

17 September 2008

By: Dan Talpalariu, Science Editor



The sheep Dolly, the first cloned animal
Daily Mail

[Ethical Issues on Cloning Our Best People](#)

For the greater good, perhaps gene banks should store samples of remarkable people

Human cloning, although highly unofficial, is possible, and there are thousands of uses for it, from the medical organ donation to science and art. We've all wondered how a classical composer such as Mozart or Bach would fare in the modern world, and many would like to listen to more songs from Freddie Mercury. But is it ethical? First, let's cover the basics of what cloning is: it refers to the process of reproducing a genetically identical organism using nonsexual means. It was first applied to plants until 1997, when a Scottish team cloned the first animal, a sheep named Dolly. Since then, cows or mice have been cloned a lot, while unofficial channels also report human cloning attempts (or successes). South Korean researchers are noted to have already cloned human embryonic stem cells. But while repopulating endangered species of animals or plants might seem like a nice thing to do (if you're not supportive of the idea that those species are the normal consequence of natural selection), human cloning has already been forbidden in several states, after it issued vivid public, religious, political and scientific disputes. The cloning process is comprised of the somatic cell nuclear transfer and the in vitro fertilization. The first part implies the presence of an egg donor (you know what that refers to) and that of a cell from a person to be cloned. The nucleus of the egg is removed, resulting in an enucleated egg, which is then fused with the cloned person's cell by means of electricity. The resulting embryo is implanted in vitro to a surrogate mother. After that, nature follows its course, although it takes a number of trials (277 for Dolly) before all this succeeds. The clone baby wouldn't share any memory of its clone parent, but would have the same (or better, if genetically altered) abilities, mental or physical, than the latter does (or did). By not fertilizing the embryo, its cells can serve for creating stem cells, which would have wide therapeutic applications such as helping persons who suffer from severe medical impairments or illnesses. Other uses for human cloning: "resurrecting" dead relatives or helping people who can't have babies, enhancing certain abilities or traits, or continuing the work of extraordinary people through their clones. The arguments against the idea of cloning humans mainly rely on medical issues, such as the fact that most of the developed clones were defective in terms of health (heart or lung problems, innate diabetes or other diseases) and on the influence of a clone's upbringing, environment and education. The clone might share the qualities of its genetic parent, but the subsequent social and intellectual development might shape it entirely different. For the "pro-clones" argumentation part, it can be said that we're already doing it. We have entire sperm banks at our disposal, which are used for artificial insemination. The difference is that cloning only removes the mother's genes from the equation. Illnesses can now be detected for their most part since pregnancy stage. Some of the natural children are also likely to have such diseases and nobody denies their right to be born. Even if the clones eventually make nothing of their genetic inheritance in the expected direction, there is nothing lost, especially since they will obviously be intellectually superior to their average fellows. Regarding the expectations forced upon them, this is a common practice for natural children as well. Eventually, it's just a point of view. It will be up to humankind to either follow this practice for the greater good or bury it before anything wrong happens. Time, social acceptance and human needs will make this difference in the end.