
Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 17:48:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://customwire.ap.org/dynamic/stories/T/THERAPEUTIC_CLONING

Quote:Feb 13, 7:57 AM EST

Therapeutic Cloning Ignites Call for Ban

By PAUL RECER
AP Science Writer

SEATTLE (AP) -- In a clash of politics and science, the first successful cloning of a human embryo - and the extraction of stem cells from it - has ignited new calls for a ban on all forms of human cloning in the United States.

The cloning announcement by South Korean scientists on Thursday prompted members of Congress and church leaders to ask for immediate legislation.

"Cloning human beings is wrong. It is unethical to tinker with human life," said Rep. Joe Pitts, R-Pa. A ban must be passed, he said, "before this unethical science comes to our shores."

The Bush administration favors such action and referred reporters to a statement by the president calling for "a comprehensive and effective ban."

"Human life is a creation, not a commodity, and should not be used as research material for reckless experiments," Bush said last month.

AP VIDEO

Korean doctor touts cloning potential

Latest News
[ImClone Stock Soars on Drug Approval](#)
[Therapeutic Cloning Ignites Call for Ban](#)

U.S. Losing Edge in Stem Cell Research

Stem Cell Procedure Mixes New, Old Ways

Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., who voted against a bill passed last year by the House that called for a ban on human cloning, said there needs to be legislation that would prevent cloning of babies, but permit "lifesaving stem cell research to proceed under strict ethical guidelines."

Two South Korean scientist who announced the landmark achievement here Thursday said they have already been the target of street demonstrations and egg-throwing incidents in Seoul even though their work is directed at treating diseases and not at making cloned babies.

Woo Suk Hwang, lead author of the study, admitted at a news conference that the technique developed in his lab "cannot be separated from reproductive cloning" and called on every country to prevent the use of the technology in that way.

He said the work was controlled and regulated by the Korea Stem Cell Research Center "to prevent the remote possibility of any uncontrolled accidents such as human reproductive cloning."

Shin Yong Moon, a co-author of the study, said the work must continue because of its great promise for treating of diseases such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, spinal cord injury and diabetes. But he said a new law passed in Korea will now require his group to get a government license before proceeding with their research.

The medical use of stem cells derived from cloning will require at least another decade of research, he said.

Both Hwang and Moon are researchers at the Seoul National University.

Donald Kennedy, editor of the journal Science, which published the study, said the work is not a recipe for cloning babies.

"It is a recipe (for human cloning) in the sense that 'catch a turtle' is the recipe for turtle soup," said Kennedy at a news conference. "There is much difficulty that would remain for anybody who tried to use this technology as a first step toward reproductive cloning."

Hwang, Moon and their team created the human embryo after collecting 242 eggs from 16 unpaid, anonymous volunteers. They also took from each woman cells from the ovaries. To attempt male embryo cloning, they used cells taken from the ear lobes of adult men.

The researchers extracted the nucleus from each of the eggs and then inserted the nucleus from the other cells.

The eggs were then nurtured into blastocysts, an early stage of embryo development, and the stem cells were extracted.

Hwang said the group had a 43 percent success rate in making cloned embryos, but was successful only in making one colony of stem cells. Only the embryos made using both the nucleus and the egg from the same woman successfully matured enough to make stem cells, he said; eggs that received nuclei from adult male cells or from adult cells of women other than the egg donor failed to produce stem cells.

Hwang, a veterinarian, developed the cloning technique on animals and then teamed with Moon for the human embryo experiment.

Embryonic stem cells are the source of all tissue. Researchers believe they can be coaxed to grow into heart, brain or nerve cells that could be used to renew ailing organs.

In the experiment, Hwang and his team said, the embryonic stem cells in tests that followed the cells for 70 divisions formed muscle, bone and other tissue.

Using cloned embryonic stem cells for therapy would avoid the problem of tissue rejection. Cloned stem cells, in theory, would be an exact genetic match to the cell donor and would not be attacked by the immune system.

Regulations approved by President Bush permit federal funding of stem cell research, but only on cell lines created from embryos destroyed before Aug. 9, 2001. The approved cell lines were not created by cloning, however.

Kennedy, the Science editor, said the U.S. restrictions are handicapping American researchers.

"There is no question that the degree of restriction has given other nations some significant advantage," he said.

Copyright 2004 Associated Press. All rights reserved

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 17:54:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Note I am duplicating the content here because often news URLs go stale after a day or so.

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 18:09:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like the link in that AP story the best..

Quote:ImClone Stock Soars on Drug Approval

such tragic irony..

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [pulverizer](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 13:15:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cloning humans... That's the baddest thing I've ever heard. Cloning humans is a big mistake I think.

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [Majiin Vegeta](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 14:15:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

slayerCloning humans... That's the baddest thing I've ever heard. Cloning humans is a big mistake I think.

for medical research and things.. its alright :/

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 16:17:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

organs and parts are ok, but not the whole thing.

Subject: First Human Cloned
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 20:24:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd agree with that. If we started doing the whole person, then we'd have ourselves in a hell of a moral/ethical mess. As if overpopulation weren't bad enough already, now we can duplicate every new person that's born, or have a set of quintuplets every year! As if that weren't bad enough, how do you deal with people returning babies when they don't come out perfect? "But doctor...it's only a clone!" No, cloning an entire person is not ethical.

If someone needs an organ transplant, this is perfect. Clone them a new one, and they're good as new- no donor needed. Liver, kidneys, eyes, stomach, lungs, even the heart and parts of the nervous system. Organ transplant would no longer require waiting in line for a compatible donor. If

it's used for healing, and has no harmful side-effect, go for it.

Subject: First Human Cloned

Posted by [Majiin Vegeta](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 04:24:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

but you cant just grow a liver or any other organ .. you need the human to grow it no??

i know its not right growing somebody then killing them.. but if we are to advance in medic science.. we have to..

this way we could test stuff out on clones.. see the side effects.. see if it even works..

Subject: First Human Cloned

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 04:55:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you don't need to have to do that. a few years ago i learned that they grew a human ear on the back of a mouse...all you would have to do is surgically remove it from the mouse and implant it. but i am sure that technology has moved forward in that and if my memory serves me right...i think i heard that you can just grow organs w/o a human donor/sacrifice. i am not 100% sure on that.

testing the side effects...that is worse than animal testing. these are human beings...you or me. i mean...yeah...they're clones...but still. you could argue that for medical purposes, every parent of twins should have to or have the choice of giving up one of the babies for testing. think about it...giving up one of your own children for testing purposes. You could also argue that you're giving up one of ur children, but for bettering your community and the world around you. but what if it doesn't? you just gave the life of your child away or severely diminished the possibility of your child living a normal life. what if your parents did that to you? who knows what kind of side effects these things have...it's just too dangerous.

Subject: First Human Cloned

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 05:18:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's a soul-searching question for ya: when does life begin? When the baby leaves the womb? When the sperm cell and the egg combine to form a zygote?

Even more soul-searching: what is life? Is life a newborn baby? Is it an unborn fetus? Or is it something as simple as a bundle of cells?

When you answer these questions, think about this one: does this process, so-called "therapeutic cloning," create life?

Think about this: we all came from an egg and a sperm cell. When those two seemingly

insignificant cells combined to form a zygote, you were created. Without that little bundle of cells, you would never have come into being. Essentially, you were a human being at the time of conception. You were a human being who had parents, who had a family, who had a DNA sequence all of his own. You had attached to the side of your mother's uterus (there's a nasty thought to think about (although true)) to be born nine months later. At that time, you had developed into a baby.

With that in mind, how different were you as a baby from that little bundle of cells that was growing ever so larger on a daily basis in your mother's womb? You had a few more organs than you did when you were still in the womb; you could breathe on your own, something you couldn't do while in the womb, but had it not been for that little bundle of cells in your mother's womb, you would not have ever become a baby.

With all of that mind, is a little bundle of cells in a woman's womb any less of a human than a newborn baby?

Now ask yourself, is it right to create a human and destroy it to help another human? What makes that one human any better than the other? Is it the fact that one is more developed than the other? Does THAT make a fully-grown adult more important than a small bundle of cells? The same question from before is raised: is that bundle of cells life?

This same argument can be made for abortion as well as cloning; both are moral issues that deal with the same concept of life: a zygote is as much of a human as a baby.

Subject: First Human Cloned

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 20:42:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A little bundle of cells only becomes human when there's an active brain attached to it. Until the central nervous system develops, you as a person do not exist in that body. Likewise, after your central nervous system fails, you are dead. Your other organs exist only to serve your brain; that is the part that matters. The brain develops somewhere during the second trimester. Before that happens, there is no baby, only a parasitic clump of biomatter that has no thoughts, feelings, or decision making capability.
