

## **BIBLICAL VIEW OF HUMAN CLONING -- Rev. Prof.-Emeritus Dr. N. Lee**

Human Genetic Engineering (or HGE) embraces a variety of life-promoting procedures. All of them purport to "create" or to "improve" the human race in a pre-conception-al setting. HGE is not concerned with either post-conception-al or post-natal surgery (such as that involved in the cutting of umbilical cords, or the separation of humanly-separable Siamese twins, or appendectomies, or heart transplants). Such surgeries are subsequent to conception -- and are variously either permissible or impermissible in the light of the eternal and comprehensive Law of God anent existent human persons.

### **Human genetic engineering, cloning, and genetic recombination**

In HGE, we are concerned solely with pre-conception-al procedures -- occurring before the existence of the person(s) to be most affected. HGE may be either non-conception-al or pro-conception-al. So we shall here look at pre-conception-al non-conception-al cloning -- and also at the different pre-conception-al and pro-conception-al genetic recombinations -- as distinct from post-conception-al embryonic improvements *etc.*

We shall not here discuss Corrective Embryonic Surgery (or CES). For CES -- although sometimes miscalled 'genetic engineering' -- is essentially different. Indeed, CES does not alter the genes or the pro-conception-al cells in organic matter prior to conception in the way both cloning and DNA recombinations do.

Now by (non-conception-al) "cloning" is meant the non-spermatocytic and non-sexual duplication of artificial specimens genetically and sexually identical to the original specimen. 1952 saw the first successful cloning of frogs, from tadpole cells. Professor Dr. J.B. Gurdon, using the Briggs-King technique, cloned a colony of identical South African claw-frogs. He did this by transplanting the nucleus of an intestinal cell from a tadpole (A) into the denucleated egg-cell of another frog of similar species (B). Very amazingly, the thus-stimulated egg-cell divided, and kept on dividing into a blastocystic cluster of several cells (which we here call C & D & E & F *etc.*).

Gurdon then divided those cells from one another, and impregnated each one of them (C & D & E & F *etc.*) into one of a similar number of denucleated egg-cells (O & P & Q & R *etc.*). Each of the latter was similar to the original denucleated egg-cell B. Once cells C & D & E & F (*etc.*) had impregnated the denucleated egg-cells O & P & Q & R (*etc.*), the latter then developed into a whole colony (S & T & U & V & W & X & Y & Z *etc.*) of tadpoles (which in turn later became frogs).

Those several tadpoles (S & T & U & V & W & X & Y & Z *etc.*) were all identical both to one another and also to the first tadpole A from which the original cell had been taken. In this way, tadpole A had now been cloned into the "identical octuplets" (S & T & U & V & W & X & Y & Z *etc.*). Each of them was also an "identical twin" of its own "identical parent" A. So, A -- through human agency -- had been induced artificially to (re)produce (S & T & U & V & W & X

& Y & Z *etc.*) from their own "grandmother" B, yet without A ever having "mated" either with her or with her offspring O & P & Q & R (*etc.*).

### **The course of genetic engineering from 1952 until 1970**

This experiment immediately led to intense speculation about its applicability to humans. Two famous novels appeared: Charles Eric Maine's *World Without Men*, and Poul Anderson's *Virgin Planet*. These anticipated a future World without sex, inhabited by genderless clones. Yet any cloning of viable **human** embryos would not be announced until 1993. Meantime speculation anent human eugenetical engineering ran rife. Weird cloning experiments were commenced, and were continued, upon mammals.

Already during 1958, in his work *The Control of Life*, Dr. Anthony Waterson, Professor of Microbiology at St. Thomas' Hospital Medical School, had insisted: "The segregation or sterilization of those who are thought to be undesirable as breeders is a serious offence to human freedom.... The ultimate logic of the adoption of eugenic measures would lead to mass artificial insemination by selected donors (*AID*)."

Professor Henry Stob agreed, in his own book *Ethical Reflections*. Dr. Stob, Professor Emeritus of Philosophical and Moral Philosophy at Calvin Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids, reminded people that man is divinely structured. He added: "I find it hazardous, if not impious, to tamper with the genetic core. To tamper with the genes seems to me to outrun God into an unknown future, and [to] exercise discrimination mere men do not possess."

According to Dr. Varga's book *The Main Issues in Bioethics*, "in 1965 Dr. Beatrice Mintz experimented with embryos of mice and succeeded in fusing them. She then placed the fused embryos in the wombs of mice.... The result was individuals with four (rather than with two) natural parents.... Multiple parenthood," Varga even then noted, "would be possible for human beings also."

### **1970-71: both opposition to and support of plans to clone humans**

In 1970, the Princeton Presbyterian Theologian Rev. Professor Dr. Paul Ramsay and the Roman Catholic Dr. B. Haering and the Jewish Medical Ethicist Dr. F. Rosner all rightly claimed human cloning is so impersonal it undermines parenthood's human and personal aspects. In human cloning, only one 'parent' of either sex would be required. This could easily give men not used in cloning, the feeling of being castrated -- and it could also easily give women not used in cloning, the feeling of being redundant. The separation of 'cloning' from human sexual intercourse, would dehumanize. It would inevitably break down the family and even society as a whole.

In 1970, not just mouse embryos but mice as such were successfully cloned -- Dr. Muggleston Harris, a Massachusetts Scientist, having received a U.S. Government Grant for this very purpose. In 1971, Dr. Landrum Shettles successfully implanted a human *IVF* embryo into a

second woman -- but later had him or her excised together with and inside that foster-mother's own defective body-parts. And in 1972 Nancy Freedman -- punning on "Joshua the son of Nun" (in Joshua 1:1) -- portrayed President John F. Kennedy as a clone in her book *Joshua, Son of None*. Then, in 1971, Dr. Joseph Fletcher published a book subtitled *Designed Genetic Changes in Man*. There, he declared: "It would be justifiable not only to specialize the capacity of people by cloning or by constructing genetic engineering, but also to bio-engineer or bio-design para-humans."

### **1973: Dr. Kass firmly opposes all attempts to clone humans**

During 1972, the University of Chicago and Kennedy Institute Biologist Dr. Leon Kass condemned attempts to manufacture human beings and issued a warning against asexual efforts to reproduce them. In all attempts to clone humans, maintained Kass, we have "a divorce of the generation of new life from human sexuality -- and ultimately from the confines of the human body."

Should humans ever prove to be clonable, continued Kass, "sexual intercourse will no longer be needed for generating new life. This novelty leads to two others." For then in that event: "There is a new co-progenitor: the embryologist-geneticist-physician. And there is a new home for generation: the laboratory. The mysterious and intimate processes of generation are to be moved from the darkness of the womb to the bright [fluorescent] light of the laboratory."

Elsewhere, Kass added: "One can purchase quality control of the product only by the depersonalization of the process. Is there not wisdom in the mystery of nature that joins the pleasure of sex, the communication of love, and the desire for children -- in the very activity by which we continue the chain of human existence? Is not human procreation, if properly understood and practised, itself a humanizing experience?"

### **1974: Dr. Fletcher's support of attempts to clone humans**

The famous 'Situation Ethics' Theologian Dr. Joseph Fletcher, in his 1974 book *The Ethics of Genetic Control*, linked humanoid manbeasts and android clones. Fletcher anticipated and almost welcomed complete animal-human hybrids.

Such humanoid manbeast hybrids, explained Fletcher, would be justified -- if they could protect real humans from danger, disease, or even unpleasant occupations. Though less intelligent than man, they could either happily or unfeelingly execute unattractive tasks and do boring jobs and thus relieve real humans for more exalted pursuits. See H.G. Wells's novel *The Island of Dr. Moreau* (the manbeast-manufacturer) - quite recently re-shot as a movie in North Queensland.

Moreover, enthused Fletcher, android clones could even donate organs to one another [and also to real humans?]. Thus, cloning would become necessary to construct 'people' for special tasks requiring special physical or 'mental' characteristics.

Smaller size 'people' should be made, suggested Dr. Fletcher, for the task of extra-terrestrial exploration. For they would better adapt to the rigours of space travel than normal-sized human beings. To Fletcher, it would seem, the 'androids' of science fiction -- if not even the robot R2D2's companion C3PO of *Star Wars* -- here suddenly begin to loom up on the horizon.

### **1975: the trans-species fusion of human and plant cells**

In 1975, at Brookhaven National Laboratory human cells and tobacco plant cells were fused and grown in combination. Also Hungarian biologists reported, about the same time, that they had successfully fused and grown HeLa human cells with those of carrots. HeLa human cells are tumor cells derived from a cancer patient many years ago.

The implications of this also for ongoing experiments toward the cloning of humans, should be obvious. It is therefore significant that, also around 1975, Professor Dr. Paul Segal of the University of California Department of Microbiology predicted that the first human being would be cloned well before the year 2000 A.D.

### **1976: a spate of novels about the cloning of humans**

Now the first man was cloned already in 1976 (and indeed from a multi-millionaire) -- argued David Rorvik's book *In His Image: The Cloning of a Man*. Still, cloning was then widely believed not to have "evolved"(!) -- yet -- much beyond the frog.

"Cloning has not been done in mammals yet," wrote the very famous British Lawyer/Theologian Professor Norman Anderson in his book *Issues of Life and Death*. But Anderson does not seem to have been aware of the cloning of mouse-embryos in 1965, nor of mice themselves in 1970.

Yet Anderson nevertheless quite rightly observed: "The very idea of the selective breeding of human beings in the manner of race-horses or prize-cattle...constitute[s] a fundamental degradation of man made in the image of God.... This brings us back to the principle of...the 'creation-ordinance.'"

For "the basic institution" is "marriage (and family relationships).... Sex, for the Christian, must (for this reason among others) be confined to marriage. So too...should the conception of a child.... For mammals, the nucleus of the adult cell is too specialized to be re-programmed to start the development of an embryo. There's nothing wrong with cloning research on experimental animals." But "it doesn't provide any answers to human concerns, misery, pain.... It's of no value."

Ben Bova's 1976 novel *Multiple Man* contemplated several identical human clones as being already existent. One, he suggested, had become the U.S. President -- after the other clones and the original were all found dead.

Also in 1976, Ira Levin's book *The Boys from Brazil* portrayed the infamous Dr. Mengele and his Neo-Nazis as alive and well on planet Earth. In South America, alleged Levin, they had cloned a whole batch of *ersatz* little Hitlers -- for a later Neo-Germanic attempt to conquer the World.

### **Dr. Schaeffer on Dr. Watson's *Moving Towards the Clonal Man***

In the same year, Rev. Dr. Francis A. Schaeffer observed: "Any of us would be glad for methods of genetic changes which would cure genetic diseases and help individuals. However, removing these things from the uniqueness which Christianity gives to people and from the Christian absolutes, tends to lead to an increasing loss of humanness, even in the milder forms. In the call for full genetic engineering, the door is wide open for the most far-reaching manipulation. The call concerns who should have children, and what kind of children they should have.

"It is a call for a group in society to determine what kind of people is wanted, and a call to set out to make them genetically. It is striking that James D. Watson (1928- ), who along with Francis Crick received the Nobel Prize in 1962 for breaking the *DNA* code, spoke out for exercising the greatest caution. He warned a Congressional Committee of the dangers of experiments...in *The Atlantic* (May 1971) under the title 'Moving Towards the Clonal Man.'"

### **Corea's 1979 *Mother Machine: Reproductive Technologies***

There is an integral interrelationship between research toward complete human ectogenesis, the manufacture of animal/human hybrids, and the proposed cloning of humans. This appears from Corea's important and seminal 1979 book *The Mother Machine: Reproductive Technologies*.

In that study, Corea stated: "Though it may never be possible to clone **adult** humans, this does not mean scientists would not be able to **clone humans** at all. On the contrary, it is likely that they will be able to do so -- using human *embryonic* tissue, as the source of the donor nuclei."

### **Dr. McKinnell's two 1979 books on cloning frogs and men**

Also in 1979, the Biologist Dr. Robert McKinnell wrote that the technology to manufacture android clones from humans was probably even then available. In his book *Cloning*, he explained that "removal of a fertilized egg from the reproductive tract of a woman could be considered an abortion"; and also that he himself "would in fact be loath to contrive an experiment [of human cloning] on an egg already 'launched into life'.... I do not want to clone a human. I know of only one who had."

Elsewhere, McKinnell added: "To clone a human, the fertilized egg must be enucleated. That means that a nascent human being -- must be eliminated.... Human cloning required the murder of one human being -- in order to create an identical twin of the donor."

Beyond all refutation, sheep were cloned in 1979 -- and cattle in 1980. Such were often overweight at birth. They sometimes regressed, yet when attaining maturity they were themselves generally fertile. This could be ominous. For genetically, what is possible with sheep and cattle, is nearly always possible also with humans.

### **1980: Lester & Hefley's book *Cloning: Miracle or Menace?***

In their 1980 study titled *Cloning: Miracle or Menace?* -- Lester and Hefley offered many arguments in favour of trying to clone androids from human material. Nine arguments in particular were adduced. They are:

Cloning is a great way to perpetuate genius. Cloning can provide soldier- and servant-classes of people. Cloning can improve the human race. Cloning can prevent genetic disease in a selected posterity. Cloning can exchange body-parts. Cloning can promote social communion, enhanced by experience. Cloning can provide a genotype of one's (living or dead) spouse, of a deceased parent, or of some other departed loved one. Cloning can provide a form of immortality for donors. Cloning can determine the sex of future children. And cloning increases scientific knowledge.

### **1981: genetic engineering questions raised by R.T. Missenden**

A whole host of important questions raised by Rev. R.T. Missenden in his paper against human engineering, aptly illustrate the undesirability of any kind of genetic guesswork in respect of human beings. Thus he asked:

"Should applicants for a marriage licence be required to present a genetic history? Should those with 'suspect' heredities submit to genetic testing?"

"Should known carriers of certain diseases be forbidden to marry? Should retarded and insane persons be sterilised? Should a retarded woman who gets pregnant, be given an abortion against her wishes?" And -- thus F.N. Lee -- should a non-retarded woman who gets pregnant by a man she regards as normal but other people regard as retarded, be forced into an abortion?"

Missenden continued to ask: "Should insurance companies rate policyholders on the basis of their genes? Should genetic profiles be required for job applicants? Should the federal government have on file genetic records for national health planning?"

"Who will be wise enough to decide which traits are worth keeping, and which should be 'corrected'? Could a mad dictator reshape a population to his liking? Can gene splicing eradicate the sin nature? Who will bear responsibility for choices? Can people blame their misfortunes on genetic engineers?"

## **Turner on ethics and legality of artificial human procreation**

In the nineteen-eighties, P.D. Turner published an interesting article in the *Journal of Urban Law*. In that article -- *Love's Labor Lost: Legal and Ethical Implications in Artificial Human Procreation* -- P.D. Turner stated that the present legal relationship between an archetypical human clonist and his or her ectypical clonant (alias his single genetically-duplicate clone) would probably be one of parent and child, rather than that of sibling or same-person.

Explains P.D. Turner: "It was reported in January 1979 that Dr. Landrum B. Shettles had transplanted a human nucleus. The transplanted human nucleus was derived from a human spermatological cell (the diploid precursors of the mature haploid sperm). The human egg recipient was enucleated with a micropipette. Several operations were performed, three resulting in ova that formed small clusters of cells (*morulae*). The three human *morulae* were then discarded. Shettles suggested normal development would have resulted, had the *morulae* been inserted in the uterus of humans.

As Dr. Joshua Lederberg had said already way back in his 1966 essay *Experimental Genetics and Human Evolution*: "Our genetic system is so complex that experiments in the surgical repair of the system are bound to fail a large part of the time, and possibly with disastrous consequences if we slip even a single nucleotide." Yet even Lederberg added: "A mix of sexual and clonal reproduction makes good sense for genetic design."

Turner now responded in the nineteen-eighties: "The problem which arises from Lederberg's proposal is the difficulty of determining who will be chosen to clone and who will be chosen to engage in sexual reproduction.... This could easily result in the totalitarian abuses deeply feared by some commentators."

It was also observed by Turner not from a Biblical perspective but simply from the viewpoint of American Law, that "whether a 'subhuman' clonal monstrosity is to be considered a 'person' and therefore under the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment -- remains an issue to be resolved. Its [!] status, however, would appear to be analogous to that of a natural child born grossly malformed. Such a child has the right to all medical treatment which would ease or improve his condition."

Therefore, suggested Turner, there should be "strict adherence to moral protocol in biomedical experimentation -- requiring the testing of such risky procedures on non-human primates. The other approach is to postpone human cloning entirely, until extracorporeal gestation is perfected in laboratories.... This would allow for the careful monitoring of the fetus, and permit its [!] termination when a mishap occurs."

Turner continued: "To restrict a person to a predetermined geno-type, may be incompatible with the Thirteenth Amendment prohibiting slavery or involuntary servitude. The more sophisticated genetic manipulation becomes -- the easier to enforce and accept the notion of genetic slavery."

## **Dr. J.H. Smit's 1981 article: *Cloning -- Demonic Technique?***

In 1981, Dr. J.H. Smit -- Professor of Theology at the University of the Orange Free State in South Africa -- wrote an important article on human genetic engineering. The very name of the article was itself thought-provoking, namely *Cloning -- Demonic Technique?*

There, Smit rightly recognized the very obvious relationship between cloning and genetic engineering. Smit wrote that there may indeed be "tremendously positive results which genetic engineering may hold for humanity" -- as regards the improvement of plant and animal stock by removing the "reproductive possibilities of a maternal parent transmitting a fatal disease or deformity." Yet, when being considered for possible application to the human species itself, "genetic engineering must constantly respect human life and the Creator's laws governing marriage and family."

As at the creation of the first 'womb-man' Eve from the 'womb' of Adam -- God Himself in the ONLY 'Genetic Engineer' of the human species. God alone is the Sole Creator of the entire human race in His own image. For not man nor woman but only God created man and woman. Genesis 1:26-28; 2:22-25; Isaiah 45:5-12; 49:1-5; Zechariah 12:1; First Corinthians 11:7-12.

### **1982: Judge Kirby says naive to think cloning will not happen**

In 1982 the Chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission (Mr. Justice Kirby) mentioned a report in an American journal alleging that the transplantation of human *nuclei* would become technologically possible in the next decade or two. He stated only the naive thought cloning impossible.

"Such sceptics should read our recent human history, not least the way in which the distinguished German medical profession was diverted into Hitler's experimentation. It is but forty years since there was talk of a master race and experiments were conducted on live humans.... Without legal regulation," concluded Judge Kirby, "it is sure that scientists somewhere will continue this experimentation." Yet we think even laws would not stop them.

### **Editors Walters & Singer's 1982 book *Test-Tube Babies***

Also during 1982, after the great Australian breakthrough in human embryo freeze-thaw technology -- Dr. William Walters, Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at Monash University and a Member of Melbourne's Queen Victoria Hospital *IVF* Team, co-edited the book *Test-Tube Babies*. Therein, Professor Dr. William Daniel explained that "the procedure of *IVF* and *ET* is a prerequisite for genetic engineering."

Professor Dr. John Morgan predicted that "any threats of a wide-scale assault on characteristically human values and institutions will come from developments of techniques which make use of [*IVF* in] cloning, genetic engineering, or using artificial placenta for gestation outside the body." While noting these warnings, we ourselves would still prefer to make a



rather sharp distinction between pre-conception-al Human Genetic Engineering and post-conception-al Corrective Embryonic Surgery.

### **Dr. William Walters himself on the subject of cloning**

In that same book *Test-Tube Babies*, Dr. Walters himself made an important admission right at the beginning of his own chapter titled 'Cloning, Ectogenesis, and Hybrids: Things to Come?' There, he admitted: "IVF and ET...almost pale into insignificance...when suggestions...are made about cloning, ectogenesis, and hybridization...."

"Although these procedures have not yet been used in man, the possibility [that they will be] in the not too distant future, raises much anxiety or even fear about the future of humanity.... The success of IVF and ET in man, paves the way for related techniques such as those which form the subjects of this chapter."

Walters first described the fixed 'nuclear transfer cloning' (as in Gurdon's cloning of the South African claw-frogs). He then went on to describe "another type of cloning": twinning, alias 'embryo fission.'

"This," explained Walters, "involves separating the cells of an early embryo at the two-cell stage and the transplanting of them into a recipient uterus, suitable primed hormonally, where they can develop into completely (and genetically) identical embryos. This technique has been applied to mouse-embryos up to the eight-cell stage."

### **Walters's refutation of objections to cloning humans**

Already anticipating the as-then-yet-still-future production of clones from humans, Walters even in 1982 attempted to deal with objections to such procedures. What if the clone learns he is a clone? Could that not have a "deleterious psychological effect" on him -- "if he recognized [in himself or in his 'parent' or in both] some physical or mental characteristics of his parent that he did not like?"

By 'parent' Walters here meant the non-parent original human being from whom the asexual attempt would be made to manufacture the clone. As a result -- it might be objected -- the clone could, admits Walters, possibly "become depressed or behave in an antisocial manner" (such as did Dr. Frankenstein's monster in Marry Shelley's novel). Nevertheless, explained Walters, this possibility should not deter scientists from cloning humans. "For this hypothetical argument could also apply, however, in the case of a child conceived in the normal manner."

Indeed, even "the creation of multiple copies of...the nucleus Donor" need not "lead to loss of identity in the clones." For "what distinguishes one human being from another is basically the unique pattern of roles and relationships he bears among his fellows, and not any dissimilarity of his body from theirs (Mackay)." Note that both Mackay and Walters had already assumed not

only that humans could be cloned. They had also assumed that such clones would be made -- and that they would still be humans.

Walters's next argument in support of future attempts to clone humans, reflected his misapplication of the phenomenon of identical twins -- and his misunderstanding of the teachings of Jesus Christ. "Identical twins are known to be particularly close to one another emotionally, rather than lacking a sense of uniqueness or self.

"In any case, it is not necessarily desirable to emphasize the self -- when one considers this in the light of the teachings of Buddha, Jesus Christ, and other religious leaders who were at pains to teach the necessity of eradication of feelings of self. In this context -- it could be argued that clones would co-operate better with one another and others, precisely because of this lack of a sense of self."

### **Refutation of Walters's rationale in favour of human clones**

Walters was right that "the teachings of Buddha...and other religious leaders" (such as Marx and Engels and Lenin) "were at pains to teach the necessity of eradication of feelings of self." But Walters quite wrongly stated that Jesus taught this. For He did, in fact, teach the exact opposite. Matthew 19:4f & 20:15 & 22:39. So too does the Holy Bible. Romans 9:20f; Ephesians 5:28; Revelation 2:17.

Nor is it true, as Walters claimed, that twins are of necessity "particularly close to one another." Just read: Genesis 25:21-27; 27:1-46; 38:27-30; First Chronicles 2:4-15; and Romans 9:10-21.

It is significant that even Dr. Walters admits that human clones would also have certain disadvantages. "There is a danger that cloned people may not be as adaptable with the passage of time to a changing environment as their fellows originating from sexual reproduction. The latter is an important means of ensuring genetic adaptability.

"Furthermore, if cloned people chose to return to sexual reproduction after several generation of cloning, there is a risk of an accumulation of deleterious recessive genes and mutations being introduced into the human genetic pool." This would lead to "an increase in various diseases and malformations."

### **Walters's final pro-cloning pleas weighed and found wanting**

"Finally," explained Walters, "cloning gives members of the present generation who put the procedure into practice, a great deal of power in determining the genetic characteristics of future generations -- even though they will not be able to predict the nature of the future environment. Hence, the wrong people may be cloned for what the future demands. Moreover, there could be many social and political problems associated with the selection of people who would be given this power over man's genetic future."

Yet Walters nevertheless defended the development of human cloning programmes. "Cloning could provide a solution to infertility in some situations. For example, it could be employed to allow women who cannot ovulate or who have no eggs -- or men who have no sperm -- to produce children of their own. The male lacking sperm cells, could arrange for a nucleus from one of his body cells to replace the nucleus of an egg-cell from his wife. Similarly, the female without eggs could arrange for the nucleus of one of her body cells to replace the nucleus of an egg cell donated by another woman.

"The resulting embryo could then be transferred to the suitably prepared uterus of the nucleus-donor, or to that of the eggcell-donor, for further growth and development. If one partner in a marriage had a severe hereditary defect -- cloning with the other partner's genetic material would avoid the defect being transmitted to any offspring. Indeed, cloning may be necessary[!] in future, to complement sexual reproduction -- as part of any programme aimed at preventing deterioration of the human genetic pool."

Dr. Walters's final paragraph on what he regards as the merits of human cloning, is unusually insightful. "Probably one of the most important arguments in favour of cloning, is that it will allow the study of factors responsible for cell growth, multiplication, and differentiations. This, in turn, may lead to a better understanding of and cure for cancer and infant malformations. Cloning would also allow the study of the ageing process in cells, with the possibility of diminishing the rate of ageing."

Of course, there is a high price tag for all of these 'benefits' which might flow from the successful manufacture of human clones. As Walters himself in all honesty adds: "OBVIOUSLY, such studies WOULD entail EXPERIMENTATION with the early EMBRYO.... The embryos may have to be DESTROYED.... This would meet with strong moral objections by THOSE who REGARD the early embryo as a definitive rather than a potential HUMAN being." Too true!

### **1983: Presbyterians plead that human clonings be outlawed**

In 1983, Princeton's famous Presbyterian Bioethicist Professor Dr. Paul Ramsay sent his *Submission to the British Governmental Inquiry into Human Fertilization and Embryology*. There, he warned: "No hope should be placed in merely national governments or medical association regulations.

"Already in Australia, experiments in freezing [human] embryos have gone beyond what the British Inquiry may approve.... I urge it take the lead in pressing upon the European Parliament, the United Nations, or other international bodies, the need to monitor and control the use of the knowledge of human genetics that *DNA* has opened to us.... Even now, certain powers [Red China was meant] were producing physically superior soldiers."

In March 1983, the Public Questions Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland approved the following statement: "If human cloning (or non-coital production of carbon-copies of a particular human being) should ever become possible (as some predict it soon will be), it would be unacceptable because of the clones' non-coital origin and because of their threat to the

God-given individuality of the person(s) cloned. Similarly, attempts at pre-conceptual or non-conceptual genetic engineering on human body parts even for eugenetical reasons should be avoided with care. Genesis 1:16-18; 2:22-25; Leviticus 18:6-16; Deuteronomy 19:29; Ecclesiastes 5:1-2; Isaiah 49:1-5; Zechariah 12:1; Ephesians 4:24; First Corinthians 11:8-15; Colossians 2:18ff & 3:10-11."

In May 1983, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland received the above statement. It itself then resolved to "affirm that human cloning (should it become possible) should be prohibited because of the logical sequence of these convictions, namely (i) the oneness of the marriage relationship; (ii) the understanding that this oneness should be inviolate in the begetting, the non-begetting, or adoption of children; (iii) the divinely-ordained, complementary functions of husband and wife in their marriage, home and family; (iv) the human rights of the child within the mother's womb and beyond -- all combine to give the clear understanding that human reproduction by cloning is not and could never be acceptable."

### **Dr. White's 1984 openness genetically to engineer amphibi-men**

1984 Immunologist Dr. David White addressed the development of human mutants -- in his essay titled: 'Future Possible Uses and Abuses of *IVF*.' There he "discussed the possibility of creating...underwater species with human characteristics....

"Production of allophenes or tetroparentals might be manipulated," he explained in respect of the artificial reshaping of human genetical material. "By combining the techniques of genetic engineering and allophene production, it should be possible to speed up the evolutionary process -- or steer it in new directions or even bypass it altogether and create...novel mutants.... It might be possible to colonise the sea, by creating a hybrid amphibian mutant species containing human characteristics."

### **Dr. Morris expects cloning to change human nature**

In February 1984, Immunology Professor Bede Morris of Curtin Medical School at the Australian National University said: "It will become possible to produce identical twins and genetic copies of one or the other parent. Eventually, the possibility will present itself for a woman to have a mother-child relationship with herself. This could be done by dividing an early embryo into segments, implanting one segment into a surrogate mother, and storing the other deep frozen.

"A female child produced from the transplanted segment will be able on reaching sexual maturity, to act as the host to the other part of the divided embryo [herself] -- after it has been re-animated from the frozen state.... The possibility of giving birth to oneself provides the...prospect of extending an individual's existence beyond that of a single life-span.... The indefinite replication of somatic cells will offer man **eternal life**." Yes indeed, you shall be gods! Genesis 3:5.

During May 1984, in Brisbane, Veterinary Anatomy Professor Tim Glover said that a World of genetically-bred super-athletes is on the way. "Even if there was a law against scientists doing these things, all you would do is slow the process.... Anything is possible.... Maybe eventually society will come to think nothing of it."

Then, in September 1984, ANU's Professor Dr. Bede Morris again -- this time in a lecture at the University of Adelaide Foundation -- said that individuals may be able to renovate their bodies by replacing worn or diseased organs with cloned components. This would involve generating and then sub-dividing surplus embryos to produce clones. Their parts would then be grown in a different time-frame, providing new components.

Explained Professor Morris: "The technology for doing this in animals is already with us, and this technology can certainly be transferred to human medicine.... 100 years from now...man will be able to design new species; replicate facsimile copies of himself; reproduce asexually; and even change his biological nature."

### **1985: Dr. Higuchi achieves stage in resurrection of quagga**

Early in 1985, California Geneticist Dr. Russel Higuchi achieved the first stage of bringing the South African quagga -- a species of zebra extinct since 1883 -- back to life. Its *DNA* was revived. This was brought about by mixing a fragment of quagga muscle tissue from the skin of an animal shot at the time of the Great Trek (1838) -- with pure *DNA* from a mountain zebra. Then, the amount of that mixture was increased -- by inserting the fragments into a virus used to infect *E. coli* bacteria.

The virus then multiplied, as too did the quagga *DNA* contaminating it. Commented the *New Scientist*: "It might indeed be possible to resurrect the quagga." If so, doubtless also the dodo. Then, what too of the tyrannosaurus and the diplodocus -- from dinosaur eggshells? *Jurassic Park*, here we come!

Now that also the World-famous Tasmanian tiger or thylacine is likewise thought to be extinct -- yet only from the beginning of the twentieth century, and thus well after the demise of the quagga. So too, more definitely, are the Mimi negritos alias the Tasmanian human black-fellows -- Truganini having died in 1876, and Mrs. Seymour as the last of that race in 1909.

Significantly, in 1985 Tasmania's well-known Catholic Senator Brian Harradine said that cloning humans and producing "spare-parts" embryos and even promoting inter-species breeding -- could all become a reality, if legislation was not introduced to prevent it. He was referring to the fact that suggestions were already being made, to inject human male embryo brains with female hormones -- so as to try to reduce or to eliminate what some call the 'killing trait' in the human male.

### **1985: recent cases of artificial parthogenesis already known**

Already in 1985, experiments in cases of so-called 'artificial parthogenesis' had been conducted. This result was achieved by the merging of two egg-cells of the same woman. The products, which lived for at least twelve weeks after their artificial conceptions, were simultaneously the daughters and the twin sisters of the mothers concerned.

Dr. Philippe Schepens M.D., General Secretary of the World Federation of Doctors Who Respect Human Life, rightly remarked: "That *IVF* is the open door for experimentation on embryos and fetuses, is clear. Many experiments are performed on embryos and fetuses in our days. Personally, we heard already in 1985 about cases of **parthenogenesis in humans**, left alive for at least twelve weeks (three months).

"A parthogenesis is the reproduction of a biological individual without participation of male gametes. It was achieved here, by the melting together of two ovocytes of the same woman. That means that the embryo was in fact at the same time the identical twin sister and the daughter of the woman." Thus, instrumentally-implemented **incest!**

### **1987: Rome condemns human cloning and embryo experimentation**

In 1987, Rome's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith -- in its *Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation* -- forthrightly declared: "To use human embryos or foetuses as the object or instrument of experimentation constitutes a crime against their dignity as human beings having a right to the same respect that is due to the child already born and to every human person.... Respect for the dignity of the human being -- excludes all experimental manipulation or exploitation of the human embryo. The practice of keeping alive human embryos, [whether] *in vivo* or *in vitro*, for experimental or commercial purposes -- is totally opposed to human dignity....

"The corpses of human embryos and foetuses, whether they have been deliberately aborted or not, must be respected just as the remains of other human beings.... Also, in the case of dead foetuses, as for the corpses of adult persons, all commercial trafficking must be considered illicit and should be prohibited.... It is immoral to produce human embryos destined to be exploited as disposable 'biological material'....

"It is a duty to condemn the particular gravity of the voluntary destruction of human embryos obtained '*in vitro*' for the sole purpose of research, either by means of artificial insemination or by means of 'twin fission'.... Those embryos which are not transferred into the body of the mother and are called 'spare' are exposed to an absurd fate, with no possibility of their being offered safe means of survival which can licitly be pursued....

"Attempts or hypotheses for obtaining a human being without any connection with sexuality through twin fission, cloning or parthenogenesis are to be considered contrary to the Moral Law.... Certain attempts to influence chromosomic or genetic inheritance are not therapeutic but are aimed at producing human beings selected according to sex or other predetermined qualities. These manipulations are contrary to the personal dignity of the human."

### **Dr. Fletcher's 1987 Ethics of Genetic Control: Some Answers**

In 1987, Lammers & Verhey edited the book *On Moral Medicine -- Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics*. It contains an essay by Dr. Joseph Fletcher titled: *The Ethics of Genetic Control -- Some Answers*.

Fletcher there states: "Good reasons in general for cloning, are that it avoids genetic diseases.... There could also be reasons of the social good.... These things could be invaluable for professional flight at high altitudes and space travel.... A biologist could solve the weight problem by going alone to a distant planet with a supply of different somatic cells, and colonize it from a cloning start....

"What cloning's constructive uses will be cannot, of course, be wholly predicted or even anticipated.... Artificial virgin births and cloned 'multiplets' promise real benefit not only to human beings but to the 'green revolution' also. There is no moral reason why we must follow heterogeneity in a human being, whenever homogeneity can service a constructive purpose....

"Others would condemn any use of genetic controls to produce a 'strain' of men with long arms to fit them to be orchard workers, or to produce a family of people with oversize lungs for sponge fishing or pearl diving.... We could even design species from scratch. There is no need to drag humans down genetically to do special or menial jobs. We can bring animals *up* to do them.... Animal brains can be markedly improved by doses of the twenty-first human chromosome."

### **1989: freezing clones of sheep-embryos for later gestation**

In 1989, full-term cloned pedigree merino lambs were born from *IVF*-ewes. Mr. Falkiner, the owner of Haddon Rig Stud Farm (600 km. west of Sydney in Australia) developed a "World first" in genetic engineering -- by **cloning** merino sheep **embryos** -- which were born later, as lambs.

Normally, ewes usually produce about five lambs in a lifetime. But in cloning sheep by splitting their embryos five ways and transferring them to donor ewes, the breeder can now see in a year what it would usually take a ewe's lifetime to produce. Then, after the lambs develop, the breeder is able to choose the best animal -- and **clone** its **embryo**.

Once thus manufactured, these embryos can be frozen and **stored for years**, allowing access to millions of variations of sheep traits (including animal size, potential wool-cut and body characteristics) -- all stored on shelves in the laboratory freezer, and all now able to provide sheep to suit a client's needs and to provide as many as required. A big question now suggests itself. How long before wealthy clients start ordering their own tailor-made and genetically-improved children, from human stud farms?

### **1989: breeding mice for purpose of using their blood in humans**

Perhaps that question was already answered, even then. For also in 1989, U.S. researchers succeeded in breeding a mouse which produces blood with the characteristics of human blood. This opens up the possibility of biologically being enabled to engineer products which could render human blood transfusions obsolete, and which could theoretically develop super-efficient haemoglobins for racehorses and athletes.

Too, the decriminalization of lesbianism and sodomy in most Australian States from 1990 onward -- raised the spectre of the adoption of children by, and even of the implantation of IVF-embryos into, one or both of the partners of such homosexual liaisons. With precisely that in mind, in New Zealand even before 1984 -- some sodomites were financing experiments on male chimpanzees which were given female chimpanzee hormones, in an attempt to get those males pregnant.

### **1991: clones replacing humans; and cannibalizing for spare-parts**

In 1991, Fay Weldon's book *The Cloning of Joanna May* appeared. It portrayed a man making a clone of his wife, and then later dumping his spouse and replacing her with her 'younger' clone.

Somewhat similarly, it was reported (also in 1991) that one Abe Ayala -- actually and deliberately -- had impregnated his 43-year-old wife only so as to harvest rare bone marrow from the resulting baby. Two years later, he had it implanted into his life-threatened older daughter Anissa.

*Time* observed this calls up brutal images of baby farming -- cannibalizing for spare parts. For the baby was ordered up to serve as a means, as a biological source of resupplies. The baby did not consent to be used. The parents created that life, then used it for their own purposes.

### **1991: anti-abortion Presbyterians ask death penalty for murder**

During 1991, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland requested the re-introduction of the death penalty for murder. It resolved to "advise the Premier, the Minister of Justice and Corrective Services, Attorney-General, the Leader of the Opposition, Leader of the Liberal Party and the media that the Assembly requests the re-introduction of the death penalty when guilt of the offender has been proved beyond reasonable doubt in the case of murder. Genesis 9:5-6."

By implication this includes the death-penalty for abortion, for the destruction of human embryos, and for the destruction of clones from humans. For all those procedures -- including also the very production of human clones -- were condemned by the General Assembly of 1983.

### **Ducharme's 1991 Vatican's Dilemma implicitly discounts cloning**



In 1991, H.M. Ducharme published an interesting article on the bearing of Christ's incarnation on bio-ethical technology. Ducharme called it: *The Vatican's Dilemma on the Morality of IVF and the Incarnation*. There, he opposed the Vatican's condemnation of IVF on the basis of the incarnation. Ducharme posited just three possibilities to explain the virginal conception of Jesus: a), from Mary's egg alone; b), from an egg created *ex nihilo*; or c), from an embryo created *ex nihilo*.

Maintained Ducharme: "If a), we have an example of fertilization by donor sperm; if b), we have fertilization by both donor egg and donor sperm; and if c), we have fertilization by way of *ET* (Embryo Transfer). Thus, from any of these perspectives, the Vatican could not rightly condemn IVFs today from human ova and human sperms solely on the basis of Christ's unique incarnation."

Ducharme's **conclusion** is correct. Mercifully, he did not reason that the man Jesus Christ as Second Adam was a clone of the first Adam (before his fall) -- nor that either the first or the Second Adam were clones of the God Whose images they were. Yet Ducharme was quite wrong that the man Jesus arose from donated sperm or a donated egg or a donated embryo. For, though unique, He did not bring a non-Adamic human nature with Him from Heaven (as the Anabaptists heretically taught). To the contrary, according to His human nature He was conceived from the egg of the Adamic Mary; within her body; as the Second **Adam**; and to become the Bridegroom of His Church as the Second Eve.

### **Neither Adam nor Eve nor Jesus nor the Church are clones**

Obviously: the first Adam, a creature, could never have been a clone of the qualitatively-dissimilar Creator. Nor could the infallible Second Adam ever have been a clone of the fallible first. Nor could the sexually-dissimilar Eve ever have been a clone of Adam.

Adam was not cloned from the preexistent *DNA* of any other living creature. He was created directly -- from the moist soil of the lifeless ground. Genesis 3:19-23 & John 1:1-18. Nor was he a duplicate of the God Who made him. For God is omnipotent, creatorly, and supra-sexual; but Adam was limited, creaturely, and male.

Also Eve was no clone of Adam. She was not created as a male *alter ego* from one of Adam's cells implanted into his excavated egg. She was moulded from his own rib, precisely as his dissimilar female (or his heterosexual helpmate). Nor is the Church alias the bride of Christ His clone; but a second Eve, drawn forth from the bleeding side of the dissimilar because divine Second Adam. Genesis 2:18-23 & Ephesians 5:30f.

Yet there is an incarnational possibility Ducharme did not consider, but should have. That is, d): Christ's miraculous and spermless and unique incarnation from Mary's egg by God the Spirit. Unlike IVF, the incarnation occurred either *in utero* or within the fallopian tube of Mary -- and not in a test-tube. Thus, Christ's conception was not parthogenetic (at the initiative of the virgin **Mary**); but **en**-parthogenetic (or **within** the virgin), because **Spirito**-genetic. See too the

famous passage Luke 1:28-35, and especially the latter verse.

After all, God the Spirit is the Initiator, the Donor, and the Source of life in all living creatures. Genesis 2:7 & 7:22 *cf.* Job 33:4-6 & 34:14f and Psalm 104:26-30. Consequently, He is also the Source of life as regards both regular human sperms and ova -- as well as the Source of life within Mary's ovum, and especially when He uniquely fructified her.

Like the unique first Adam, also the even more unique Second Adam Jesus Christ is therefore an archetype of the renewed human race -- and no ectype of an old clone! Also because of Christ's divine preexistence, it cannot be argued cogently that He was a clone of Mary.

### **1992: Presbyterians state human personhood is from conception**

In 1992 Queensland's Presbyterian General Assembly resolved to "declare that personhood is to be considered to occur from the commencement of conception, which is from the penetration of the wall of the ovum by a sperm" -- and that one should "treat the developing embryo as a person, from the commencement of conception." This implies that any removal and/or destruction of a zygote even less than a day old, including the enucleating of a fertilized human egg alias a tiny human being, is murder and -- in terms of the General Assembly resolutions of 1983 and 1991 -- merits the death penalty.

What does this imply as to the destructibility by humans, of what may be cloned from humans? This question was left open. To be sure, way back in 1983 these Presbyterians had already condemned all attempts to clone humans. However, in view of the later speculation as to whether the clearly-personal Adam and Eve and Jesus were clones; and in view of the abilities of clones of sheep and cattle to feel pain and to do the things the animals they were cloned from normally do -- it is submitted that Presbyterians would conclude that once humans had been cloned illicitly, it would further be illicit to destroy those clones.

### **1993: manufacture and destruction of human clones in the U.S.A.**

In the U.S.A. during 1993, a George Washington University Team multiplied seventeen human embryos into forty-eight **clones**, which then grew for six full days. Working with abnormal embryos from eggs fertilized by more than one sperm and hence destined for gross deformity and early death anyway, Drs. Hall and Stillman got permission from the University to conduct their experiment. In spite of the abnormalities, the cells were copied with their genes intact -- using a process whereby agricultural researchers have cloned embryos from cattle for more than a decade.

Japan's Medical Association called the experiment "unthinkable." The French Socialist President Mitterand pronounced himself "horrified." The Vatican said it could lead down "a tunnel of madness": for all cells contain within their *DNA* the information required to reproduce the entire organism.

Director Arthur Caplan of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Minnesota then defended human cloning in situations where a woman was about to become sterile, but who by cloning timeously could store embryo-clones for future impregnation -- or in situations where hereditary haemophilia or cystic fibrosis could be avoided in embryos by snipping cells off them. Because that sometimes kills them, an extra supply of clones which might survive such a snipping-off could lead to healthy children.

The public was outraged. 90% of Americans polled, were opposed to any cloning of a child they might conceive. Protested Director Daniel Callahan of the Hastings Center for Ethics in New York: "We have a right to our own individual genetic identity.... I think this [cloning] could well violate that right." Observed Christian Ethics Professor Germain Grisez of Maryland: "The people doing this ought to contemplate splitting themselves in half, and see how they like it."

Dr. Jean-Francois Mattei of Marseilles's Timone Hospital protested: "It's aberrant, showing a lack of a sense of reality and respect for people." German Professor Hans-Bernhard Würmeling at the University of Erlangen called it "a modern form of slavery." Germany punishes attempts to clone humans with up to five and Britain with up to ten years in prison. Dr. Leeanda Wilton of Monash University's *IVF* Centre in Australia said there were "hundreds of scientists who could have split an embryo in half.... They have not done so, because it opens a can of worms."

Even among cattle clones, only 20% survive. Yet of those 20%, they could all be grown and then used for spare parts as needed by the living being grown earlier from the original embryo. Thus, a human couple with a grown-up daughter (earlier cloned embryonically before birth) could have from her frozen embryo-clone another identical twin-daughter -- even decades later. Indeed, the elder daughter herself could then carry and give birth to that child as her own identical twin.

Yet even cloning animals is counter-productive, as pointed out by J. Madeleine Nash in her 1993 article *They Clone Cattle, Don't They?* Nash explained: "Cloning farm animals, feasible as it may be, has never become widespread.

Madeleine Nash added: "Even simple embryo splitting...is too expensive and complicated to take off commercially." This was confirmed by George Seidel, an Animal Physiologist at Colorado State University. As he explained: "Cloning remains very much a niche technology.

"But people have certainly tried to turn livestock cloning into a booming branch of agri-business in the U.S.... Wisconsin-based American Breeders Service...now owns the rights to cattle-cloning technology developed by Granada Biosciences, a once high-flying biotech firm that went out of business in 1992.... Triplicate bulls bred by Granada were testimony to the technology.... In theory, then, it ought to be possible to extract a 32-cell embryo from a prize dairy cow and use it -- to produce 32 identical calves....

"In practice, however, only 20% of the cloned embryos survive, meaning that instead of 32 calves researchers end up with only five or six.... At present, this method of cloning does not

seem much better than embryo splitting, which typically produces twins and sometimes triplets.

"There have been other problems as well. Some of the calves produced have weighed so much at birth that they have had to be delivered through caesarean section.... Using cloning to create large numbers of identical calves runs counter to what breeders strive to do.... Rather than a major advance in livestock breeding, cloning taken to extremes could prove to be the exact opposite: a big step, all right; but in the wrong direction."

### **Pro-cloners' absurd allegations that God cloned Eve from Adam**

Some who defend the above-mentioned experiments to clone humans at George Washington University, absurdly allege that it cannot be wrong: because God Himself cloned Eve from Adam; and because the entire human race has descended from that one particular clone. This startling and sensationalistic suggestion is obviously quite untrue.

Eve, unlike a clone, was not "artificial." For she was made by God, and not by man. Again, unlike a clone, Eve was not "genetically and sexually identical" to Adam. For she was an ensouled and full-breasted woman -- not an ensouled and flat-chested man; nor a soulless but bearded and short-haired and life-sized living doll; nor a bearded and flat-chested "woman" from some or other circus or vaudeville act.

The very idea of calling Eve a "clone" is demeaning to the fairer sex, alias the female gender of the human species. To call Eve a clone is to dehumanize all of her daughters, and to insult true womanhood as such. In fact, this is all the more so -- when such preposterous claims are sometimes made not just by certain effeminate males but especially by certain female feminists themselves -- frustrated women apparently ashamed of their own God-donated gift of human femininity. How sad!

### **Is true cloning of viable human beings really possible?**

Although true clones may well be made of many plants and animals in the future, true cloning of really 'human' beings from original human beings -- as distinct from the cloning of unsame yet mobile likenesses thereof (*homoi-ousioos* alias merely similar thereto) -- will, it seems to us, always remain impossible. This is so, because even striking replicas made of (or even from) a real human being -- though perhaps indeed narcissistic or auto-erotic if not actually even "incestuous" (Genesis 38:9f & Leviticus 18:7f) -- would not be true clones.

Interestingly, even cloned cattle are not physically congruent to their originals -- nor even to their co-clones. Full-term human clones, even if they were to prove humanly manufacturable (and even if they thereafter also remained viable), could still less have truly-human immortal souls **just like the original**. Very significantly, even in the Jewish story of the *golem* of Prague -- God did not thus graciously so endow that 'clone.' If 'clones' of humans were ever to become viable, they would need to have a soul in order to be human. But any soul they then might have, would be as different from that of the human cloned as the souls of identical twins differ from one another.

Without a truly-human immortal soul -- which not man but only God could make (Genesis 2:7 & Zechariah 12:1 *cf.* Matthew 10:28) -- any replicas of man could not be true clones either congruent to or *homo-ousioos* with (alias of the 'same substance' as) the ensouled original. For of all of the Lord's many creatures, and of all of man's many fabrications -- man alone is the image of God. Genesis 1:26-28; 9:5-6; James 3:1-9. Less importantly yet also interestingly, it was claimed by a scientist in March 2001 that the clone of any human, once grown to maturity, would have a navel as big as an apple.

The divine image extends not just to the human body, but even and indeed especially to the human soul. Genesis 2:7; 9:5f; Ecclesiastes 7:29; Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10. For not man but only God can create the human soul. *Cf.*: Job 33:4-6; 38:4-8; Psalm 100:3; Isaiah 42:5; 45:9-12; 49:1-5; Zechariah 12:1.

Of course, also the soul is subject to growth. It can be enhanced, or even destroyed (but not annihilated). Matthew 10:28. Yet there can be no transmigration of souls from one person to another. Ecclesiastes 12:7-14; Luke 23:43; Hebrews 9:27. Once created, the substance of the soul (and the personality-kernel it enshrines) -- continues to exist for ever. Compare: Revelation 14:9-13; 20:10-15; 22:3-5.

Indeed, not just human souls but even ensouled human bodies are quite different from living animal bodies. *Cf.* First Corinthians 15:39. Moreover, even ensouled male human bodies are different from ensouled female human bodies. Genesis 1:27; 2:22-25; Romans 1:26-27. Even embodied (and postmortally-disembodied) male and female human 'souls' continue to differ from one another -- and, indeed, even unto all eternity. See: First John 2:17 & 3:2 and Revelation 2:17 & 3:12.

### **Differences in human personality protest the cloning of humans**

At any rate, each ensouled human body of one specific sex is different from every other ensouled human body of the same specific sex. Genesis 25:21-28 & 38:27-30. Indeed, each ensouled human body (and embodied human soul) is different from every other ensouled human body (and embodied human soul) which ever lived. Revelation 2:17 & 19:12 & 20:12f.

Even in respect of the same person, each ensouled human body is somewhat different from that very same human body as it grows older (from fetushood through senility) -- and especially different from its subsequent remains, once it becomes de-soul-ed into a corpse. Second Corinthians 5:1-8 & James 2:26. Indeed, each corpse is quite different from what even it becomes when after death it becomes decomposed. That again is even more different from what it later becomes when re-composed, and re-en-soul-ed by its previously-disembodied conscious soul which then returns from Heaven or from Hell) and re-surrects it as a spiritual body. First Corinthians 15:37-54.

For that spiritual body yet-to-come, though it will be substantially 'this same body and none other' (*Westminster Confession* ch. 32 compare Job 19:25-27) -- will nevertheless be more

developed and "more glorious" than our present body, and not congruent to it. Philippians 3:21 & First John 3:2f. Throughout, however, it is God Alone Who generates (and Who also re-generates) human beings. Man himself can no more create a truly-human clone -- as distinct from manufacturing a humanoid clone -- than he can create or re-create himself. Indeed, to suggest that he can -- is both blasphemous and ridiculous. See Genesis 1:26-28 & 3:5f.

### **The horrors of pre-conceptual genetic recombination in man**

What is meant by pre-conception-al "genetic recombination"? We ourselves would define it as the human re-arranging of minute particles within dioxyribonucleic acid (alias *DNA*), so as to alter specimens of the species. Its purpose is humanly to re-program the subsequent execution of life-promoting procedures -- away from the exact way they were divinely-programmed before or at human conception. This *DNA* is found within wholes or parts of genes -- whether God-givenly inherent in, or whether by man's artifice synthesized from, natural raw material.

Indeed, these natural genes are to be found within chromosomes inside of the sperm-cells and/or the egg-cells of all living creatures. Genetic recombination by man, however, would (re)combine these *DNA*-derived substances with other similar or dissimilar substances -- in order to try to promote some humanly-desired behaviours deemed to be improvements. Thus: divinely-given *DNA* from prolific but delicate grapevines, might humanly be transferred to barely-fruitful but hardier grapevines.

Again: *DNA* from healthy cattle in one part of the World -- could humanly be transferred to disease-ridden cattle elsewhere in the World, to improve that latter bovine race. Yet again: *DNA* from black-skinned Negroes might be introduced into the genes of blue-eyes 'Palefaces' -- in order to breed a uniform human race; or to try and eliminate all racial discrimination Worldwide; or to 'immunize' the overly-blond Nordic race against sunburn *etc.* Indeed, yet again: *DNA* from docile persons malformed with mongolism alias Downes's Syndrome, might be transferred to normal and assertive human beings -- in order to try to turn them into a new race of submissive slaves, in socialist dictatorships.

Now if human cloning (alias the non-coital reproduction of copies of specific human beings) should ever become viably possible -- as some predict it soon will be -- that process would be unacceptable because of the clone's non-coital origin, and also because of his or her or its obvious (even if unintended) threat to the God-given individuality of the person cloned. Similarly, attempts to create de-brain-ed humanoid clones for spare-parts toward the repair of true humans -- and attempts at pre-conceptual or non-conceptual or post-conceptual genetic engineering on truly-human body-parts of embryos even for eugenetical reasons -- should be avoided. Genesis 1:26-28; 2:22-25; Leviticus 18:6-16; Deuteronomy 29:29; Ecclesiastes 5:1-2; Isaiah 39:1-5; Zechariah 12:1; Ephesians 4:24; First Corinthians 11:8-15 & 15:8; and Colossians 2:18f & 3:10f.

### **Genetic unpredictability of the future dissuades human cloning**

The simple fact is, man cannot "genetically predict" the future. Who could have foreseen that the unfallen Adam could have (re)produced the wicked Cain? Genesis 1:26-31 *cf.* 4:1-8f. Who could have predicted that the fallen Eve -- especially after giving birth to the rotten Cain -- by the grace of God could yet have gone on to (re)produce the godly Abel? Genesis 3:16 and 4:2-4 and Hebrews 11:4. And in animals, we already know that cloning often leads not to advances but to regressions.

Who could have predicted that the ordinary parents of Samson could have produced such a son of quite abnormal strength? Judges 13:2-5f. Who could have predicted that slightly-built David would so easily overcome the colossal giant Goliath? First Samuel 17:33-43f. Who could have thought that Jehoram the son of wicked Ahab and Jezebel would put away his father's image of the idol Baal? Second Kings 3:1f. Indeed, who could ever have predicted that a horrible couple like wicked King Abijam and idolatrous Queen Maachah would ever produce a son like Asa -- who became one of the godliest kings Judah ever had? First Kings 15:1-14f.

We should also note God's disapproval of men who, by constantly preventing their own gene-containing seed from getting deposited within the wombs of their own wives, refused to accept the possibility of an unwanted pregnancy within their marriages. Genesis 38:7-10. By way of analogy, we should also note God's further disapproval of seed-mixing (Leviticus 19:19 & Deuteronomy 22:9-11) -- especially in light of His apparent approval of the selective breeding of domestic animals. Genesis 1:26f; 30:31-43; 31:6-16.

One should also mark David's realistic and full acceptance of the sinfulness which deformed him even from his own conception onward (Psalm 51:5) -- as well as his joyous acceptance of God's sovereignty over him throughout his own humanly-secret gestation, while previously within his mother's womb. Psalms 22:10 & 139:13-16. Indeed, even when under grievous adult tribulations -- we should further note the godly Job's same humble acceptance of his own hereditary strengths and weaknesses. Job 3:3-12; 10:9-19; 13:12-26; 14:1-10; 15:14-16; 25:4-6; 31:33; 33:4-10.

As the Preacher wisely states in Ecclesiastes (6:3), even "if a man beget a hundred children and live many years so that the days of his years be very many -- if his soul is not filled with good" alias that which the Lord regards as morally right, a miscarriage or "an untimely birth is better than he." Indeed, as Missenden has observed (in his *Biblical-Ethical Inquiry into Some Problems Relating to Human Engineering*): "Any form of genetic manipulation which intrudes into the marriage bond or regards the child in the womb of the mother as less than a person, is a most unacceptable operation."

### **Post-conceptual non-genetic improvement is not human cloning**

Altogether different to the above, however, is post-conception-al non-genetic human embryonic improvement. By this, we mean any of various possible human attempts to eliminate undesirable features post-conception-ally. This would include, sometimes, postconceptionally yet prenatally attempting to correct congenital defects as soon as (or shortly after) they appear within (or in connection with) the developing human embryo.

This does not involve tampering with the genetic code (which conceivably could lead to inheritable changes). It involves no destruction of the nucleus of the 'fertilized' human egg-cell -- as in attempts to clone. But here, in post-conception-al embryonic improvement, we are talking about the remedial healing of an already-existing young human being -- while he or she is yet an embryo.

Therapeutic pregnancy termination and removal of the fetus from the womb for the sake of saving the life of an unborn baby would be one such example of fetal improvement. Another would be giving sufficient doses of gammaglobulin to a pregnant mother and/or her young embryo -- in order to minimize eye defects in the baby when born -- in cases where the mother contracts German measles shortly after conception. Indeed, yet a third example would be a pregnant mother's avoidance of alcohol and tobacco for the full term of her pregnancy -- and her selection of the healthiest possible diet for the sake of maximizing the health of her unborn baby. See Judges 13:2-5.

When it comes to corrective surgical procedures on babies -- such as the separation of separable Siamese twins -- it would usually be better to wait till they are born, and even till some time after their birth. Cf.: Genesis 25:21-27; 38:24-30; Exodus 21:22f; Psalm 130:5f; Isaiah 25:9; 28:16; Habakkuk 1:2f; 2:1-3. Yet, in emergency situations, even pre-natal surgery is permissible. Cf. First Corinthians 15:8f.

However -- throughout, everything possible must indeed be done neither to terminate nor to imperil but rather to save and to improve the life (and to promote the welfare) of an already-existing unborn human being. By no stretch of imagination can this ever be equated with tampering with the human genetic code before the conception (alias the 'bringing into existence') of a new human being.

### **The ominous advances in cloning from 1997 to 2001**

Before 1997, cloned females became water-logged and such animals got inflated to huge sizes. They exhibited also other abnormalities, including hyperventilation (resulting from horribly deformed lungs). Then, after 277 failures, in 1997 Dr. Wilmot (from non-embryonic cells) revolutionarily cloned "Dolly" -- the 'perfect' sheep. Other experts, however, said such techniques fail at least 97% of the time.

Dolly was followed by the cloning of a monkey. Promptly, evolutionists and humanists predicted the soon similar cloning also of viable humans. Then, while almost all Protestant Churches were culpably silent, at least the Pope forbade all Romanists from being involved in such attempts.

Even the enigmatic U.S. President Bill Clinton -- who vetoed the criminalization of human abortions at birth -- nevertheless threatened prohibitory legislation against human cloning. Yet the real issue is the First Table and the Sixth and Seventh Commandments of the Law of the Lord. For they all forbid the cloning of man the image of God.



In Britain, however, the rapid movement toward the approval of human cloning has been highly disturbing. In June 1999, the British Government wisely rejected bad advice -- and instead blocked human cloning. Otherwisely, just over a year later in August 2000 -- British Prime Minister Tony Blair gave MPs a free vote in Parliament on the cloning of human embryos.

The depraved Anglican Church then took its cue from the depraved British Government. On December 3rd 2000, the Church of England said cloning was 'morally acceptable.' On December 20th 2000, British MPs voted for research on human embryos -- and easily carried the day in the Lower House (of Commons).

Events then escalated with almost unbelievable rapidity. On January 3rd 2001, the international 'Aliens' cult said it would itself clone a dead baby girl. On January 12th 2001, international scientists themselves created the first genetically modified monkey

On January 15th 2001 -- Islamic, Judaistic, Roman Catholic and even some Anglican Leaders in Britain joined forces to oppose a foreshadowed law which would authorize the cloning of humans. On January 18th 2001, former British Prime Minister Baroness Margaret Thatcher opposed that foreshadowed new law; and on January 22<sup>nd</sup> 2001, many British Peers of the House of Lords resolved to challenge any attempts to clone 'human' embryos. Sadly, however, apparently on that same day -- a day of infamy -- a majority in the House of Lords voted in favour of the new law!

Andrew Sparrow, Political Correspondent for ISSUE, wrote in his column "Yesterday in Parliament" for January 23rd 2001: "The House of Lords voted by an unexpectedly large majority last night for legislation allowing the cloning of human embryos for medical research. Despite an appeal from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr George Carey, and other religious leaders -- they approved regulations that will allow scientists to clone human embryos up to 14 days old. With Peers allowed a free vote, the result had been hard to predict -- and Ministers [of the Crown] were immensely relieved when they won with a majority of 120.

"Since 1990, scientists have been able to experiment with embryos up to two weeks old for research into fertility. The Government's regulations will allow these embryos to be used for therapeutic cloning. This involves the creation of a genetically identical embryo, from which scientists then take stem cells for research into conditions such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, cancer and diabetes." Lord Hunt of Kings Heath, the Minister of Health, said Peers should consider the importance of this research "to those people who shoulder the burden of these terrible diseases, their families and friends".

Lord Alton, a former Liberal Democrat MP who sits as a crossbencher, led the opposition to the Government's plans. He warned the Lords against believing in "miracle cures". He urged Peers to back an amendment blocking the Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Research Purposes) Regulations until a Lords' Select Committee had "reported on the issues connected with human cloning and stem cell research."

Lady Thatcher was among senior Tories who voted with Lord Alton. She was supported by

Lord Tebbit, Lord Waddington, Lord Mackay of Clashfern, Lord Biffen, Lord Wakeham, Lord Mayhew of Twysden, Viscount Cranborne, Lord Strathclyde and Lord Lang of Monkton. Lord Alton was also supported by Lord Habgood, the former Archbishop of York, and by the Lord Bishop of St. Albans.

But the Alton amendment was defeated by 212 votes to 92. The Peers then approved an amendment tabled by Lord Walton of Detchant, a crossbencher and former Medical Professor, saying that a Select Committee should investigate the regulations once they took effect. Lord Hunt said the Government would accept Lord Walton's proposal and "listen to the Committee and review the regulations in the light of the Select Committee Report."

If the Select Committee were to decide that stem cell research was unnecessary, Parliament would be "bound to take notice". He also promised that the Government would introduce "as soon as possible" a Bill to ban reproductive cloning, which is distinct from the therapeutic cloning covered by the regulations.

Lord Alton questioned during the debate whether it was right to treat the human embryo as "just another accessory to be created, bartered, frozen or destroyed." He said: "Since 1990, when miracle cures were promised for 4000 inherited diseases, between 300000 and half a million human embryos have been destroyed or experimented upon. There have been no cures, but our willingness to walk this road has paved the way for more and more demand."

Lady Warnock, who chaired the original infamous inquiry into human fertilisation back in the 1980s, acknowledged that there was a great deal of concern about the issue. Although she backed the Government because she was not opposed to the new research, she said that Ministers of the Crown were wrong to try to impose the regulations on the public in a hasty manner.

Finally, in March 2001, it was announced over Australian TV that already before the end of this year, humans would be cloned by scientists who are already at work on it. It was also suggested that such human clones might not have long or healthy lives, and that their navels would be as big as apples. This would serve to identify them at least while almost naked at the beach, in the event that any 'interracial' war between human clones and normal human beings might ever break out with the aim of determining whether real humans or clones of humans should rule this planet.

Meantime, as of March 17<sup>th</sup> 2001, hundred of childless couples from Italy to Japan are already eager to secure children which some scientists say they will start to clone from them and for them before the end of the year. Indeed, one such cloning scientist has already produced a non-cloned offspring for a 62-year-old woman.

Fortunately, on March 21st, the U.S. Congress passed the First Reading of a Bill which would make it a federal crime to kill or to injure a human fetus at any stage of development. All Democratic Congressmen opposed the Bill. At the same time, news leaked out that an underground Australian laboratory had produced a clone by inserting a human cell into the shell of a sow's ovum and had later killed their "creature" when seven days old. Even animal cloners in Australia (where trying to clone humans is a federal crime), condemned the experiment --

saying that it produced a tiny humanoid with porcine features.

Last. One of many religious sects has an old tunic it believes is stained with the blood of Jesus Christ Himself. From those bloodstains, that sect is right now planning to clone Jesus Himself -- by inserting one of those blood-cells inside a female human egg-shell, and then nidating it inside the womb of a virgin to be "born" as a baby at what they believe will be Christ's Second Coming on December 25th 2001. See <http://www.clonejesus.com>

### **Conclusion: human cloning and genetic engineering unacceptable**

Conclusion. If cloning from humans were ever to become possible -- would those clones be viable for very long? How would they behave if they were to grow up at least to adolescence? If they were thereafter ever to reach maturity, should they be allowed to marry real humans or even one another -- regardless as to whether those clones were impotent or sterile or not? Indeed, would humans be murderers if they disposed of such clones -- or would clones be murderers if and when they might gang up in an 'interacial war' against true humans?

Cloning and genetic engineering may indeed have many merits when humanly applied to plants and animals, in the execution of man's cultural mandate to subjugate to God's glory the earth and the sea and the sky and all of the sub-human and pre-human living creatures which inhabit those realms of the World. See Genesis 1:26-28; 9:1-7; Psalm 8:1-8; First Corinthians 15:25-28; Hebrews 2:6-8; James 3:7. Yet man has no mandate at all to subjugate also the human race itself (James 3:3-6f). Nor should man ever attempt to multiply the human race, except by way of marital *coitus*. Genesis 2:22-25; Proverbs 5:15-20; Matthew 19:4-6.

For, unlike the plants and the animals, of all the various earthly creatures -- man and man alone is the unique image of God. Genesis 9:1-7. Moreover, cloning humanoid or 'android' individuals that too closely resemble real humans, also seems to be condemned -- at least implicitly -- in the prohibition against sexually and hence reproductively "approaching" anyone that is too near of kin. Leviticus 18 & 20 and *Westminster Confession of Faith* 24:4.

Accordingly, all attempts to clone not just 'living dolls' but also true human beings alias God's own images with the same immortal soul as its truly human prototype -- are not only blasphemous but also quite impossible of execution. Psalm 100:3 *cf.* Zechariah 12:1. Indeed, attempts to improve if not to perfect man's genetic code even before human conception -- are likewise both astonishingly arrogant and highly inadvisable. Psalm 22:9f; 51:5; 139:13-16. Questionable indeed is the title of a January 2001 book by the scientists who cloned Dolly -- *The Second Creation*.

For it was not clones but humans that "God created in His Own image. He created humanity in the image of God...[both] male and female. God blessed them...and God said to them: 'Be fruitful and multiply!'.... None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin...to uncover their nakedness....

"The Lord called me **from the womb**. From the bowels of my mother He has mentioned my

name.... The Lord formed me **from the womb** to be His servant.” And “from the womb” does **not** mean: **from the laboratory**. Genesis 1:27f; Leviticus 18:6; Isaiah 49:1-6.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Francis Nigel Lee was born in 1934 in the Westmorland County of Cumbria (in Great Britain). He is the great-grandson of a fiery preacher whose family disintegrated when he backslid. Though Lee's father was an Atheist, he married a Roman Catholic who raised her son in that faith.

At the onset of the Second World War, Lee's father was appointed by the Royal Navy as Chief Radar Officer (South Atlantic). So the family then moved to South Africa. There, Lee became a Calvinist; had the great joy of leading both of his parents to Christ; and became a Minister of God's Word and Sacraments in the Dutch Reformed Church of Natal.

Emigrating to the U.S.A., Lee attended the very first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America; transferred his ministerial credentials to that denomination; and pastored Congregations in Mississippi and Florida. He was also: Professor of Philosophy at Shelton College in New Jersey; Visiting Lecturer at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Ms.; Staley Distinguished Visiting Lecturer at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis; Research Scholar-in-Residence at the Christian Studies Center in Memphis; and Academic Dean of Graham Bible College in Bristol, Tennessee. He was then the only person in the World serving on the Executives of both the British Lord's Day Observance Society and the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States.

Preacher, Theologian, Lawyer, Educationist, Historian, Philosopher and Author, Lee has produced more than 330 publications (including many books) -- and also a multitude of long unpublished manuscripts. Apart from an honorary LL.D., he has twenty-one earned degrees -- including eleven earned doctorates for dissertations\* in Education, Law, Literature, Philosophy and Theology.

Lee rises early; reads God's Word in ten languages; then walks a couple of miles before breakfast. He has been round the World seven times; has visited one hundred and ten countries (several repeatedly); and also every Continent (except Antarctica). He is in demand as a Promoter of Doctoral Students in Australia, England, Germany, South Africa and the United States. He has lectured and/or preached in all of those countries, as well as in Brazil, Scotland, Korea, Japan, Namibia, New Zealand, and Zambia.

A diehard predestinarian, Lee now lives in Australia -- where he was for twenty years the Professor of Systematic Theology and Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College. He retired in 2000.

His wife Nellie is in fulltime Christian Service as a godly Homemaker. Their elder daughter Johanna has completed her M.A.; and teaches English, German and Modern History in Brisbane at the Parkridge High School. Their younger daughter Annamarie (B.A. & Dip. Lib. Sc.),

whom Dr. Lee baptized as a baby in 1970, was until 1998 Secretary/Librarian at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College, Brisbane, Australia. After completing her Dip. Ed., she became a Teacher and the Librarian at Lockhart River Primary School in Northern Queensland.

The above article on human cloning is substantially a chapter (without the footnotes) from Dr. Lee's 1996 D.Hum. dissertation below. It was updated on March 16<sup>th</sup> 2001, to include the latest events in the rush toward man's attempt to play the Creator by cloning himself before the end of 2001.

- \* Th.D.: *The Covenantal Sabbath*
- Ph.D.: *Communist Eschatology*
- D.Min.: *Daily Family Worship*
- D.Ed.: *Catechism Before Communion!*
- S.T.D.: *Rebaptism Impossible!*
- D.R.E.: *Baby Belief Before Baptism!*
- D.Jur.: *Women Ministers & Australian Litigation*
- D.Litt.: *Holinshed on the Ancient British Isles*
- D.C.L.: *The Roots and Fruits of the Common Law*
- D.Hum.: *Tiny Human Life -- Abortion and IVF*
- D.Phil.: *Miracles -- What and When and Why?*