

Ethical debate on human cloning



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Today, science is developing at lightning speed. Today's science allows us to do many things that we would have appeared impossible a few decades ago, such as cloning. Firstly, what is cloning? Cloning is a process of producing genetically identical individuals, where one creates copies of cells or DNA fragments. But beyond the scientific level, the cloning issue has been controversial since ethics and morality on the same day when the idea was developed, there is this almost 100 years, and ethical questions raised about human cloning are several levels. Some objections relate to safety of human cloning experiments, because the process is far from being regarded as infallible, but it raises mostly moral and ethical objections that go well beyond issues of safety and scientific concerns. Indeed, we can question the motives of human cloning, whether some reasons are more acceptable than others, but also about the likely impact that this will lead to humanity. Is cloning morally acceptable?

On the one hand, according to the theories of Greek philosopher Aristotle, it would be true to say that human cloning is unethical because of the ridiculous methods are employed to get there. Indeed, many methods developed and the many uses of cloning technologies destroy lives and do nothing but harm. For example, it took just over 277 tests before the scientists can create the first clone. Moreover, the theory of naturalism ethics, methods of cloning are not the result of an action according to the order of nature, in other words, cloning is not consistent with human nature, because is not natural for humans to be cloned. Moreover, if cloning ever becomes a reality in the near future, it will be a reasonable way to contribute to the good of humanity. Unreasonable use of cloning for the purpose of an

individualistic happiness could lead to irreversible consequences on humans and society.

On the other hand, if we look at the ethical theories of philosopher John Stuart Mill, human cloning would be beneficial as long as the number of people who benefit outweighs the number of people who suffer. In fact, according to Mill, the calculation of the moral value of any action is the result of the sum between the consequences and results of this action, the addition of happiness generated and pain caused. Unlike Kant, Mill gives no weight to the intent of this gesture, but he still believes that the consequences of an action determine its moral value. For example, cloning kills clones that have been a failure in experiments, but it could be a way to help prolong life. According to the theory of utilitarianism, Mill also believes that actions must be judged on how they promote human happiness for the greatest number of people, and action is deemed morally acceptable as it tends to promote happiness, because for Mill, happiness is the only true virtue. In this way, then Mill would agree that improving the lot of all humanity in exchange for a small group of less fortunate people is justified because they are not the consequences that must guide us, but rather the intention which is hidden behind our action. In short, cloning is morally acceptable to society because it leads to the greatest happiness for the greatest number of men.

Finally, contrary to Mill, Immanuel Kant would disagree with cloning because we use people as a means to an end, even if it is to save or to benefit a greater number of people. According to the principle of universalization, any action is not morally acceptable if it harms the interests of humanity, or if it leads to the destruction thereof. For example, we must ask ourselves

whether it is possible that all humans on the planet can be cloned or have the right to do so. If we allowed everyone to be cloned, what would happen? The answer is obvious: it would lead inevitably to global overpopulation and thereby would cause the destruction of humanity. Moreover, cloning violates the principle of Kant to a certain level, because if we make a clone in order to create a superior race, having clear expectations about the personality and physical abilities of the individual or psychological, would undermine the fundamental principles of humanity or respect for others, minorities and the individuality of human beings. In addition, if one based on the possibility that humans could be cloned to provide organs can then be transplanted into the donor DNA without risk of rejection, he admits that creating a clone simply as a source of “ spare parts” is a flagrant violation of the principles of Kant. Indeed, this method would be selfish for those who can not afford such a transplant, and it also results from the use of people to achieve something. In short, cloning does not therefore comply with the various principles of Kant and makes cloning morally unacceptable.

In conclusion, the ethical theories of various philosophers therefore lead us to have many different views on this new scientific approach so controversial. While the proponents of human cloning argue that the initial negative reaction is simply a common response of man had something new and unknown, it is clear that the ethical debate on human cloning is not the point of fade. It remains nonetheless that cloning would violate a lot and very widespread belief about the individuality and the freedom of every human right, because what is the value of a human being is its uniqueness. The living being is unique and indeterminable.