

Human Clone: Who Is Related To Whom

B Rai, S Dhattarwal, D Kharb, R Jain, L Kharb, S Kharb, S Anand

Citation

B Rai, S Dhattarwal, D Kharb, R Jain, L Kharb, S Kharb, S Anand. *Human Clone: Who Is Related To Whom*. The Internet Journal of Law, Healthcare and Ethics. 2006 Volume 4 Number 2.

Abstract

In principle, human cloning does not represent a forbidden interference in nature, on condition that its use is limited specifically to those cases that would benefit mankind. Multiprofessional commissions should be established to deal with positive and negative aspects of the subject so as to maintain genetic stability and biological diversity.

INTRODUCTION

The response of most scientific and political leaders to the prospect of human cloning, indeed of Dr. Wilmut as well, was of immediate and strong condemnation.¹ In the united states President Clinton immediately federal financing of human cloning research and asked privately funded scientists to halt such work until the newly formed National Bioethics Advisory Commission could review the “troubling” ethical and legal implications.² The Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) characterized human cloning as ethically unacceptable as it would violate some of the basic principles which govern medically assisted reproduction.³ A few more cautious voices were heard, both suggesting some possible benefits from the use of human cloning in limited circumstances and questioning its too quick prohibition, but they were a clear minority. This paper reviews argument on Human Cloning.

POTENTIAL DRAWBACKS PROBLEMS

The development of eugenic techniques to duplicate people with special characteristics (intellectual genius, exceptional strength, beauty etc.), or the wish of evil dictators such as Hitler, Gaddafior Sadolam Hussain to replicate themselves.⁴ The creation of large groups of people who are identical not only in their external appearance but also in their human characteristics, such that the individuality as each person is eradicated. This would lead us to lose the basic respect which we feel for people specifically because each person is different and unique. In addition, such a situation could exert a profoundly negative psychological influence on the identical cloned products. Also, there will be the threat of a “black market” for fetuses created from people with “positive” characteristics. Tailor made babies : demand for

babies with outstanding intelligence, strength, beauty etc., would create an industry of fetuses which would be sold to potential parents desiring such children.⁴

MORAL RIGHT TO USE HUMAN CLONING

When individuals have alternative means of procreating, human cloning typically would be chosen because it replicate a particular individual's genome. The reproductive interest in question then is not simply reproduction itself, but a more specific interest in choosing what kind of children to have.⁵ The right to reproductive freedom is usually understood to cover at least some choice about the kind of children one will have; for example, genetic testing of an embryo or fetus for genetic disease or abnormality, together with abortion of an affected embryo or fetus, are now used to avoid having a child with that disease or abnormality.⁶ The more a reproductive choice is not simply the determination of oneself and one's own life but the determination of the nature of another, as in the case of human cloning, the more moral weight the interest of that other person, that is the cloned child, should have in decisions that determine its nature.⁷

HUMAN CLONING AS ETHICAL

Another position defends the use of human cloning in medically based circumstances, provided that the safety of the procedure can be guaranteed.⁸ According to this perspective, clone would meet an infertile couple's desire to participate biologically in development of a new human being, and it could nurture the emotional bond between the partners. If conceiving a child with the genes of atleast one partner is highly important for infertile couples, or is they have reservations about using the genetics of anonymous

donors, human clone would be welcome alternative.⁹

Human cloning would solve the problem of finding a transplant donor who is an acceptable organ or tissue match and would eliminate, or drastically reduce, the risk of transplant rejection by the host. The availability of human cloning for this purpose would amount to a form of insurance policy to enable treatment of certain kinds of medical needs.^{10,11,12} Kahn (1989) has proposed human cloning then might well produce individuals with exceptional capacities, but we simply do not know how close their clones would be in capacities or accomplishments to the great individuals for whom they were cloned.¹³ Human cloning and research on human cloning might make possible important advances in scientific knowledge.¹⁴

HUMAN CLONING UNETHICAL ISSUE

Human cloning would devalue the genetic distinctiveness of each individual. It would deprive the child of a sense of mystery or right to ignorance about his or her origin.¹⁵ Moreover, it would amount to unethical experimentation on the child, who cannot consent to be conceived in a manner that poses risks to her or his health throughout life that can not completely be addressed. For those who subscribe to this perspective, no situation would justify human cloning because the act itself is considered immoral. Human cloning should be respected as barometer of what is intuitively unacceptable.¹⁶

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AND FINANCIAL

No doubt knowing the path in life taken by one's earlier twin may in many cases have several bad psychological effects.¹⁷ The later twin may feel, even if mistakenly, that his or her fate has already been substantially laid out, and so have difficulty freely and spontaneously taking responsibility for and making his or her own fate and life.¹⁸ If the later twin is the clone of a particularly exemplary individual, perhaps with some special capabilities and accomplishments, he or she may experience excessive pressure to reach the very high standards of ability and accomplishments of the earlier twin.¹⁹ Ruth Macklin has explored and criticized the claim that human cloning would lead to persons being viewed as replaceable.²⁰ In a science fiction frame of mind, one can imagine commercial interests offering genetically certified and guaranteed embryos for sale, perhaps offering a catalogue of different embryos cloned from individuals with a variety of talents, capacities and other desirable properties. This would be a fundamental violation of the equal moral respect and dignity owed to all persons, treating them

instead of objects to be differentially valued, bought and sold in the market place.²¹

CLONING AND FAMILIES

The birth of a long awaited child for couples experiencing infertility or genetic risk might have positive effects in families in which genetic relatedness is highly valued. On the other hand, human clone would create the new relationship of a person being raised by a genetic twin who is also the social parent.²² Although this need not be injurious, the birth of a child who shares the genome of one parent might contribute to feelings of inadequacy among siblings who do not share a parent's genome or feelings of inadequacy among siblings who do not share a parent's genome or feelings of superiority by child who does. A situation in which partners have different degrees of genetic relatedness to a child may or may not be troublesome. This is not unlike situations in which a family's children have different genetic backgrounds because of remarriage or conception questions about who is related to whom and about privileges and responsibilities in event of divorce.

Thus close supervision of development and use of this technology in order to prevent complete breakdown of the existing world social order and prevent socio-halachic problems for generation to come.

CORRESPONDENCE TO

Dr. Balwant Rai S/o Sh. Ramsawroop Village – Bhangu
Distt. Sirsa Post Office – Sahuwala I. E-mail :
drbalwantraissct@rediffmail.com Mobile No. :
091-9812185855

References

1. Wilmut IM, Schnieke AE, McWhir J, Kind AJ, Campbell KHS. Viable offspring derived from fetal and adult mammalian cells. *Nature* 1997; 385 : 810-3.
2. SV.S. National Bioethics Advisory Committee. 6 June 1997. "Cloning Human Beings" Washington, D.C.
3. World Health Organization, WHO Director General Condemns Human Cloning, Geneva, Switzerland : World Health Organization Press Office, March 11, 1997.
4. Steinberg A, Loike J.D. Human Cloning : Scientific Ethical and Jewish Perspectives. *Jewish Medical Ethics*. 1998; 125 : 11-19.
5. Robertson J.A., *Children of choice : Freedom and the new reproductive techniques*, Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 1994 (a).
6. Brock D.W., *Reproductive freedom : its nature, bases and limits, in health care ethics : critical issues for health professionals*, D. Thomasma, J Monagle (eds.), Craithersburg, MD : Aspen Publishers, 1994.
7. Annas G.J. Regulatory models for human embryo cloning : The free market professional guidelines, and government restrictions, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 1994; 4 (3) : 235-49.

8. Robertson J.A. Two models of human cloning : Hofstra Law Review 1997 ; 27 : 609-38.
9. Strong C. Cloning and infertility. Combo Health Care Ethics 1998; 7 : 279-93.
10. Harris J. Wonder women and superman : The ethics of biotechnology, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1992.
11. Kahn C. Can be achieve immortality? Free Inquiry, 1989; 9 : 14-18.
12. Robertson JA. A ban on cloning and cloning research is Unjustified, testimony before the national bioethics advisory commission, March 1997.
13. Kderberg J. Experimental genetics and human evolution, the American Naturalist, 1966; 100 : 519-31.
14. Smith GP. Intimations of immortality : clones, cyrons and the law, University of New South Wales Law Journal, 1983 ; 6 : 119-32.
15. Anns GJ. Why we should ban human cloning. N Engl J Med. 1998; 339 : 122-5.
16. Kass LK. The wisdom of repugnance. New Republic 1997; 17-26.
17. Callahan D. Perspective on cloning : a threat to individual uniqueness, Los.
18. Studdard A. The lone clone, man and medicine : The Journal of values and ethics in health care, 1978; 3 : 109-114.
19. Rainer JD. Commentary, man and medicine : Journal of values and ethics in health care, 1978; 3 : 115-117.
20. Macklin R. Splitting embryos on the slippery slope : ethics and public policy, Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, 1994; 4 : 209-26.
21. Turner PO. Love's labor lost : legal and ethical implications in artificial procreation, University of Detroit Journal of Urban Law, 1981; 58 : 459-87.
22. The ethics committee of the American Society for reproductive medicine : Human somatic cell nuclear transfer. Fertil Steril : 2000; 5 : 1573-9.

Author Information

Balwant Rai, B.D.S.

Resident, Government Dental College, Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science

S. K. Dhattarwal, M.D. (Forensic Medicine)

Associate Professor, Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science

Deepa Kharb, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Law, National Law College, M.D. University

Rajnish Jain, Ph.D., M.D.S. (Endodontics)

Senior Lecturer, Government Dental College, Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science

Latika Kharb

Research Scholar, Department of Computer Science & Application, M.D.U. Rohtak

Simmi Kharb, Ph.D, M.D. (Biochemistry)

Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science

S. C. Anand, (M.D.S.) Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery and Orthodontics

Professor (Brig.), Government Dental College, Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science