

Vgpvcvkq Fgeg o dgt 4223 - C Tgurqpug vq J w o cp Enqpkpi

The recent announcement by a Massachusetts research firm that they had cloned a human embryo appears to be a publicity stunt perhaps intended to gain financial advantage in the marketplace. The six-celled human embryo did not survive long enough to make it a viable source of stem cells. Scientists the world over, include Nobel prize winner Paul Berg of Stanford University, denounced it as being of little significance. Although this ought to dispel the idea that human cloning is just around the corner, it is disturbing that, in the debate that followed, a distinction has been made popular between what is being called "therapeutic cloning" and "reproductive cloning." Although polls indicate that 90% of Americans are against reproductive cloning, the truth is that therapeutic cloning cares even less for the embryo it creates, intending from the beginning to destroy it in the name of research.

The only appealing argument for therapeutic cloning is the assumed benefit to sick and injured people. The assumption is that science can do anything if given enough time and raw material to