

MORAL AND SOCIAL EVIL IN HUMAN CLONING: A PHILOSOPHICAL EVALUATION

CHUKWUMA JOSEPH NNAEMEKA

revjnchukwuma@yahoo.com

08037723330

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT UNN

AND

ONWE, JERRY N.

Abstract- The ethics of human cloning is a do-or-not issue in the science of cloning and bio-technology. Since the successful cloning of Dolly the sheep, the issue of human cloning has been a controversial agenda. According to the proponents of this development, there is a possibility of creating genetically identical human beings just as that of Dolly the sheep, animals and tissues of living and dead organisms could also be cloned from a single genetic progenitor. Some bio-technologists claim that if human cloning is in place, the issue of childlessness, starvation and premature death would be augmented. Hence, science of cloning advances science of embryonic research. There are some ethicists who insist that the attitude of bio-technology (science of cloning) should be evaluated since it uses human beings as objects of scientific experiments. And human beings are ends in themselves and not a means to an end. Perhaps, the negative implications of science of cloning outweigh its positive implications. Therefore, it is morally and socially reprehensible and evil for human beings to pursue. In an attempt to address this problem, we explored the tenets in cloning, the sanctity of human identity, the law of nature, life and human nature, objective good in cloning and cloning and family structure. In conclusion, we contend that science of cloning should not be allowed in human terrain.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the inception of the science of cloning, it has generated spates of controversies in moral and bioethical domains. This new development has two-sided characteristics, the good and the evil. This creates two opposing camps. Some thinkers succinctly argued that ethics of cloning is evil (antagonists) while others aver that cloning is a development not different from science and technology which seeks to enhance human life.

Undoubtedly, if the science of human cloning is in place, humanity has finally been brought to a brink of precipice. Hence, human beings by nature are end themselves not means to an end as the Science of cloning depicts. The proponents of bioethics who advocate for science of cloning argue that, the science of cloning came to resurrect the comatose state of science and technology. Precisely, the science of embryology or heredity. However, cloning is good in the sense that it tends to liberate man from the shocks of premature death, and more so revolutionize our agro-industries, etc. These provisions are not enough to reduce human intrinsic values as the objects of scientific experiment. Meanwhile, cloning has spiritual implications such like devaluation of human identity. Essentially, man is a spirit and the fact that human being is component of two realities; the body which houses the inner man, and the soul which is the

seat of human essence. If this misnomer of a development called science of cloning is not evaluated human essence will be animated.

Consequently, the traditional theorists of cloning and agriculturist who introduced this science of cloning claim that the science of cloning purposely came to enrich agro – industries, but not to reduce human value to a state of precipice. By and large, the science of cloning raises some critical questions to whether cloning is evil or good? Why cloning? In what condition if any could human cloning be justified? Is human cloning justified in the case of a married couple who has no child? Does science of cloning have any impact on human identity? What are the social benefits of cloning? A stark human-centered ethicist would answer the above questions with no romance on the science of cloning. He will vehemently posit that the ethics of cloning is both ethical and social evil. Hence during the traditional era only agro-products were cloned. But in the later years some groups of scientists diverted the biotechnology to centre on animals like sheep; frogs' egg and pea. The successful cloning of Dolly the sheep owe to the agitations for human cloning. Thus the science of cloning gained popularity in twentieth century, though it has been posited by selfish scientists and biotechnologists who refused to evaluate the nature of cloning and its ethical implications.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLONING

In 1800's Gregor Mendel, a Monk who lived in Brunn Austria proposed a law of heredity. This made him the first successful man to study the heredity quantitatively and hence revolutionized the field. This contrasts Aristotelian tradition that both parents contributed to their children's genetic heritage. Mendel used pea instead of human beings as the present biotechnologists agitate for. The associate researchers of Mendel who preceded the study of heredity, Augustine Weismann, a zoologist followed Mendel's findings. He sought to explain why cell differentiation is second to god in only one direction. According to him, a single fertilized egg could give rise to every cell in an organism.

Wilhelm Roux sought to know why frogs' eggs due to their large nature replicate each other in their genetic progenitor. He decided to see what happened when one half of the two cell embryo was destroyed from these rigorous attempts, the scientists picked this same stream of research, namely Adolf Eduard Dreisch who used sea urchin eggs to

carry out experiment, Hans Spemann etc. Meanwhile the science of cloning concerns itself with the manipulation of both living and dead organisms through scientific apparatus. Thus, it is the science of reproduction without sex. This means, that it violates the natural law of procreation; it is disastrous to human race if its attitude is not evaluated. The life of human beings is animated and man is brought drastically down to state of dilemma because the possibility of cloning human beings without slaughtering human beings as in the case of Dolly the sheep is not thereof.

However, the subsequent improvement ushered in Ian Wilmut, "the head of a research team at the Roslin Institute in Edinburgh, Scotland."¹ The success of Wilmut and his men gave other scientists the impetus to try other animals like cow, monkey, and hence moved the motion for human cloning.

III. THE EVIL IN HUMAN CLONING

We have emphatically explained the misnomic credence of cloning in the introductory part of this work. We equally maintain the same stream of argument that insofar as cloning involves reproduction without undergoing natural processes (cloning is asexual reproduction), it is evil. It does not involve the joining of genetic materials from two parents into an embryo that may give rise to a new adult organism, if development occurs well.

"A clone therefore, entails a product of asexual reproduction"²

No wonder Oderberg says that:

The most grave implication of human Cloning is that such technology destroys Human being, hence, such practices Slaveralty is inconsistent with the Sanctity of life and the inherent Dignity of human being.³

In line with this point, we insist that cloning and its offspring namely,

Human embryonic stem reserve, in-vitro fertilization are heavy sins (evils). No matter how some scientists may romance this development (cloning technology), we choose not to find romance to its provisions if any. Oderberg is also right when he opines that "human embryonic (which is also one of the offspring of cloning) cells research is unqualifiedly and gravely immoral."⁴ Thus, there is no qualification by this development that could outweigh its harms to mankind if it is in place. We mean, there is much harm created by the science of cloning if its attitude is not check-mated. The law that supersede all is the golden rule "thou shall not kill", and it is not certain that life will not be wasted through cloning. In short, in cloning technology, it is scientifically approved that over 277 sheep were slaughtered before the successful cloning of Dolly the lamb. To address this issue critically, I would like to buttress more on the evils in human cloning with the following headings:

IV. THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN IDENTITY

The essence of man is the soul. The soul is the seat of will, knowledge and creative nature of man lies in the soul. This is why the soul is the essential part of man. The body houses the soul. It is the spiritual eye of a man (soul). The quality of man

is measured by what he produces through his thought. Thus, man is a thinking being and deserves to be dignified. A clone cannot think rationally because his thinking ability which is the soul has been tampered with by biotechnical means. God manifests Himself in the human mind (soul). In Other words, God's scientific and creative inclination is seen in human identity that is, human soul. Man's identity is essentially his soul. This does not mean that human body which gives him power to perceive is not important. But the soul is the most essential part of man and should not be animated.

To avoid tarnishing the image of man (soul), that is man's identity, we must avoid human cloning. Consequently, with advancement of human cloning humanity would be rendered useless. More so, in philosophy, the problem of identity, that is the problem of 'self' will be more complicated if we allow human cloning. Kass and Wilson write that with biotechnology in place, precisely human cloning "the cloning technology possesses even than nuclear technology the practical possibility of taking humanity into an abyss from which it will absurdly never escape."⁵ undoubtedly human cloning is a serious issue we should consider first before venturing into cloning technology. Although, in philosophy there are two opposing blocks on the issue of 'self', whether man is essentially material (body) or spiritual (soul). The idealists agree that human being is essentially the soul. People, like Socrates in his moral ethics were convinced that inner man that is, the soul is more important than the body (outer man). Thus, he averred in the Plato's Apology "Man know thyself." He trenchantly urged the necessity to "care for oneself."⁶ knowing the importance of the soul, Socrates encouraged us to care for our soul because it is the seat of life. The human soul is the sanctity of human person. By this, we mean that irrespective of the body, human soul is the reservoir of values. Then, the sanctity of human identity is the inner man (the soul). People after Socrates like Plato followed him closely; Aristotle, Malebranche and Descartes deduced that man is both matter and form and still retorted that human identity is the sanctity of human life. Scientists however, have no right to treat men as means to an end because men are end in themselves.

Furthermore, the materialists would argue that the science of cloning will do harm to the bodily identity of human person, whereas the idealists will be concerned about the mental (spiritual) destruction cloning would cause to man, and at the same time may cause spiritual imbalances to man. Again, it is evident that cloning will cause some physical abnormalities in the fertilization of the cloned embryo. Scientists should not pretend, they know the implications thereof. They should hearken to Arne Naess' advice that there is a need for "the change of mentality,"⁷ if we want effective change in our society. Therefore, we should dethrone the science of cloning. And more importantly, if we want human race to stay we must put all hands on the deck to stop the science of human cloning. Additionally, the level of deformities of cloned animals is placing alarming danger on the science of human cloning if we allow it. Eboh laments that biotechnologists should respect innocent human beings. Oderberg Succinctly adds that:

a correlation of the sanctity of life is that human being should be treated as anything less than individual with unconditional intrinsic worth and inherent dignity, and this is incompatible

with treating human beings as commodities, pure objects of use, sacrificial victims or experimental subjects⁸

Meanwhile, man is not meant to be used in the laboratory. But scientists have refused to acknowledge this fact. The exercise of using human beings as objects of scientific experiment is both socially and morally evil, and must be evaluated.

V. THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN IDENTITY

The essence of man is the soul. The soul is the seat of will, knowledge and creative nature of man lies in the soul. This is why the soul is the essential part of man. The body houses the soul. It is the spiritual eye of a man (soul). The quality of man is measured by what he produces through his thought. Thus, man is a thinking being and deserves to be dignified. A clone cannot think rationally because his thinking ability which is the soul has been tampered with by biotechnical means. God manifests Himself in the human mind (soul). In Other words, God's scientific and creative inclination is seen in human identity that is, human soul. Man's identity is essentially his soul. This does not mean that human body which gives him power to perceive is not important. But the soul is the most essential part of man and should not be animated.

To avoid tarnishing the image of man (soul), that is man's identity, we must avoid human cloning. Consequently, with advancement of human cloning humanity would be rendered useless. More so, in philosophy, the problem of identity, that is the problem of 'self' will be more complicated if we allow human cloning. Kass and Wilson write that with biotechnology in place, precisely human cloning "the cloning technology possesses even than nuclear technology the practical possibility of taking humanity into an abyss from which it will absurdly never escape."⁵ undoubtedly human cloning is a serious issue we should consider first before venturing into cloning technology. Although, in philosophy there are two opposing blocks on the issue of 'self', whether man is essentially material (body) or spiritual (soul). The idealists agree that human being is essentially the soul. People, like Socrates in his moral ethics were convinced that inner man that is, the soul is more important than the body (outer man). Thus, he averred in the Plato's Apology "Man know thyself." He trenchantly urged the necessity to "care for oneself."⁶ knowing the importance of the soul, Socrates encouraged us to care for our soul because it is the seat of life. The human soul is the sanctity of human person. By this, we mean that irrespective of the body, human soul is the reservoir of values. Then, the sanctity of human identity is the inner man (the soul). People after Socrates like Plato followed him closely; Aristotle, Malebranche and Descartes deduced that man is both matter and form and still retorted that human identity is the sanctity of human life. Scientists however, have no right to treat men as means to an end because men are end in themselves.

Furthermore, the materialists would argue that the science of cloning will do harm to the bodily identity of human person, whereas the idealists will be concerned about the mental (spiritual) destruction cloning would cause to man, and at the same time may cause spiritual imbalances to man. Again, it is evident that cloning will cause some physical abnormalities in the fertilization of the cloned embryo. Scientists should not pretend, they know the implications

thereof. They should hearken to Arne Naess' advice that there is a need for "the change of mentality,"⁷ if we want effective change in our society. Therefore, we should dethrone the science of cloning. And more importantly, if we want human race to stay we must put all hands on the deck to stop the science of human cloning. Additionally, the level of deformities of cloned animals is placing alarming danger on the science of human cloning if we allow it. Eboh laments that biotechnologists should respect innocent human beings.

Oderberg Succinctly adds that:

a correlation of the sanctity of life is that human being should be treated as anything less than individual with unconditional intrinsic worth and inherent dignity, and this is incompatible with treating human beings as commodities, pure objects of use, sacrificial victims or experimental subjects⁸

Meanwhile, man is not meant to be used in the laboratory. But scientists have refused to acknowledge this fact. The exercise of using human beings as objects of scientific experiment is both socially and morally evil, and must be evaluated.

VI. THE LAW OF NATURE (PROCREATION)

Biologically and socially, the science of human cloning and its offspring violates the natural process of procreation. And as such, abnormalities and imbeciles are possible to be given birth to. Agbakoba Notes that, "in replication, man is likely to beget a beast, a conscious automation, not the man we know."⁹ Then venturing into human cloning is ethically and traditionally evil, given the strong possibility of material and immaterial defect of it (cloning).

VII. LIFE AND HUMAN NATURE

Life is a natural phenomenon. The sanctity of human life is immeasurable and incomparable to anything in the universe. The meaningfulness of life places a hierarchy in its consideration. For example the life of human beings is more important than the life of animals. The question then is, when do we see human life as the greatest among all forms of life like the life of animals? Human life should be seen more essential than anything. Scientists should be mindful of their attitudes towards human life. Human life is a sanctuary which commands some awe. Therefore, we should deepen our care and love for human beings. The ontological meaning of life considers human life greater than all forms of life on earth.

No wonder Socrates contended that when "the god commands us to know ourselves, he means that man should study his own soul."¹⁰ Socrates understood the importance of human soul. The soul is the seat of life. And it is disastrous to use human beings as scientific objects. The sanctity of life cannot be objectified by scientific experiment. Life is larger than what the scientists and the biotechnologists see it. At best, science and biotechnology should focus on man for the realization of the best in human, knowing clearly what life is worth living for. Meanwhile, scientists should gain true knowledge of 'self'. By this, they would know that venturing into human cloning will endanger the authentic nature of human being (human essence). The 'self' in this context is life. Scientists should honour human life and fear the impeding danger with the advancement of cloning in place. There should be ethics of life which will evaluate the attitudes

of science of cloning. Hence Schweitzer wrote that ethics begins when we are fully aware and fully in awe of the fact that:

The man who has become a thinking (living being) feels a compulsion to give every will-to-live the same reverence for life that he gives to his own. He experiences that other life in his own. He accepts that being good: to preserve life, to promote life, to raise to its highest value life which is capable of development; and as such as being evil; to destroy life (precisely human life), to injure life, to repress life which is capable of development. This is the absolute fundamental principle of the moral.¹¹

It is the nature of man to enjoy life without human destruction. It has been divinely given to human beings to live on the earth and replenish the world. Why should the science of cloning bring this divine providence to the brink?

Arne Naess, a Norwegian nature-centered philosopher wrote that "*life is creative, and that there is a creative life in nature.*"¹² This creative life is manifested when human beings live freely without scientific encroachment; a place secured enough to explore his creative ability. Thus, the creative nature of human life manifests in God's nature. Man is an image of God and science and technology have no right whatsoever to animate this divine essence. It is worrisome that science of cloning has vowed to use human beings as objects of scientific experiment. This barbaric development is not a worthwhile enterprise that human beings should pursue. Meanwhile, science and technology should mind the way they exploit nature and the way they cause harm to human beings. If the science of human cloning is allowed, it might lead to the era of personalized transplant therapies, and the grave implication of this development is that human race is on the verge of precipice. It leads to the change of human essence. However, the essence of human being is the sanctity of human life. We mean, the extent of human life is the end of human value or dignity. Therefore, everything is wrong with human cloning; even though a good reason for cloning technology has recorded its possibility of revolutionizing food production by turning animals into biological factories, revolutionizing pharmaceutical industries. Come to think of it, human cloning does not give certainty of its claim that the exercise (human cloning) will not endanger human health.

Meanwhile, if all animals are deserted human comfort is not assured. These animals are created for human comfort and for recreational purposes. Scientists should know that life is the greatest assent we can think of. And this misnomic development treats human life without remorse.

VIII. IS THERE ANY OBJECTIVE GOODNESS IN CLONING?

Utilitarianism an ethical principle holds that utility is the standard for measuring the correctness of human actions. According to the proponent of this school, Jeremy Bentham, if any act of cloning does not provide the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people in the society, it (cloning) is evil. The question then is, how do we measure happiness? In other words, is happiness measurable? Of what number should we conclude that we have greatest number of people who have equitably the same medium of happiness in a society? This is not possible to determine, however, but the point remains that the science of cloning is greatly evil because its negative implications outweigh its positive implications. Hence, it is a

morally wrong development, reprehensible and not worthwhile an action for human beings to pursue. Moreover, a clone has no right to an open future. This has automatically rendered his social status useless. The psychological state of this lack of openness to the future of a clone cannot be imagined. Additionally, such concerns do not apply to identical twins. While they share a genetic identity, their lives unfold at the same time, giving each the freedom to escape from the other's shadow and live their own private life. In cloning, the older twin's life would apparently have already unfolded, and the later-born twin could never escape this shadow. Of course, this is liable to crude genetic determinism.

IX. CLONING AND FAMILY STRUCTURE

Family is a social network where future generations are raised. It is the bedrock of human society. Human cloning is harmful to the family structure if it is allowed. And family as a social network cannot function effectively if human cloning is in place. If human cloning is allowed, many families will collapse. Some married couples, for instance, who are under the curse of barrenness, would buy this development. Supposed they choose to have a son by cloning the father, the family would be in a genetic term quite unusual. Consequently, the cloned child's genetic ties to only one (single) parent might complicate family dynamics and perhaps reduce the stability of the family trend. More so, this development if not evaluated, in the case such as divorce or adoption, might lead to structures that differ from the traditional nuclear trend in the family structure.

Against this backdrop, married couples have seriously argued that cloning is of a great help to recover, for example, from the psychological and tragic shock of a case of sudden death of their child or beloved one. For them, cloning would be to replace the lost child so that the parents would get rid of the shock caused by the death. I do not believe that the case seems to be as these people think. Come to think of it, the psychological state of the parents and well-wishers of the dead is not considered appropriately; what happens to the 'self', the identity of the dead? Apparently, the original 'self' or identity of a clone can never be mentally or physically the same. A cloned dog, for example, can never run and bark exactly the same way her progenitor does. There is no evidence to show that science and bio-technology can balance the psychological loss of the couple whom their child or beloved one died. The mental trauma created by the so called cloned folk cannot be overemphasized.

Some scientists may think cloning is a tool to fight against infertility. Thus, human cloning according to these people is often seen as an avenue to extend the existing war of assisted reproductive technologies, namely in-vitro fertilization and her related technologies. This generally is not ethically and socially right. Insofar, therapeutic cloning, gene cloning, in-vitro fertilization and molecular cloning involve experimental methods, and human beings are intrinsically good in themselves, the science of human cloning is evil and a social misnomer. This is because human beings are not created for experimental use. And some scientists know this truth that human beings are neither animals nor experimental objects yet, they agitate for this barbaric development. While numerous bio-technologists and scientists have drawn a number of general principles including the claim that human

liberty, reproductive choice and openness to scientific enquiry, freedom of ownership of property (nay reproductive factory), human and reproductive cloning should not be prohibited. As for me, this claim is not viable enough because liberty is a socio-political concept that requires general or societal preference, especially in many democratic societies. The concept of freedom in philosophy is not limited to such subjective postulation. Its determination needs a critical evaluation. Therefore, the conclusion that scientists have some sort of freedom to use human beings as objects of victims is hereby thrown into a paralytic oblivion. Seen thus, the principles above do not validate the assertion that human cloning or the science of cloning came to resurrect the comatose state of bio-technology and science, rather, it came to mar human values.

X. CONCLUSION

The science of cloning involves artificial reproduction. At worst, it is a system whereby the law of nature in the process of procreation is manipulated through bio-technological means. In an attempt to execute the scientific and bio-technological plans, massive destructions of life usually occur. For instance, over 277 sheep were slaughtered before the successful cloning of Dolly the lamb. Imagine how this would be in the case of human beings!

Although, a good reason for cloning technology has recorded its possibility of revolutionizing food production and pharmaceutical industries. We should know the fact that human value which includes respect, love, truth, peace and non-violence should not be frowned at.

In some countries presently including France, Singapore, and the United States of America, reproductive cloning of human beings is a criminal offence. In technical sense, cloning refers to somatic cell-nuclear transfer (SCNT), which involves transferring the nucleus of a somatic cell into an oocyte from which the nucleus and thus most of the DNA (Deoxyribonucleic acid) has been removed. I want to deduce that insofar the science of cloning involves destruction of existing embryos In the case of embryonic cloning or in-vitro fertilization; it is not good for human beings to pursue.

The negatives social implications of human cloning cannot be overstated. If the science of cloning is allowed, it will only be a realistic option for the very rich; hence, it may be highly expensive for the poor. However, prior to the economic cost of cloning technology, it is also evident that cloning procedure is time-consuming, rendering it inappropriate for certain clinical applications where urgent attention is required, especially that of therapeutic cloning. Human life should be the prime to every other thing on the earth. Science and her cohorts should acknowledge this fact-human life is socially and morally creative which commands some awe.

REFERENCES

- [1] Loen, R. Kess, and James, Q. Wilson, *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, Washington, D.C: American Enterprise Institute Press, 1998, VIII
- [2] Aaron, D. Levine, *Cloning: a Beginner's Guide*, England: Oneworld Publishing Company, 2007, 192.
- [3] Oderberg, S. David, "*Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: What is Wrong With It?*", Published Article on Feb. 21, 2005, 2.

- [4] Oderberg, S. David, "*Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: What is Wrong With It?*", 2.
 - [5] Loen, R. Kass, and James, Q. Wilson, *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, III.
 - [6] Plato, *Apology*, 128a.
 - [7] Arne Naess, *Ecology Community and Lifestyle*, Trans. David R., New York: Cambridge University Press 1989, 91.
 - [8] Oderberg, S. David, "*Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: What is Wrong With It?*", 20.
 - [9] Joseph, C. A. Agbakoba, *Theories of Mind: A Case for Interactionism*, Nsukka, Enugu: University Press, 2001, 127.
 - [10] Grube, G. M. A., *Plato's Thought*, Baston: Beacon Press, 1969, 220.
 - [11] Albert Schweitzer, *Out of my Life and Thought*, Trans. A. B. Lemke, New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1990, 131-132.
 - [12] Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy*, Trans. Roland H. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008, 6.
- Other sources include:
- [13] *Eisentadt V Baird*, United States Supreme Court, 405, U.S 438 (1972), [Majority Opinion], Thompson Reuters in caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getc... accessed on 25/05/2013.
 - [14] Margaret, Somerville, "*Immortalizing Our Genetic Selves: The Ethics of Human Cloning*" in *The Ethical Canary*, published by McGill-Queen's University Press, on April, 2004.