

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF IN VITRO FERTILIZATION (IVF) AND HUMAN CLONING THROUGH THE LENS LEON KASS

Okechukwu, Chidiebere Peter

Department of Philosophy,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

chidiebere.okechukwu@unn.edu.ng; +2348030978892

&

Emeribe, Justus O.

Department of Philosophy,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

justusemeribe@gmail.com; +2348068636828

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.12616.55046

Abstract

Scientists have enveloped the whole humanity with their unprincipled practices and experimentations. Now, a child can be born through a non-natural means of production like cloning, in-vitro fertilization, insemination, surrogating and the likes. However, for Leon Kass, cloning and in vitro fertilization create an immoral experimentation upon the would-be child; generates misperceptions of personality and uniqueness. It further makes the original idea of "to beget" into manufacturing; and then give parents the sole control of the kind of genes they want. To this effect, this research examines the ethical implications of human cloning and in-vitro fertilization through the lens of Leon Kass. The research concludes that in vitro fertilization and human cloning are ethically unacceptable because they do not respect the dignity of the human person, but involve mutilation, mistreatment and animalization of the human nucleuses. They do not respect the moral or legal right of the human embryos. De jure, de facto, regardless of one's views on abortion or personhood of the human embryo, human embryos are unequivocally human beings and therefore should not be subjected to any kind of disparaging experimentation.

Keywords: In-vitro fertilization, Cloning, Genes, personhood, Embryo, Somatic cell, therapeutic, fertility, infertility, biotechnological, Genetic control, Fetus.

Introduction

Knowledge, it is said, is power. And this power that knowledge bestows has triggered Bio-technological Sciences and Medicine to go an extra mile in their research on how to improve the environmental condition of man and then

revamp the quality of the human life; and as such give human beings a new pattern of life. However, the efforts of the scientists & Bio-technologists have paved ways for extension of scientific researches on the human person. Thus, the question questioning the main question is: Are these scientific and biotechnological discoveries a blessing or a curse to humanity; and are they really humans with authentic personal identity? According to Pope JohnPaul II, "what is technically possible is not always admissible". Hence, in his address to the International Congress on the Transplants on the 20th day of August,2000; he contends that, "medical... methods that fail to respect the dignity and value of the human person must always be avoided".¹ Carrying out his research, Leon Kass foresees that systematic task to understand the universe would lead to the degrading of the human life if care is not taken. This feat is basically found in the work to transform the human nature. He fears that these activities may bring about the theological truth of the creation of man in the likeness of God.² Here; he frowns at the idea of human cloning and in-vitro fertilization, arguing that they demean human dignity.

Some Key Terms To Understand

Biotechnology is the use of living systems and organisms to develop or make products, or "any technological application that uses biological systems, living organisms or derivatives thereof, to make or modify products or processes for specific use." Biotechnology is the integration of natural science and organisms, cells, parts thereof, and molecular analogues for products and services. In medicine, modern biotechnology finds applications in areas such as pharmaceutical drug discovery and production, genetic testing (or genetic screening).

Genetic engineering is the process of manipulating an organism's genes with biotechnology. It is used to transfer genes across species to bring forth another organism.³ There are also ethical concerns, on the area of ethics, economic and ecological implications. Hence, should the technology be used not just for treatment, but for enhancement, modification or alteration of a human beings' appearance, adaptability, intelligence, character or behavior? The distinction between cure and enhancement can also be difficult to establish. Transhumanists consider the enhancement of humans desirable. It is with this concerns that this research will take its bearing, using the argument of Leon Kass

and other ethical propositions to hold that in vitro fertilization and human cloning demeans the dignity of humans.

In Vitro Fertilization

Around the fifth century B.C. it was supposed that both males and females each produced two seminal liquors, one stronger than the other; an intermingling with the prior would produce a male issue, with the latter a female. The subsequent century, brought about another influence by Aristotle who projected that the first stage of a human being was indeed the egg found in females. Sperm had the ability to give that egg its form. On one hand, the male would bring the substance, which is immaterial, while the material strength comes from the female. But in the year 1875, the research of Hertwig showed that only one sperm cell would come in contact with the egg to bring about fertilization.⁴ Be that as it may, the birth of the world's first baby born as a result of in vitro fertilization (IVF) in July 1978 was an act of chance. But today, nearly all forms of infertility can be treated by the various techniques of assisted reproduction, which are now responsible for the birth of around two million children worldwide.

In vitro fertilization etymologically means "outside a living thing" as against "in vivo" within a living being. As it were, "In Vivo fertilization" takes place within a living being. Hence, the process of in Vitro fertilization involves removing one or more eggs from a woman's ovary placing them in culture medium in a glass dish and then adding sperm to the culture. This leads to fertilization in about 80 percent of the egg treated. The embryo can be kept in culture for two or three days, while it grows and divides into two, four, and then eight cells. At this stage, if the embryo is to have any prospect of developing into a child, it will be transferred to a woman's uterus. If this transplant is done in another woman other than the wife is tantamount to surrogate motherhood. However, in the process of this, things might go wrong for some un resolved reasons.⁵ Hence, the process of IVF leads to the creation of embryos which cannot develop into a person unless there is some deliberate human act, that is, transfer to the uterus and which even then in the best situations will most likely not develop into a human person.

Human Cloning

The word clone derived from the Greek *Klonos*, which means branch; and this elicits some semantic implication. It is the process of producing an organism with same genes. Notably, cloning might not produce an exact copy of the person

cloned; but characteristically, it copies itself and creates a duplicate DNA/genes. The person will not be a Xerox copy. He or she will grow in an environment different from that of the clone, with different experiences and opportunities.⁶ The idea of human cloning is in no doubt one of the most interesting discoveries in the history of the human kind. As it were, one question that burrs the mind of ethicists as the regards issues concerning human embryo is; when does human life begin? According to V. Astarastoe, life begins when the sperm fertilizes the egg (sexual reproduction), or when the donor sperm has been introduced to the egg recipient (asexual reproduction), as obtained in cloning.⁷ Record has it that in the year 1996 the first cloning of mammal dolly was carried out. The issues surrounding this feat brought about the human cloning proscription act of 2009, that made several countries to see it as unethical, and illegal, and went ahead to ban it. There are two types to be observed here: the therapeutic cloning, which is used to take care of diseases, like diabetes; while reproductive cloning is for the manufacturing of clones that are human.

Methods Of Cloning

In order to aid better understanding of the exact ethical implications of human cloning, it will be wise and necessary to in a way explore and expose the varied methods used in cloning. For the sake of clarity, primarily there are three methods of cloning that will be explicated by the researcher namely: Embryo Cloning, Adult D.N.A. or Somatic Nuclear Cell Transfer and Therapeutic Cloning.

Embryo Cloning: This is a medical technique, which produces mono-di- or tri-zygotic tissue. It duplicates the process that it uses to produce twins or triplets. One or more things may be removed from a fertilized embryo and encouraged to develop into one, two or more duplicated embryos. With this, twins or triplets are formed with identical D.N.A., this is scientific imitation of the natural way that identical twins are formed in the womb. Hence, embryo cloning is also known as artificial twinning. In nature, twins occur after fertilization of egg cell by a male sperm. In some cases, during the process of fertilization, the resulting fertilized egg, which is called a zygote, tries to divide into two-celled embryo. The two cells separate independently. Each cell continues to divide independently. Then each of those cells now develops into separate individual within the mother's womb. Thus, given that these cells developed from the same zygote, they are genetically identical. In the embryo cloning, twins are created artificially. "It occurs as in the Petri dish instead of in the womb."⁸ This is done

by manually separating an early embryo into individual cells, and then allowing each to divide and develop on its own. These resulting embryos are placed into a “surrogate mother”⁹(surrogacy is refer to the practice of using a substitute mother in place of the natural mother, or a woman who serves as an incubator), where they are carried to the theatre and delivered. Since the entire embryo came from the same zygote, all are therefore genetically identical.

Adult DNA Or Somatic Nuclear Cell Transfer: This is another method of cloning which uses different approach other than the embryo cloning method, but it gets the same result, that is, an exact clone or genetic copy of an organism or an individual. What then, does SCNT means? Somatic Cell means any cell in the body other than the two types of reproductive cells, sperm and egg. These are sometimes called germ cells. In mammals, Somatic cell has two complete sets of chromosomes, while the germ cells have just and only one complete set. On another note, the nucleus is like cell’s brain, it is like a warehouse that contained all the information that cells needed to form an organism. Therefore, this information comes inform of D.N.A. and admittedly, the existence of this DNA has made all individuals unique. When there is a nuclear transfer, the genetic information contained therein is moved from the one cell to another. Furthermore, this technique is intended to produce a duplicate of an existing animal. It involves the removing of D.N.A. from an ovum and replacing it with the D.N.A. from a cell removed from another animal. The fertilized ovum, now called a pre-embryo is implanted in a womb and allowed to develop into a new animal. As of January 2002, according to report, it had not been tried in human being due to the complications and difficulties in mammals. A Scientist, named Severino Aniniori, was rumored to have succeeded in initiating a pregnancy through reproductive cloning. This method can be used on anybody either on children or on adults. Like in the embryo cloning method, the different between Somatic Nuclear Cell Transfer and the natural ways lies in the place where it is done. The former occurs in the petri dish while the latter occurs in the womb.

Therapeutic Cloning: This method is similar to somatic nuclear cell transfer method. Therapeutic cloning is solely used for manufacturing of embryos for research purpose. The idea of therapeutic cloning is not to create cloned human beings but rather to harvest stem cell that can be used to study human development and cure diseases. Stem cells are very importance to the biomedical researchers because they can be used to produce or generate any type of specialized cell in the human body. “Stem cells are extracted from the egg after it

has been divided for five days. At this stage of development, the egg is called blastocyst.¹⁰ But one thing certain is that, at the time of extraction, an embryo, a human being in the early developmental stages is killed. This has generated some critical questions from many ethical or moral minded individuals. Although, it is true that therapeutic cloning has helped in the promotion of human life, its methodology is still very questionable. Therapeutic cloning has to do with the extraction of the D.N.A. in a woman's ovum. A woman ovum contains her D.N.A. When the extraction is done, the extracted cell is connected to a power source. Then, electric current is applied to stimulate it into fertilization. It will result to pre-embryo. The embryo is allowed to develop and produce many stem cells. This method is identical to that of adult DNA cloning but the resultant pre-embryo is not implanted into the womb as in the adult DNA cloning. This method is carried out in order to harvest stem cells. Stem cells are removed from the pre-embryo and this action results to the death of the pre-embryo. Stem cells are encouraged to develop into whatever tissue that is needed to be transplanted into a patient. This is why it is called therapeutic cloning. "It is as well of great importance to know that to extract a stem cell from a pre-embryo is to kill the embryo and this is exact murder."¹¹ It is on this ground that the therapeutic cloning is rejected for whatever reasons. It is against the ethics and morals of life. Therefore, therapeutic cloning for whatever reason posited, is against human life or rather called anti-life.

Reasons For Human Cloning And In Vitro Fertilization

The process of human cloning has generated many issues, which are viewed from the perspective of its reason. As it were, it involved the manifesting a twin of a person with the same gene. Science could have the ability to do something, but it is inhuman to use a human person as a means to an end. Hence, the reasons for doing any action must be more important than the reasons for not doing the action; therefore cloning a person should not be because of capability.

For Infertility: This is the very reason for in vitro fertilization. Those who advocate for this have argued that it helps couples who have not given birth to have a child of their own. However, one may ask: has it really solved the problem of infertility? Some people say that it only helped them get a child to train. On the other hand, Cloning is reportedly used to cure the problem of infertility in women. But this is called to question. It is obvious that cloning would aid the married couples to have biological related children. For instance, when a man donates his sperm, cloning would allow him to have a child who is

biologically related to him. According to report, United State based human cloning foundation (H.C.F.) spokesman, David Madrigal believes that, “human cloning must be a choice offered to infertile parents”. Furthermore, cloning aids genetic illness, that is, if a person chooses not to have a child that is genetically their own because of a risk with passing on a genetic illness, then again adoption is a better solution for the reasons mentioned previously. Still on the reason for cloning, it also effect vanity, that is, bringing a child into the world should not be about our narcissism, vanity, or an attempt at indirect immortality, because we are all unfairly biased for ourselves and our genes. And lastly, it breeds super humans, that is, selecting the most perfect genetic donor in someone’s opinion, whether it is Albert Einstein, Plato, Panteleon Iroegbu or some other above average persons. Arguably, imagine a world with fewer variations of people who are super-geniuses or super-philosophers or athletes, advances in science and technology might develop at an even faster rate and more people would be healthier.

For Health Reasons: Cloning is seen as a scientific means of curing diseases. The growing scientific field known as regenerative medicine, also known as therapeutic cloning, is allowing thousands of lives to be saved from cloning human cells, tissues, and even organs. Cloning human body parts guarantees a genetic match to prevent organ rejections and does not require immune suppressive drugs. However, this research is still in its infancy and requires a lot more time, effort, and money before it matures into saving a lot more people. It could also aid body replacements, that is, one of the stranger reasons for cloning humans is for a complete body replacement. This is only science fiction now, yet it may someday be a possibility in the distant future. While it will always be unethical to kill another human being to save another person, what if the cloned human body replacement did not have a brain and was intentionally designed that way from the beginning? And what if in vitro fertilization becomes a night mare to married couples and a pill to the dearth of human reproduction, especially as regards the use of it by the trending 21st century marriages of gay and lesbians? It is on this page that this research will now bring to a full limelight the ethical argument and debates against the duo, using the “ethical binoculars” of Leon Kass, synthetically.

Ethical Implications Of In Vitro Fertilization And Human Cloning Through The Lens Leon Kass

The salient line of observation by Joseph Fletcher, in his book: *Ethics of Genetic control*, that “there is a strong sentiment that it is somehow unethical and bad to go outside of the coitus gestation mode of reproduction—a proper way of reproduction thesis”¹² captures the argument to be advanced here. Human cloning and in vitro fertilization, right from their inception have raised some ethical dusts. Although, some scientists and biotechnologists have been overwhelmed with the benefits of human cloning and in vitro fertilization, but pay little or no attention to its ethical implications. Human cloning is intrinsically evil and indifferent act. It is intrinsically evil in the sense that it involves intentional creation and destruction of human life. Scientists create human embryo, which is human being with the intention to kill it in order to harvest the stem cells. On the other hand, it is indifferent in the sense that human dignity is not respected by either cloning or in vitro fertilization.

Leon Richard Kass, an American icon and a renowned physician was born in February 1939. He is greatly known as a critic of human cloning, and any kind of process of technology that demeans the dignity of the human person. He views himself as “an old-fashioned humanist, who is concerned broadly with all aspects of human life, not just the ethical.” His upbringing was not religious, but moralist. He sees “Morality as his religion, sues for human dignity and social justice. He views that the problem of cloning and in-vitro fertilization can make man to be situated as a product of an artificial manipulation, fulfilling the will of the human manufacturer, rather than an image of God.

Since human life is involved in modern biotechnological discoveries, its dignity and value should not be neglected. Consequently, one of the problems with human cloning and in vitro fertilization is not its benefits but rather the denial of the status of human embryo. It is equally of great importance to note that some biologists have denied the personhood of human embryo thereby regarding it as a mere object, and mass of cells which serves as material for experimentation or research. No wonder Alan Keyes states: “...laboratory technique, such as cloning and embryo manipulations are now confronting us with a temptation different to that of slavery. That we may disregard the dignity of some human being for utilitarian benefits. He went further to say that this arbitrary discrimination is proposed to rest on how these tiny human beings are conceived”.¹³

The Problem of identity: On this stand-point, the opinions were held that the fact that human cloning and in vitro fertilization help infertile couples in bringing wanted children into the world does not still make them both an infertility drug. Cloning on its part has gone a long way to betray the communal rational understanding of man. For it makes a person, no longer a person; and an individual no longer an individual, but an indefinable divisible object that can be replaced at will by his cloned self. The point is that human embryo no matter how it was fertilized is a human person and should be accorded its dignity and respect. In this respect Kass argues that the planned duplication of an individual will lead to his dehumanization.¹⁴ To add to his argument on the standpoint of abhorrence, Kass insists that the idea of cloning creates an immoral experimentation on the would be child, and brings about identity crisis; where to beget becomes the idea of to make. This further gives the parents the leverage to decide the genetic components of their children, which is dangerous. He contends that the embryos are human beings and the use of them for such acts constitutes some issues.¹⁵ He is not worried about the improvement of life in some ways that the scientific feats have done, but his contention is on the treatment of the human nature in an alterable manner that tampers with his dignity. The reason for the unethical positions of human cloning and in vitro fertilization is on the grounds of the deep experience of the mutual commitment of a husband and wife in their love making and baby making, the historic and accustomed bond of the family; from a strong sense of human romance and of the dynamic force of interpersonal relationships.¹⁶ Kass places has great respect regular and accustomed cycle of birth through coitus (reproduction), and holds that death is inevitable and a blessing in its own way. Hence, no one should by such means as cloning push to be immortal. To drive home the problem of identity, parenthood and social status inherent in human cloning and in vitro fertilization, he posits thus: "then one could argue, without embarrassment, that the new technologies of human reproduction, babies without sex, and their confounding of normal kin relations, who is the mother: the egg donor, the surrogate who carries and delivers, or the one who rears?" He thus concludes that the identity is confusing.

On another note, human cloning can bridge the security of a society. When a person is cloned, there are multiplicities of the individual, which in no little way can keep the society at risk. Imagine a situation where one of the cloned individual commits a felony, how would the security services identify the actual culprit? It is in this regard that Kass argues that the society is threatened and that

the life of another could be endangered. He proposes that the idea of cloning is susceptible to three categories of worries and oppositions, related to these three points. (1) That cloning portends misperception of personality and uniqueness. (2) Cloning denotes a great move to changing reproduction into fabrication, by implication, making the human person an artefact, by the will of man. (3) That Cloning is a kind dictatorship of the person who clones over the one cloned; thus constitutes a serious abuse of the true idea of the relationship between a child and his parents, and what it means to say yes to our own departure and replacement.¹⁷

He also casts a doubt if a clone or an embryo manipulated for in vitro fertilization will be a moral agent, because of the manipulations of the embryo. He went further to state that Cloning with its counterpart creates serious issues of identity and individuality. Commenting distinctly about cloning, he argues that the cloned person may experience concerns about his distinctive identity not only because he will be in genotype and appearance identical to another human being, but, in this case, "because he may also be twin to the person who is his "father" or "mother."¹⁸ This poses a threat to the society, borrowing Kant's categorical imperative which states that "act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law"¹⁹, he contends that no society would rationally make cloning a universal law because of the dangers it foreshadows; and with this he draws a line that a society where this is encouraged cannot stand. Hence, every act should flow from the law of nature, and nature has placed on man the ability to procreate in a natural way. It is with this he dismisses the issue of cloning and in vitro fertilization.

Human cloning would also represent a giant step toward turning begetting into making, procreation into manufacture (literally, something "handmade"), a process already begun with in vitro fertilization and genetic testing of embryos. With cloning, not only is the process in hand, but the total genetic blueprint of the cloned individual is selected and determined by the human artisans.²⁰ Biologically, we are made to understand that life begins in the fusion of male sperm and women's egg and this act lead to the process of fertilization by which human embryo or foetus is developed. Human embryo, as we know from the earliest stage of development is human being, and any act to terminate its growth leads to its death. Hence, to kill, naturally, is morally evil.

Another problem of concern about human cloning and in vitro fertilization is the problem of population increase. This is problematic because the hunger in the world today, especially Africa is quite alarming. In Nigeria today, there is the

issue of recession. Imagine in this situation, more humans are cloned and in vitro fertilization is encouraged. There is going to be man's inhumanity to man and men eating their fellow human beings. Natural resources will definitely not be enough to carry the population. In this regard Dr. Asogwa N. U., argues in his article Human-Centered Environmentalism: An Ethical Evaluation that "in a situation where by the concept of reproducibility is applied generously, there would be more people than the carrying capacity of the habitat, and this will result in overpopulation."²¹ He thus raises concern about the African situation where population has outweighed the sustenance of the populace by the environment and the government. He explicates that the concept of reproducibility will foster growth in human numbers, that would lead to more environmental problems: rising levels of energy use, and of course need for more jobs, to mention but a few. Truly speaking, if the artificial way of reproduction is made a law, and then there will be more people than the available natural human recourses, social infrastructure and basic amenities; and this will cause problem and endanger the life and well being of the populace. By implication, "belly amenities" and "stomach infrastructure" will not be dully provided and made available for the hungry populace.

Subsequently, as far as life is concerned here, some religious sects, individuals, political bodies etc., have warned against unethical practices of some scientists and genetic engineers in the use of embryo itself. For instance, the Catholic Church, from the point of biological and anthropological nature of human existence, has warned against the use of human embryos for research(s). She warned that researchers should not pay more attention at the huge financial gains of the research programs but on the dignity and value of human life. She also laid emphasis on the ethical and social implications of human cloning and other human embryo experimentations. The church, without reservation, banned human cloning, and other scientific manipulation of human life. Like reproductive cloning, the future determinant of cloning human cannot be predicted. It destroyed the constitutive relationship that is resolved in natural means of procreation. Then, one should think of the psychological and physiological determinants of the cloned personality. Reproductive cloning is an attack on the dignity and integrity of human person-hood.²² Arguably, therapeutic cloning involves intentional creation and destruction of human life. Biologically, human life begins at conception. This biological fact was agnostically, rejected by some biologists and biotechnologists.

To kill one's life in order to save another's life is morally bad. Some scientists clone human embryos in order to harvest some of the organs to save the other. And to harvest an organ from an embryo means killing the embryo and this, in all ramifications, is murder. What a terrible unethical and immoral act. There is no gainsaying that "to create life with the planned intention of destroying it violates the basic norms of morals, and legal considerations designed to protect the individuality and integrity of each human being."²³ As a result of this, in the document issued by the Holy-See, the idea of human cloning was banned irrespective of its objectives. The document maintained that human cloning contravenes basic precepts of international law. Consequently, in bioethics, law emerged to ensure the universal respect of human dignity, human rights, and fundamental freedom for the welfare of the individual in medical practice and in the application of the tremendous progress in life of sciences and technologies. Human cloning infringes the right of human life at the embryo state. This could also be true of the manipulations involved in "in vitro fertilization". The document went further to state that human cloning regardless of its objectives are contrary to the dignity of human beings and their right to life. Other religious sects including the Catholic Church do not support human cloning. Like Islam, the council of *Ulema*, and the highest council in the Saudi Arabia Kingdom in which Sheikh Mohammad Ibn Saleh al Othimin is a member. Sheikh views that the lowest penalty fitting on those who invented cloning should be amputation of their hands and feet. Otherwise, there should be exploitation and manipulation of humankind. It is the worst kind of corruption on earth. This position however may sound as a religious position within the Sharia Law, (not philosophical per se), but it has some imprints of the upholding of moral principles. On the other hand, in vitro fertilization, poses ethical problems in that one cannot categorically state the candidates qualified for it. The world today is feasted with a lot of people that are lesbians and homosexuals. And if these go for it, and if it be made a law, someday the human race might lack the idea of natural way of procreation. I wonder how such a society will look like! So, human cloning and in vitro fertilization are in their essences unethical acts due to the fact that they are against the natural way of creation. They both involve manipulation of human life thereby reducing human being to instrument and object for experimentation. Scientists and biotechnologists should not instrumentalize human embryos just for the purpose of research; attention should be paid to the ethical values of human life. Moreover, human being should not be used as means to an end. Any scientific experiment should respect

the dignity of human life and not using them as a means to achieve scientific results. No wonder Immanuel Kant warned that “to treat a person merely as a means is to disregard their personhood by exploiting or otherwise using them without regard to their own interests and needs. It involves a failure to acknowledge that every person has a worth and dignity equal to that of every other person and that this worth and dignity cannot be compromised for utilitarian or any other reasons”²⁴

Conclusion

In the final analysis, there are questions of concerns that can be used to drive home the arguments on the ethical implications of human cloning and in vitro fertilization. What is the status of cloned human in the society? Who is responsible for cloned human? What is the family relationship of cloned individual? On the in vitro fertilization, what is the condition of the defective embryo? Consequently, then, let us examine and evaluate the family relationship, social effect, and safety of human cloning. Admittedly, it is biologically proved that a new child develops through the unification of male sperm and female eggs. Through this means, a new born, and the fertilization takes place in the womb of a woman. Presently, the scientists have enveloped the whole humanity with their unethical practices and experiments. Now, a child can be born through artificial means of production like cloning, in-vitro fertilization, insemination, surrogating and the likes. A child who is produced through cloning, who will be his or her parents? The point is that the child is going to suffer from psychological traumas, in the sense that the natural family relationship that exists between parents and child will be absent. The child, psychologically, will not live an authentic life. This issue of family relationship cannot be compromised. It has a dangerous effects on the child because the child’s personality will be shaking as long as he or she lives. In fact, creation of the person through somatic cell nuclear transfer is not a healthy practice even when it is for therapeutic purposes. However, National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) also emphasized on this issue of using the somatic cell nuclear transfer to create human being. This commission, after some meaningful deliberation consider it negative, and that the possibility of the psychological harm associated with the practice demises the individuality and personal autonomy. Hence, it will also lead to degradation in the quality of parenting and family life of the child.²⁵ In addition, the social life of the person created through somatic cell nuclear transfer is questionable. It has, and will continue to bring

class distinction and division in the society. Society would be divided into two different classes of individuals. That is, cloned individuals and non-cloned individuals. Now, come to think of this; a person who has no traceable background or family background, or either real human identity, how does one think he or she is going to associate with others in the society? It is not enough producing children but that the identification of those children should be of great concern to parents and the society at large. Subsequently, somatic cells nuclear transfer has raised some fear about the position of these human beings in the society. It undermines the important social values by creating a wider horizon for other manipulation of persons as if they were objects for research(s) or experimentations. Scientists through cloning of human being have thrown the whole humanity into a terrible dilemma and put nature and dignity of human person into question. The problem is, how can these person(s) defend their individual identity or personality in the family they find themselves and in the society at large? This system has really violates the social status of the child or children created through this means of procreation. The issue of deformity is another problem. Would the deformed cloned be accepted in the family or society in which they are existing? Through the reports given about the cloned animals, one could observe that there is a high practice of risks in cloning human beings. For instance, failure in human cloning leads to abortion and abortion intrinsically is evil. Nobody will be ready to accept a deformed human being. And we know that, the issue of abortion is not ethically accepted. It involves termination of human life, and to this end, Pro-lifers were vehemently against this. However, based on the safety of human cloning, the commission instituted by US government to look into human cloning states that "it is morally unacceptable for anyone in the public or private sector, whether in a research or clinic setting, to attempt to create a child using somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning."²⁶ According to this commission, they reached such conclusion due to the fact that the current scientific information indicated that this technique is not safe to use in humans at this time. It will also violate important ethical obligations were clinicians or researchers to create a child using these particular risks to the foetus and potential child, which Leon Kass explicates.

At this point, there is need to make a thorough synthesis of this discourse about human cloning and in vitro fertilization. In vitro fertilization and human cloning are not ethically accepted due to the fact that they do not respect the dignity of human person, but involve manipulation, exploitation and dehumanization of human embryos. They do not respect the moral or legal right of the human

embryos. Regardless of one's views on abortion or personhood of the human embryo, human embryos are unequivocally human beings and therefore should not be subjected to destructive research. An international scientific consensus now recognizes that human embryos are biologically human beings beginning at fertilization and acknowledges the physical continuity of human growth and development from the one-cell stage forward. This work is a contribution to the global warning and calls to ban human cloning, in vitro fertilization, and other inimical scientific research(s) or experiments that involves human life. The case is that scientists have done more harm than good to the dignity of human life. The morality of any scientific practices should derive its origin from the natural law, as already stated in the exposition of the ethical implication. There are diversified views on the beginning of human life because there is no consensus about the standard of moral judgment. Each moral judgment has its ethical presuppositions and convictions or interest to protect. Scientists have their interest to protect and perfect their findings, that is, to experiment on human life and its development. So, natural law provides fundamental right to everybody whether in the womb or outside the womb. To this effect, the Catholic Church states that "every human being has the right to life, and physical integrity. Thus, this right should not depend on the approval or disapproval of the state, or any authority."²⁷ In proposing this, the church means that such rights are inalienable; rights that are inherent in every human being, and has its consummation or completeness in the natural law.

Human beings have a right not to be created for purposes of experimentation, and like many thinkers agree with Leon Kass, man should not be used as a means to an end, because he is an end in himself. Kass, further argues that cloning and in vitro fertilization constitute an immoral experimentation on the would-be child, and generates identity crisis. It further brings about confusion of identity and individuality, turns sexual-reproduction into manufacturing, and gives parents the chance to choose the features of their children. Therefore, it is intrinsic in human nature not to kill his or her fellow human being, or manipulate the human body for any sort of investigation. In the society today, it is considered abomination to commit adultery or for a man to climb another married woman or any of such kind. At least most men detest that. Hence this research asks a fundamental question worth ruminating on: What is the actual difference between having one's wife impregnated by another man and all these artificial method of child-bearing through embryonic manipulations? If this question is answered correctly, and if no one would be happy to have his wife/

spouse manipulated or used in a bid to procreate, then, it begs the question: "who is fooling who?" If this ground of argument is thought provoking, then this research will by necessity lay bare that artificial insemination is more of an intrusion into the monopoly of monogamy. No doubt, marriage is morally and exclusively a sexual relationship between a man and a woman, considered as husband and wife. And as it were, sperm and ova are a part of a person's sex and their genitals. Any kind of external operation of these by way of procreation is tantamount to adultery and an intrusion into another person's spouse. However, if this is done by any kind of consent, it amounts to low self esteem and lack of the sense of the sacredness of marriage and its meaning. It is in the words of Plato "ignorance", because no one who knows will willingly do wrong. Therefore, any scientific practice that involves dehumanization, exploitation, and manipulation of human and its dignity, is against the natural law and human nature, and anyone who indulges in this or supports it will be tending towards creating chaos in the ecosystem and implicitly against the natural cause of things (natural law).

Endnotes

1. Pope JohnPaul II, an address before the International Congress on Transplants, (2000). <http://www.religious tolerance.org/clo.ther.htm> (Retrieved 4.11.2020).
2. Quoted in Harvey Flaumenhaft, "The Career of Leon Kass," *Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy* 20 (2003).
3. *The European Parliament and the council of the European Union* (12 March 2001). "[Directive on the release of genetically modified organisms \(GMOs\) Directive 2001/18/EC ANNEX I A](#)". *Official Journal of the European Communities*: 17.
4. David Gardner, *In vitro fertilization: A practical Approach*, (N.Y: Informa HC, 2007), 1-2.
5. Peter S, and Co, *IVF Technology and the argument from potential*, in *Philosophy and Public affairs*, vol.17, No 2, (Spring 1988), 89.
6. Kischer Ward C, *When does Human Life begin? The final answer? A human embryologist sociolegal Speaks out about issues involving the human embryo*, 2003, <http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/kisc/kisc04when lifebegin1.html>
7. V., Astarastoe, Trif Almos Bella, *Essentialia in bioethics*. Iasi: Contes Publishing House, 1998), 1.

8. Kumer, C., et al., *Clinical Medicine* (6th ed.), (London: Longmanns Publishing, 1997), 97.
9. V. Roberts, et al., *A functional Biological approach Students Manual*, (USA: Newmann Publisher, 1999), 111.
10. P. Iroegbu, *Enwisdomization and African Philosophy*. (Owerri: International Universities Press Limited, 1994), 67.
11. O. Rouke, et al., *Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teachings 2nd Edition*.(Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press, 1999), 99.
12. Joseph Fletcher, *Ethics Of Genetic Control*, (NY: Prometheas Books, 1988), 86.
13. A. Keyes, *Demand Respect for the Dignity of Human Embryo*, <http://www.rnclife.org/faxnotes/2001/july01-07-26.shtml>(accessed 10/12/2020)
14. Leon R. Kass and [James Q. Wilson](#). *The Ethics of Human Cloning*. (Washington: AEI Press, 1998) 6.
15. Leon R. Kass and [James Q. Wilson](#). *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, 7.
16. Joseph Fletcher, *Ethics Of Genetic Control*, 86.
17. Leon R. Kass and [James Q. Wilson](#). *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, 26-27.
18. Leon R. Kass and [James Q. Wilson](#). *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, 33.
19. Immanuel Kant, *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. T.K. Abbot (NY: Prometheus Books 1988), 49.
20. Leon R. Kass and [James Q. Wilson](#). *The Ethics of Human Cloning*, 38.
21. N. U. Asogwa, "Human-Centered Environmentalism: An Ethical Evaluation", in Ogbozo C. and Co, editors, *Philosophy Science And Human Development: International Conference Papers 2011*, (Enugu: Snaap Press, 2014), 255.
22. J.N. Ekennia, *Bio-medical Ethics: Issues, Trends, and Problems*, 147.
23. Human Cloning: Comments by Political Groups, Religious, http://www.religioustolerance.org/clo_react.htm. (access 2/12/2016).
24. Beauchamp, T.L. et al, *Contemporary Issues in Ethics*, (Fifth Edition), (USA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1999), 15.
25. Harold, Shapiro, (Chairman) *Cloning Human beings: Report and Recommendation of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission* (Rockville, MD: 1997), 30-31.
26. Beauchamp, T.L. et al, *Contemporary Issues in Ethics*, 678.
27. Paul IV, *Humanae Vitae*, trans. By NC News Service, St. Paul Editions, Boston 1986, Nos. 25.