International

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL, HUMANITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

Open Access Refereed E-Journal & Refereed & Indexed

JOSHASjournal (ISSN:2630-6417)

Architecture, Culture, Economics and Administration, Educational Sciences, Engineering, Fine Arts, History, Language, Literature, Pedagogy, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Tourism and Tourism Management & Other Disciplines in Social Sciences

Vol:5, Issue:18	2019	pp.658-667
journalofsocial.com	ssssjournal@gmail.com	

AN ETHICAL OVERVIEW ON CLONING IN NIGERIA

Joseph Nkang OGAR

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

Samuel Akpan BASSEY

Department of Philosophy University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

Article Arrival Date : 13.07.2019
Article Published Date : 24.09.2019
Article Type : Research Article
Doi Number : http://dx.doi.org/10.31589/JOSHAS.152
Reference Ogar, J.N. & Bassey, S.A. (2019). "An Ethical Overview On Cloning In Nigeria", Journal Of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences, 5(18): 658-667

ABSTRACT

This work titled "An Ethical Overview on Cloning in Nigeria" analyzed the debate on cloning for which many scholars believe that cloning is not just ethically and morally acceptable, but beneficial in that they allow otherwise infertile couples to have children and permit the study of genetic diseases and indeed genetic development. This work examined cloning from an ethical/moral perspective and held the view that there is everything inherently wrong with the idea of human cloning. As a scientific discovery, it violates the dignity, respect, and value of human life and concluded that cloning coupled with its related procedures, placed the human offspring at risk of genuine harm. Also, it is shown that Cloned offspring's run the risk of misplaced or distorted genealogy. The work relied on library materials, analysis, critical exposition, and evaluative methods to achieve its objectives.

Keywords: Cloning, human offspring, Nigeria.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our society is one which has become sophisticated and graded with scientific discoveries, which has affected the human standard of living both positively and negatively. Our attention is also drawn to proclaim, if possible along the streets of our communities, the incomparable dignity, respect and value of human life. Before now, the human gametes was an astonishing development in the sense of primitive theories entertained over the years, but today, human life has been leveled down to mere human manipulation. Etokakpan buttresses this fact when he avers that genetic manipulation has provoked much interest and debate in the past few decades, part of said manipulation being cloning, (67).

The phase 'clone 'comes from a Greek word for taking a cutting from a plant. To clone is mean to make an exact genetic copy of an existing organism. It happens naturally in many plants (if you bury a potato it makes clones of itself), and even in a few animals. The U.S. President's Council on Bioethics sees human cloning as, "The asexual production of a new human organism that is, at all stages of development, genetically virtually identical to currently existing or previously existing human being…" (De Gama, 147). In like manner, Neresini defines human cloning as, "the creation of a genetically identical copy of a human being (not usually referring to monozygotic multiple births), human cell, or human tissue" (221). It must be noted that the term is generally used to refer to artificial human cloning; natural human clones in the form of identical twins are commonplace,

with their cloning occurring during the natural process of reproduction. Dolly was a biological revolution- a sheep produced by taking cells from the udder of a ewe and reprogramming then to make a new embryo, which was implanted in another ewe. It had been thought unfeasible to grow a mammal from body tissue. But if this 'nuclear transfer' cloning was achievable in sheep (and now in many other animals), could it be made in humans? if it could be, should it be?

Many scholars believe that all that is scientifically possible is also ethical, explicit and beneficial. For such scholars, genetic manipulation can be produced to cure diseases. Diedrich and Griesinger opines that, undoubtedly, the eventual mapping of the human genome will be a boom to science, medicine, and technology, among other disciplines. This map will offer a clearer lens with which to inspect the question of what "being human" means, will direct us where to look for anomalies that cause disease, and will greatly assist in correcting those errors (773). These scholars are also of the opinion that human cloning should be permitted since it does not harm anyone who is entitled to human respect and concern. This is not the case, as cloning as scientific discovery violates the dignity, respect, and value of human life. This work argues that cloning coupled with its related procedures does place the human offspring of cloning at risk of genuine harm. It thus provides a basis for questioning the moral permissibility of cloning and its related technologies without implying that human pre-embryo has dignity or is owed respect. Though, cloning can be viewed from this perspective- biological and scientific, this work wells more on human cloning.

2. TYPE OF CLONING

Embryo Cloning: Simply an imitation of the natural cloning in identical twins. It involves the medical technique used in producing monozygotic twins or triplets. Here, Scientists duplicate the process that nature uses to produce twins or triplets. The fertilized egg becomes a zygote, an embryo. It divides into two and then four identical cells. At this stage, the cells can be separated and allowed to develop into separate but identical blast cysts, which can be implanted in a uterus.

Adult DNA Cloning: It involves cell nuclear replacement, somatic cell nuclear transfer. It can also be called reproductive cloning (Travis, 132). It differs with the embryo cloning in the sense that its end is to produce a duplicate of an existing animal or human being as we saw in an example of Dolly the sheep. Here, the DNA from an adult ovum is removed and replaced with the DNA from a cell removed from an adult animal or human being (Ekennia, 118).

Therapeutic Cloning: It uses the cloning procedure to produce a clonal-embryo, but instead of being implanted in a womb, it is used to generate stem cells. Stem cells are primordial cells capable of developing into a variety of types of cells. Some stem cells can be cultured and potential used to generate therapeutic tissues or human spare parts (Ekennia, 119).

3. WORLD'S GREAT RELIGIONS ON HUMAN CLONING

The views of the world's great religions on human cloning can have an insightful impact on whether nations such as the United States ultimately ban or legalize this controversial technology. Judaism holds a fairly positive view of cloning. One of the fundamental tenets of Judaism is that God wants human beings to use all of their capacities to improve the health of others. Also, Jewish law does not identify the human embryo as a human being. Therefore, to therapeutic cloning, whereby scientists remove stem cells from the embryo, could use to cures diseases, most Jewish scholars believe it should be allowed (Travis, 132). The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and the Rabbinical Council of America made a policy statement on therapeutic cloning averring that because the procedure could lead to cures for devastating diseases. It should be permissible. "The Torah commands us to treat and cure the ill and to defeat disease wherever possible to do this is to be the Creator's partner in safeguarding the created" (Shandler, 203). The council added: "The traditional Jewish perspective thus emphasizes that maximizing the potential to save and heal human lie is an integral part of valuing human life" (Shandler, 203). However, reproductive cloning, a procedure that produces a child, raises deep concerns in Jewish thought because of questions about how a clone

would affect familial relationships. Some Jewish scholar's worry that cloning could make human beings products by making it possible to breed clones to have certain characteristics such as physical strength or high intelligence. The Rabbinical Council has declared its opposition to reproductive cloning.

Not all Jews disapprove of reproductive cloning, however, Rabbi Michael Broyde quoted by Shandler expressed the view of some adherents to Reform Judaism when he argued in favour of reproductive cloning: "In sum, one is inclined to state that Halacha (Jewish law and custom) views cloning as far less than the ideal way to reproduce people, however, when no other method is available it would appear that Jewish law accepts that having children through cloning is perhaps a mitzvah (blessing) in a number of circumstances and is morally neutral in a number of other circumstances"(204).

The arguments underlying the need for human embryonic stem cell research incorporate various philosophical and metaphysical principles to establish the maxim that embryos are not individuals based on the logical premise that although the embryo is a collection of cells working in concert at a level higher than they would exhibit in singularity; their concerted effort does not lend itself to define the embryo as a "higher order of life"-a human being, therefore this leads to the logical conclusion that if the embryo is not an individual by not being a "higher order of life" then the embryo is not deserving of any additional protection or the equivalent protections afforded to traditional human beings.

The arguments against embryonic stem cell research are deeply rooted in ethical, moral and religious grounds and theories. All forming an overarching construct that will serve to bolster their premise that embryos represent the most innocent of human life and needed to be afforded the maximum amount of protection under the law.

The arguments against embryonic stem cell research begin from the proposition that the embryo is undoubtedly the most complex entity known to man. The argument acknowledges that the embryo does not even closely resemble in the slightest bit the makings of a human being, in the traditional sense. However, the fact that all human beings start as embryos brings into context the gravity of every individual's origins and the need to value those origins as sacred human life. The embryo commands a certain level of respect and this respect must be maintained.

The main philosophical tenant of this argument is the fertilization of a female gamete by a male gamete represents the union of a man and a woman to foster the development of human life (Yanagimachi, 200). Therefore, the embryo is human life in its most basic of forms. According to this purview, the embryo is not just a collection of cells but rather a cohesive unit working together in concert to perform those vital functions that render human life in existence (García-Rivera, 143). This argument seeks to remedy the position taken by those who argue in favor of stem cell research regarding the distinguishing characteristics between a fully developed human being and a gesticulation phase embryo. Accordingly, an individual is an individual regardless of the stages of development.

All humans are afforded the basic protections of their morality and dignity regardless of their stage of development or level of distinguishing characteristics. The more serious aspects of this logical construct deal with individuality, potentiality and "special respect". Those who seek to impart moral supremacy to the embryo counter the "14" day mark by asserting that the innate genetic conditions that quintessentially define what it means to be a human being are present at the first moment of conception (Fletcher, 773). Therefore, nothing happens after that bestows upon the embryo the degree of "humanness" necessary to trigger the moral protection of a human embryo. Indeed, those taking this line of reasoning find agreement in the ancient text of Aristotle that discusses the "handedness" of a thing, in that the essential qualities are present even if a thing lacks traditional structures and qualities.

The morality and ethical constructs that are present within the logical premises that form the underlying foundation of the arguments against stem cell research inevitably circle back to the concept that the aura surrounding the embryo is one of intense mystery (Fletcher, 775). The mere existence of the embryo demonstrates the very essence of human history-given that all individuals started as a fertilized egg.; adding the rubric of preserving this state of being through enhanced moral and ethical protections renders their use in scientific research nearly impossible. This maxim flows into the overtly religious aspect of the argument, the aspect of protecting the weakest among you; similar to Jesus' words “When you did so for the least amongst you, you have done so for me”.

This religious connotation is firmly demonstrated in the arguments used by those individuals and groups seeking to curtail stem cell research. The very existence of the human embryo and its use in scientific research, according to this group, goes to the very heart of what it means to treat all individuals with the same level of equality-although one could very easily argue that the turbulent history of the United States has certainly contained some contradictory events to this very fundamental precept. For those seeking to limit the use of embryonic stem cells in laboratories, the issue boils down to two simple absolutes: the embryo is the weakest form of humanity and society must maintain consistency with its moral justifications to ensure that all individuals regardless of background or stage of development are entitled to equal protection under the law and morality (Jaeggi, 23). These truths lead to an examination of the societal aspects of this argument.

Those who argue the moral and religious connotations concerning embryonic stem cell research hold that this form of scientific inquiry represents the crossing of several moral and ethical boundaries. Using embryonic stem cells for the sole purpose of their destruction creates a sort of instrumentality of human life (Jaeggi, 24). This argument makes the distinction that those embryos that were set for destruction did not lose their moral authority if those embryos were used for medical research. However, the moral justification for limiting stem cell research calls out those cells that are "programmed" to revert to their stem cell state and are in turn used for the sole purpose of being destroyed. These "re-programmed" cells referred to as IPSC's lose all moral equivalencies and therefore should not be generated for the singular purpose of destruction.

4. ETHICAL ISSUES REGARDING HUMAN CLONING

The cloning debate involves legislators, religious leaders, scientists, philosophers, and international organizations, but they don't often agree. Many have argued that human "reproductive "cloning is unethical. According to UNESCO, cloning a mammal has been meeting with a high failure rate, since its inception, only 29 were implanted in ewes and only one developed successfully. Similar experiments with humans would be unacceptable (Langlois).

The high failure rates (more than 90 percent) and high morbidity of animal cloning strongly suggest its inapplicability to humans. Furthermore, deformity and disability rates are high in cloned animals. For instance, Dolly herself developed problems in 2003, at the age of just six and a half years, even though many sheep live for more than 10 years. She had developed progressive lung disease, which is typically found in older sheep, as well as premature arthritis (Langlois). Some experts in this field have consequently claimed that cloned humans might need hip replacement surgery while still adolescents and might also suffer from senility before age 20 (Langlois)

The ethical ramifications of cloning, especially about humans, seem to defy easy limitation. Even if cloning technique problems are resolved with time, many questions remain. On what grounds could reproduce children by cloning be allowed or prohibited? Should cloning be used for sterile couples or for homosexual couples who want biological offspring? How would a child born by asexual reproduction experience life, as a unique individual or as a genetic “prisoner”? Is a cloned child simply a twin of its genetic donor, with a certain time lag? Should parents choose the traits of a future child, as is possible with cloning? Those and other such issues now preoccupy scientists and bioethicists who see in cloning procedures the potential to endanger human identity.

The world community provided an answer when it declared human cloning contrary to human dignity, in Article 11 of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and human rights (1997) elaborated by UNESCO. IN Section C of the Declaration, "Research on the human Genome", it is stated, "practices which are contrary to human dignity such as reproductive cloning of human beings, shall not be permitted…" (Langlois)

After careful consideration, several countries have formulated opinions and regulations on human reproductive cloning. In France, the National Consultative Ethics, Committee for health and life sciences (CCNE)- Committee comiteconsultatif national d'ethiquepourless sciences de la vie et de la santé) addressed central dilemmas when in 1997 it rejected human reproductive cloning. "the notion that perfect genetic similarly would in itself lead to perfect psychic similarity is devoid of any scientific foundation "stated the Committee, adding that human reproductive cloning would cause "a fundamental upheaval of the relationship between genetic identity and personal identity in its biological and cultural dimensions"(Opinion No 54, " "Reply to the president of the French Republic on the subject of reproductive cloning". April 1997) (Descamps, 310). Other nations concurred, citing the sheer risks involved in cloning ventures, notably to mothers and babies.

For japans' Council for Science and Technology, human cloning had no usefulness to commend its practice. It added that medical applications using human cells obtained through cloning "may lead to breeding of human beings and violation of human rights"(Descamps, 321). Furthermore, the Japanese expert committee concluded that asexual reproduction through cloning would destroy the family concept in their society.

In its "human Cloning and human Dignity" study in 2002, the president's council on Bioethics in the United States observed that efforts to clone a human would be unethical "at this time" because of "safety concerns and the likelihood of harm to those involved". A wealth of other, concerns, could well preclude ever attempting human clones, the report said. "The notion of cloning raises issues about identity and individuality, the meaning of having children, the difference between procreation and manufacture, and the relationship between the generations" (Descamps, 311). These conclusions seemed to promise a debate over the morality of biological sciences and cloning that would continue for many years to come.

In Tunisia, the National medical Ethics committee examined the issue of reproductive cloning at the request of the Minister of Health in 1997 and concluded that any technology of human cloning should be banned. It deemed the practice as undermining the concept of human reproduction and the dignity of human beings and an open door to all forms of abuse (Caulfield). Some 30 countries including Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Norway, Peru, Spain, and the United Kingdom have so far enacted a variety of laws that prohibit reproductive cloning (Caulfield).

At the international level, the issue of reproductive cloning was urgently addressed in several UN agencies following the announcement in 1997 of dolly's birth. For example, the World Health Assembly of WHO affirmed in its resolution WHA 50, 37 (1997) and resolution WHO 51.10 (1998) that "cloning for the replication of human individuals is ethically unacceptable and contrary to human dignity and integrity" (Dickenson, 55). Six months after the announcement in 1997 of Dolly's birth the 29th UNESCO General conference adopted the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human rights, a landmark document that took its place in the growing discussion of cloning. The following year, in 1998, the United Nations General Assembly endorsed the Declaration. In its 25 articles, the Declaration reaffirms the human genome as "the heritage of humanity" (Dickenson, 57). It recognized the inherent dignity and diversity of the human family. It was "imperative "the Declaration added, "not to reduce individuals to their genetic characteristics" (Dickenson, 61). And the Declaration expressly banned, as mentioned above, the reproductive cloning of human beings.

In another multilateral attempt to define a framework for scientific research and cloning practices, the Council of Europe in April 1997 enacted the "Convention for the protection of human Rights and Dignity of the human being about the Application of Biology and Medicine (Saunders, 501). The document forbids the creation of human embryos for research purposes. Many schools of thought of different views on human cloning and the following subheading explain more (Saunders, 501).

• Cloning Humans Is Unnatural

According to some, cloning humans is contrary to nature. While the splitting of human embryos does occur in nature, somatic cell nuclear transfer does not. Further, while a sexual reproduction does occur in nature, it is unnatural for the species Homo sapiens which practices sexual reproduction. This argument against cloning humans presumes on an understanding of nature as a primordial structure that is independent of a structure, for example, social structures.

• Cloning Humans Is "Playing God"

Warnings against playing God have been interpreted in multiple ways. What is common to these interpretation "is the idea that there is a natural order or structure, perhaps divinely ordained, and that proposals to exceed the limits which this natural order defines should be rejected out of hand or at least considered very carefully"(Grey, 43). In its religious applications, the phrase "playing God" alludes to God's omniscience and omnipotence and serves to identify acts or decisions outside the realm of legitimate human activity. Some of the religious interpretations of the phrase "playing God" are helpfully summarized in the NBAC report, Cloning Human Beings:

> Human beings should not probe the fundamental secrets or mysteries of life, which belong to god. Human beings lack the authority to make certain decisions about the beginning or end of life. Such decisions are reserved to divine sovereignty. Human beings are fallible and also tend to evaluate actions according to their narrow, partial and frequently self-interested perspectives. Human beings do not know, especially knowledge of outcomes of actions attributed to divine omniscience. Human beings do not have the power to control the outcomes of actions or processes that is a mark of divine omnipotence (Kaveny, 223).

In response, some argue that God expects us to use our reason, imagination, and freedom to advance our quality of life. In this view, human beings are made co-creators and human's action is an expression of divine will (Hefner, 1998).

• Cloning Human Is Contrary To Human Dignity

This reprimand against cloning humans rests, in part, on the Kantian view that persons should be treated as ends in themselves (Baird, 192). In this regard, cloning humans is morally wrong because typically clones are created entirely as a means for benefitting another. For instance, clones may be created solely to suit an interest in having a biologically related child, to replace a diseased or dying loved one, for tissue donor or to serve as an organ.

In response, some insist that this case in opposition to cloning is faulty insofar as it ignores the fact that typically there are multiple reasons and motives for procreating (whether by sexual relations or cloning), and that clones would never be created entirely as a means to another end. Others grant that some clones would possibly be treated as mere means, but they argue that this problem is not unique to cloning since people who conceive "in the usual way" at times also act instrumentally as, for example, when persons reproduce to save a failing marriage to prove their virility, to maintain their genetic line, or to have somebody to care for them in their old age. Still, others insist that it is an issue for debate whether human embryos fall within the scope of the Kantian categorical imperative (given their disputed moral status) and more generally, they argue that Kant's principle is adequately vague (Udoudom et al, 30).

• Cloning Human for the Sake of a Child

It has been suggested, for instance, that some couples may want to use cloning technology because it is the only way to have a child that is biologically linked to each of the partners. This might incorporate: infertile couples where both have no gametes (where the male spouse could supply the somatic cell and the female partner could provide the enucleated oocyte); women undergoing in vitro fertilization (IVF) with too few oocytes who might benefit from embryo splitting, and lesbian couples (where one partner could provide the somatic cell and the other could provide the enucleated oocyte) (Baird, 182). Others probably interested in human cloning are couples at high possibility of having a child with a serious genetic disease. Cloning could also be used to please a wish to re-create a deceased loved one; the usual illustration given is of parents who want to re-create a deceased or dying child. There might also be those who would use cloning technology to get a well-matched organ or tissue donor for themselves or their offspring. Finally, there may be individuals who for reasons of "curiosity, vanity, the wish for personal power, or an undoubtedly misguided desire for immortality" (Wolf et al, 2019) want a genetic replica of themselves.

One consequence of the unrelating focus on the personal is the perception of human cloning as a generational issue. Human clones are often depicted as "spaced twins", later-born identical twins" delayed genetic twins", and the "ultimate single-parent child". As well, the dominant image for human cloning is one of mass production with multiple images of an identical phenotype- "Xeroxed human beings "and "carbon-copied humans", not the traditional pedigree chart or family tree with missing or unusual linkages. Cloning is thus portrayed as horizontal multiplication, not as vertical, multigenerational replication.

With attention focused on the present and the next generation, precedence is given to concerns about possible medical and psychological harms to future children and fundamental questions about what it means to be human are set aside. Notably, this dominant perspective is highly compatible with contemporary silence on the possible uses of human cloning to pursue public health or broader goal. When the possibility of cloning humans was discussed in the 1960s, there was considerable speculation about the potential societal benefits of human cloning. One submission was to clone persons with a high pain threshold or resistance to radiation (Haldane, 355). Another submission was to clone persons skilled in a certain profession, for instance, soldiers (Fletcher, 779). Today, the examples have changed and the focus is on cloning specific persons of contra ordinary talent such as Beethoven or Einstein. As well, there is particular attention to the potential societal harms of human cloning resulting from the replication of persons with undesirable traits, the most common example being Hitler. In response to such fanciful claims, scientists have been successful in labeling most speculation about the energetic applications of human cloning as "stupid talk" that obscures the real scientific issues (Butler & Wadman, 142). To avoid the change of "stupid talk" serious academics dutifully focus on the "more immediate and realistic possibilities "and abdicate their responsibility to engage in hypothetical reasoning.

5. CONCLUSION

We are all sensitive to claims that cloning is necessary for the pursuit of valuable medical research. We also recognize that medical is an eminent, essential and necessary form of service to mankind and the ecosystem. Therefore, research involving the cloning of animals, plants and even human genes, cells and tissues can be beneficial to human beings and presents no intrinsic ethical problems. Ogar avers thus that our growing understanding of the world is so central a part of why it is good to be human, we may want to select from among us some good specimens for replication and genetic enhancement so that we might transcend our intellectual limitations (109). Before any such hypothetical need should arise, however, we can perhaps more easily imagine a world in which the increasing abilities of machines are fast outpacing those of humans. In reaction to this threat, humans might want to genetically boost their cognitive skills by cloning good specimens to be genetically engineered in order to acquire new and increasingly refined judgment decision making and adaptation skills (Baylis, 121).

The benefit of regarding the cloning of humans as an enhancement technology is twofold. The first benefit is that this perspective will shed new light on questions that are already the subject of intense debate. Among these questions: What are the ethical costs of human cloning? What obligations do we have to subsequent generations who will be subject to an unprecedented measure of control from preceding generations? How are these obligations to those who are living? What about issues of social justice? While many live in poverty and lack basic health care, can we responsibly devote energy and resources to the project of cloning humans? Is human cloning necessary? If so, necessary for what? Is human cloning progressive? If so, progressive towards what end? Is it efficient? If so, affecting what? Is it good for its own sake? Answers to these questions will differ significantly depending upon the framework for analysis- whether one considers cloning to be reproductive and/or an enhancement technology.

The second benefit of considering the cloning of humans as an enhancement technology is that this perspective will bring into sharp focus a range of novel questions that merit thoughtful reflection. For example, with the cloning of humans are we bound to embrace "volitional evolution "whereby we intentionally intervene in the shaping of human purpose? Can volitional evolution result in the domestication of the species? What is the value of diversity? What is the value of homogeneity? What social customs regarding gender, race, and appearance might (intentionally or inadvertently) be entrenched with cloning technology? While undeniably offensive in its eugenic implications, in the long-term, would homogenization of the species be a cure for such social and political ills as racism, sexism, classism, and homophobia and so on, or would any initiative of this kind only serve to exacerbate existing prejudices?

As well, another group of questions might stem from an understanding of human cloning as the modern corresponding to reincarnation. This viewpoint might refashion our perceptive of such concepts as "a life plan or "a life span". For instance, given the belief that reincarnation is an apparatus that allows individuals to improve upon themselves over time, in our modern production-tilting society would there develop a prospect that persons should avail themselves of cloning technology for the express intention of improving upon prior incarnation? What would be the end-point? Would it be culturally informed or socially stipulated? What would be the social-political and moral responses to this new eugenics?

When the cloning of human is considered solely as reproductive technology, the questions listed above garner hardly any serious attention. Instead, we ponder on questions about potential harms to children and personal choice, for instance, is a clone any worse than a 'normal' but unwanted baby? Is Steve, who wants to clone himself, any more egotistical than Saul, who wants to conceive naturally, though his children will have a 25 percent chance of getting Tay-Sachs diseases? And if cloning should be forbidden because it may challenge family values, should we criminalize divorce as well? (Ogar et al, 27). In marked contrast, when the cloning of humans is considered an individual or species enhancement technology broader societal and species-type questions outside the protected realm of personal and reproductive autonomy are "front and center". Thus, it is salient to understand that the current debate on the ethics of cloning humans with its predominant focus on autonomy (individuals' rights, desires, and choices) is profoundly unsatisfactory and lacking in imagination.

When research turns its attention to the human subject (that can never be objects) when human life is at stake our argument, actions and reflections midst necessarily recognize the dignity and value of the being involved. In the same vein, we must be sure that we do not undermine human dignity in the process of seeking and working hard to serve it. Scientific research and human experimentation divorced from ethical consideration may enhance the progress of science more rapidly on a technical level, but at the expense of loss of humanity. There have been much speculations and expectations in recent years about ways human cloning might revolutionize medical research on various diseases. In all these, ambitious propositions, however, other alternatives seem to be possible which do not involve the use of cloning technology to create and destroy human embryos.

In other words, the reduction of human embryos to "thing" involves serious ethical problems. The principal ethical problem in human cloning is that of destroying human embryos to obtain the desired cells for cloning (Bisong et el, 9). It is worth noting that embryos can be created for the sole purpose of extracting the cells for research and cloning. In this case the gravity of act arguments with such intention. Another strong ethical point is the experimentation of human being needs formal and informed consent from the interested subject. Here, the utilization of the embryo demands consent from someone. But no one has the right to give consent for any experiment on another human being when such procedure is to destroy the subject involved in it. This is one of the reasons why the legislation of all states in the world are against the commercialization of organs since the human body is never an object to be disposed of as a disvalue.

WORKS CITED

Baird, P.A. (1999), cloning of animals and humans: What should the policy response be? Perspective in biology and Medicine 42(2), 179-194.

Baylis, F. Human cloning: Three Mistakes and an Alternative, Journal of Medicine and philosophy 2002, Vol.27, No.3, pp.319-337.

Bisong, Peter B., Joseph N. Ogar, and Asira E. Asira. "The abortion debate: a contribution from Ibuanyidanda perspective." *Online Journal of Health Ethics* 12.2 (2016).

Butler, D. & Wadman, M. (1997), Calls for cloning ban sell science short,. Nature, 386, & Callahan, D. (1998), Cloning: Then and now, Cambridge Quarterly of Health care Ethics, 7(2), 141-144.

Caulfield, Timothy, 'Human Cloning Laws, Human Dignity and the Poverty of the Policy Making Dialogue', *BMC Medical Ethics*, 4 (2003) http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6939-4-3

De Gama, Katherine. "Medical Law." *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 1993: 147–152. Web.

Descamps, Philippe, 'Miseries of Institutional Debate: An Example of Human Reproductive Cloning and Its Ethical Treatment by the CCNE', *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale*, 67 (2010), 311–23 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/rmm.103.0311>

Dickenson, Donna, 'Commodification of Human Tissue: Implications for Feminist an Development Ethics', *Developing World Bioethics*, 2002, 55–63 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1471-8847.00035

Diedrich, K., and G. Griesinger, 'Reproductive Medicine: Venture Progress - Recognize Limits', *Gynakologe*, 41 (2008) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00129-008-2190-0>

Ekennia, J. N. Bio-Medical Ethics: Trends and Problems, Barloz publishers, Owerri, 2003.

Etokakpan, A. "Human cloning: Scientific analysis and ethical considerations". Koinonia. Vol.4, No.5 December, 2009.

Fletcher, J. Ethical aspects of genetic controls. New England Journal of Medicine, 285, 1971, pp.776-783.

García-Rivera, Alejandro, 'Endless Forms Most Beautiful', *Theology and Science*, 5 (2007), 125–35 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14746700701387552>

Grey, W. Playing God Encyclopedia of applied ethics (Vol.3). USA: Academic press 1998.

Haldane, J.B.S. Biological possibilities for the human species in the next ten thousand years. In: G.E.D. Wolstenhome (Ed). Man and his future, London: Churchill, 963, pp.353-360.

Hefner, P. Cloning as quintessential human act in: M. Ruse (Ed) Philosophy of biology. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1998, pp.352-256.

Jaeggi, Rahel, *Critique of Forms of Life*, *Critique of Forms of Life*, 2019 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4159/9780674988712>

Kaveny, M. Cathleen, 'The NBAC Report on Cloning', in *Handbook of Bioethics and Religion*, 2006, pp. 221–42 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0195178734.003.0011>

Langlois, Adèle, 'The Global Governance of Human Cloning: The Case of UNESCO', *Palgrave Communications*, 3 (2017) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.19>

Neresini, Federico, 'Eve's Sons', *New Genetics and Society*, 2007, 221–33 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14636770701466923

Ogar, J. N. (2019). Ethical Implication of Environmental Crises on African Societies: A Challenge to Future Humanity. *Int. J. of Environmental Pollution &Environmental Modelling*, *2*(3), 109-115

Ogar, Joseph N., Nwoye Leonard, and Samuel Akpan Bassey. "Issues Related to Infertility in Africa: An Ethical Scan." *Research & Reviews: A Journal of Biotechnology* 8.3 (2019): 26-32.

Saunders, J., 'Manual for Research Ethics Committees.', *Clinical Medicine*, 3 (2003), 479–530 <http://dx.doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.3-5-479>

Shandler, Jeffrey. "Unclean Lips: Obscenity, Jews, and American Culture by Josh Lambert." *American Jewish History* 98.3 (2014): 203–204. Web.

Travis, J. "Ewe Again? Cloning from Adult DNA." *Science News* 151.9 (2008): 132. Web.

Udoudom, M. D., Bassey, S. A., Okpe, O., & Adie, T. (2019). Kantian and Utilitarian Ethics on Capital Punishment. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 28-35

Wolf, P. L., G. Liggins, and D. Mercola, 'The Cloning Debates and Progress in Biotechnology.', *Clinical Chemistry*, 1997, 2019–20

Yanagimachi, Ryuzo. "Male Gamete Contributions to the Embryo." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. Vol. 1061. N.p., 2005. 203–207. Web.