters of the Bible can’t agree on what actions God would allow to be done with justified means. In addition, Religion and religious books have limits to their validity because they do not address specific issues that need to be answered.

People can say human cloning is unethical because bad means are used to achieve the goals For instance, it took scientists 277 tries to create the first cloned sheep. This means that there were hundreds of deformities before the successful specimen was created. In the same way, deformities of humans would be a result of experimentation, which would decrease the quality of life for those specific clones. Recent studies have shown, most cloned mammals tend to die early unless perfected the process is painstakingly difficult. And, even if we found a cure for a disease, let’s say cancer, it would be reaching a good end through bad means. http://www. scientificamerican. com/

On the other hand, people for the process would say that human cloning is ethical in that the number of people who benefit from it outweighs the number of people who suffer from it. For example, cloning could be a way to help expand the length of human life, but it would cost the lives of clones who were failures in the experiment. In this way, realists and people for cloning would agree that bettering all of humanity in exchange for a small group of less fortunate people is justified. would say the act of cloning a human being is an act of human will separate from god or religion. Therefore, if an individual decided to go forward in this act, because humans have the ability to do it, it should be done.

After taking into account many of the alternatives and situations of cloning, Human cloning should be supported. The effects from all of the harms that are unknown outweigh all of the good that can come from the research of cloning. Many sacrifices must be made, including possible consequences to society and civilization to accommodate this science. cloning involves too much unknown information that we would need in order to even consider it, but we can’t proceed or perfect without taking the first step. If scientists had enough information to be able to clone a human without a doubt, then it might be ethical to clone. But, the social stigma would still be present; clones would be seen as inferior to naturally reproduced humans even if they were perfected copies identical to humans. Once the support of legalization of cloning or any practices is passed. Laws can also be passed to grant rights to Clones. But as of right now, if humans could be cloned without the risk of death or intentional killing of clones for organ transplants it would be more acceptable to practice it. This would be a great start before cloning full humans.

The possibilities and benefits of cloning are endless, and it shouldn’t be something that should be feared. The Pro’s of cloning significantly outweigh the negatives of cloning, so the obstacles blocking the technology from being used should be demolished. A technology that can be of immense great use to Human civilization, shouldn’t be something that is discarded.