

Reproductive Control

Cloning

1. animal cloning: some ethical issues related to animal testing and non-harm

Speciesism: the notion that the interests of non-human animals need not be considered

A Singerian argument against animal cloning for medical research.

1. Cloning animals for medical research is a form of speciesism.
2. If cloning animals for medical research is a form of speciesism, then cloning animals for medical research is morally wrong.
3. Therefore, cloning animals for medical research is morally wrong.

A possible counter-argument (that Singer would endorse)

1. If the benefits of animal cloning for medical research outweigh the suffering of the animals involved, then animal cloning for medical research is morally right.
2. The benefits of animal cloning for medical research outweigh the suffering of the animals involved.
3. Animal cloning for medical research is morally right.

A possible counter argument in the spirit of Carl Cohen:

1. Either cloning animals for medical research is a form of speciesism or it is not.
2. If cloning animals for medical research is a form of speciesism, then cloning animals for medical research is morally right.
3. If cloning animals for medical research is not a form of speciesism, then cloning animals for medical research is morally right.
4. Therefore, cloning animals for medical research is morally right.

2. human cloning:

An argument against human cloning

1. If research involving human cloning would lead to tragic outcomes for the cloned individuals, then human cloning is morally wrong.
2. Research involving human cloning leads to tragic outcomes for the cloned individuals.
3. Therefore human cloning is morally wrong.

*An interesting point about Munson's book emerges here: many reasons are given why human cloning is completely deplorable. But not a single argument is humored *in favor* of human cloning.

Exercise: Is it possible to argue that human cloning is morally permissible, at least in some cases (or at least could be in the future)?

the "photo-copy myth": the mistaken idea that a clone will be an exact duplicate of the organism that is cloned.

twinning: a procedure in which a fertilized embryo is artificially chemically induced to split in its early stages of development.

Assisted Reproduction:

1. Destroyed Embryos

The human embryos argument

1. If the destruction of human embryos is morally wrong, then assisted reproduction is morally wrong.
2. The destruction of human embryos is morally wrong.
3. assisted reproduction is morally wrong.

2. Eugenics

“Evolution need no longer be a destiny imposed from without; it may conceivably be controlled by man, in accordance with his wisdom and values.” Theodosius Dobzhansky

The aim of **Positive Eugenics** is the promotion of positive traits within a given gene pool.

What genes are deemed *positive* is largely a function of which genes express traits a given society finds valuable or desirable to have.

The aim of **Negative Eugenics** is to decrease the number of negative, or undesirable genes from within a given gene pool.

What genes are deemed *negative* are—most of the time—those genes who express themselves as genetic diseases.

Ethical Difficulties with Eugenics

NE doesn't help much: on average, everyone carries recessive genes for 5 genetic diseases or disorders.

PE doesn't help much either: it's difficult to promote positive genes, and even if we could, it would be almost impossible to agree which genes to promote. What counts as a desirable trait varies.

Eugenics and AR :the “perfect baby” scenario

3. Family related considerations: the AR and the threat of the Brave New World.

Would assisted reproduction, drawn out to its logical conclusion, really erode the notion of family? Do we need to worry about creating some weird dystopia? Or is this belief a mere artifact of fear of the unknown.

