



ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at <http://www.journalcra.com>

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 9, Issue, 01, pp.45103-45104, January, 2017

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF CURRENT RESEARCH**

REVIEW ARTICLE

HUMAN CLONING: RIGHT OR WRONG

***Ngoc Huynh**

Midwestern State University, Wichita Falls, Texas, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 16th October, 2016
Received in revised form
09th November, 2016
Accepted 13th December, 2016
Published online 31st January, 2017

Key words:

Cloning, John Lennon, Privacy,
Biomedical, Ethics, Legal.

ABSTRACT

The legal and moral justification for cloning has been a source of argument in the research world. A case study reflected how Dr. Zuk planned cloning John Lennon using DNA taken from his rotten tooth in the 1960s, which brought about the debate of morality and privacy in human cloning. The court ruled that Lennon's privacy was violated, as well as the fact that human beings have the right to safety and autonomy. Human cloning was found to exhibit high failure rate, plus the fact that there were no available tools to detect genetic abnormalities resulting from cloning. Religious and societal discourse have perceived cloning to violate natural law which could also influence the society negatively. The foregoing has made human cloning in its current form unacceptable. Dr. Zuk experiment was questioned against the backdrop of the discourse. Without an answer, it was suggested that government should make specific rules about human cloning so that it would be more morally acceptable by the society.

Copyright©2017, Ngoc Huynh. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Ngoc Huynh, 2017. "Human Cloning: Right or Wrong", *International Journal of Current Research*, 9, (01), 45103-45104.

INTRODUCTION

As technology pushes human genetic engineering and human cloning becomes closer to daily reality, the issue of human cloning will continue to raise significant concerns surrounding both research methods and subjects. With modern technology, cloning humans is a possibility today, instead of a work of science fiction like in the time before Dolly (Kolata, Gina, 1997). In 2013 Laura Rivard discussed a case study in "DNA, Privacy and Human Cloning." This case study is about Dr. Micheal Zuk, a Canadian dentist who plans to clone John Lennon, a former member of the Rock 'n' Roll band the Beatles, from DNA taken from a rotten tooth removed in the 1960s. The Albertan resident, bought the tooth in the hope of extracting Lennon's DNA, getting his genomic sequence, and using this information to create his clone as the technology available. Since John Lennon is proclaimed as musical genius, his resurrection could be a beautiful use of the technology for the enrichment and advancement of 21th century. This brings forth an interesting example in the debate surrounding morality and privacy concern with human cloning. Some argue that human cloning is permissible since Lennon's DNA might produce an infant with similar potential musical talent. Others doubt that the first generation of technology cannot guarantee that the first cloned humans will be normal. Other issues with this case includes issues such as; Is John Lennon's privacy (and the privacy of his descendants), violated by the DNA sequencing effort?

Whether human cloning is acceptable? If technology for cloning humans from old DNA is available, should Dr. Zuk be allowed to proceed with his plans? If not, who should stop him?

To address whether or not John Lennon's privacy (and the privacy of his descendants) is violated by DNA sequencing, the American Supreme Court defines two types of privacy that are protected: the right to make personal decisions, and the right to keep personal information private. In this case, John Lennon gave his tooth to his housekeeper, which her son put up for auction as unique piece of history that sold for \$33,000 without Lennon's knowledge (Rivard, Laura, 2013). Without John Lennon permission, sequencing his genome for social interests and the advancement of a particular technology would come into conflict with the principle of autonomy with implicit right to privacy and self-determination. Therefore, Lennon's privacy is violated by DNA sequencing. With these points in mind, is human cloning itself acceptable? The first consideration concerns the principle of non-maleficence. According to Tom Beauchamp and James Childress's text, the Principles of Biomedical Ethics, doctors and researchers ought not to perform any procedure on human subjects where the benefits do not outweigh the lost (Beauchamp and Childress, 2001). Current human cloning exhibits a high failure rate. In addition, there are no current tools able to detect genetic abnormalities resulting from the experiment and control quality. Aside from safety, autonomy must also be considered. All human beings have a right not to be created simply for the purpose of experimentation. Cloned children may not be able to develop a unique sense of self if the parents forces the children to become

**Corresponding author: Ngoc Huynh,*
Midwestern State University, Wichita Falls, Texas, USA.

the person they were cloned from. Cloned children might suffer from psychological problems stemming from human freedom, existence, well-being, and emotional harm for life (Kelman, Herbert, 1976). Because human cloning does not reply on traditional procreation, Catholic and other religious way to see it as violates "natural law" in a baby or child cloned or replicated rather than begotten from the love of his or her parents. Furthermore, human cloning can play a big impact on the society. There is a big different on the way we raise and think about human being between a society allows to clone human and a society refuse to do so. The society which considers human cloning as acceptable would think about human value and raise children is different from the society which refuses human cloning. Therefore, human cloning, in its current form, is unacceptable. This brings light to the other questions on the attempts the technology for cloning humans from old DNA. Should Dr. Zuk be allowed to proceed with his plans? If not, who should stop him? In this questions, exclude the bioethical of human privacy, it is a hard to have good answer that can balance between natural and social about human production with current laws or regulation. Dr. Zuk should not be allowed to proceed with his plans since human cloning is unacceptable.

John Lennon's descendant may have the right to stop since they share Lennon's genetic information and could be affected if the DNA sequenced is published. The answers to these questions are temporary, considering the ethical issue, but it will keep as a debate topic as technological advancement and give rise to different ethical issue. In my view, government should make specific rules about human cloning so that it would be more morally acceptable by the society and culture.

REFERENCES

- Kolata, Gina, 1997. *Clone: the road to Dolly and the path ahead*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Rivard, Laura, 2003. *Case Study in DNA, Privacy and Human Cloning*.
- Beauchamp, T.L., Childress, J.F. 2001. *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 5th ed. New York City, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kelman, Herbert, 1976. Human use of Human Subjects: The Problem of Deception in Social Psychological Experiments. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67(1): 1-11
