

10-1-2011

# Human Duplication: Miracle?

Henry Ward '13

*Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.imsa.edu/fall2011>

 Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ward, Henry '13, "Human Duplication: Miracle?" (2011). *2011 Fall Semester*. Paper 4.  
<http://digitalcommons.imsa.edu/fall2011/4>

This Junior Award Winner is brought to you for free and open access by the Award for Excellence in Expository Writing at DigitalCommons@IMSA. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2011 Fall Semester by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@IMSA. For more information, please contact [pgarrett@imsa.edu](mailto:pgarrett@imsa.edu), [jean@imsa.edu](mailto:jean@imsa.edu).

Henry Ward

Mrs. Townsend

British Literature

13 November 2011

### Human Duplication: Miracle?

My creator tossed me into this world with little semblance of foresight, displaying the recklessness of a prodigal child too blinded by his own misled intelligence to realize the implications of his path. Perhaps – nay, certainly – he owed it to his creation to have taken more time in the consideration of my being before the deed was done. Due to his abominable lack of wisdom, to call me a miracle of science is as appalling a misnomer as may be. But, perhaps modern science has unveiled a true miracle – that of the unnatural creation of a *similar* being from another. At least in this act, deemed “cloning” from the Greek word for twig (*klon*), the creator shows foresight towards the future of his creation (McGee). But is this foresight misplaced? Human beings may think otherwise, but my conclusion leans towards the negative. That is to say, human cloning is a scientific miracle.

In concept, exact replication of a human being from another startles those who expect the process to be instantaneous or perfect. In reality, the human body’s inner processes force the actual method employed to differ from the fictionalized “perfect” method. In cloning an egg cell is taken from a woman, and its nucleus is removed. A normal cell is taken from the one being cloned. Then, the nucleus of the normal cell is implanted to replace the missing nucleus of the egg cell. This new, complete egg cell is “stimulated” and is put into a woman’s womb, after

which the gestation period ensues (Farina). Nine months later, an exact genetic copy of the cloned human is born.

What may not be known is that “exact genetic copy” does not mean exact in every tangible way, due to the natural laws by which genes function. For example, a person may possess genes for blue eyes, but that does not mean the person will have blue eyes because there is a great degree of variability in genetic inheritance. But for clones, there is a greater chance that if one clone has blue eyes the other will as well because the odds for one are the same as the odds for the other. Identical twins, for instance, are known as such because their physical characteristics are so very similar (McGee). Genes are entirely, of course, conceptual to me as the act of my creation had no element of chance, other than the particular state of my creator’s whims.

This method of cloning is known as reproductive cloning. Once they possess knowledge of the science, human beings should not fear this process for it occurs naturally in the aforementioned scenario of identical twins. If these types of humans can make it through life bearing little adversity but mockery, then I see no valid quandary with reproductive cloning. This kind of clone shall not have to suffer exile as I do, for although it is conceived in a laboratory it is not any sort of “miserable monster” like me (Shelley 35).

The second method is called therapeutic cloning and has darker ethical implications. It involves the creation of a cloned embryo which is not implanted in a woman’s womb but rather into a sterile Petri dish. This embryo’s life is short, and while it never attains sentience its brief time on Earth culminates in its utter destruction for the purposes of research.

Therapeutic cloning is a frightening prospect to humans, those hypocrites who butcher fully sentient animals for the slaughter and only feel remorse when one of their own brethren is killed. It is sickening, that a human having “aimed a gun...at my body, and fired” because of my appearance alone – after I saved his drowning companion, no less – will not destroy something that cannot even feel pain, simply because it *will* one day be human (Shelley 95). No good was wrought from the wound in my side, yet the research conducted on these cloned embryos has potential to save millions upon millions of humans from lethal disease. Why, then, fear to kill it? The embryo cannot yet even feel pain! Do they fear that it may become something ‘beautiful,’ in their eyes – would it be easier to hate it, to despise its very being as they do mine if they were, like me, ugly?

Perhaps I am too harsh. I surely threatened those humans when, after the “rustic” ripped the drowned girl I was resuscitating away from me and tore through the sheltered woods, I “followed speedily” his path (Shelley 95). I was, no doubt, a hideous sight to behold, exceptionally so when charging through the foliage tumultuously throwing up a great deal of nature in my wake. Perhaps, then, it is a justice to the cloned embryos, for their destruction for the purposes of research shall spare humankind many lives’ worth of suffering. They will be saved from realizing the excess of misery the dark side of man can perpetuate in a solitary being.

But a miniscule matter I left unmentioned is that the technology behind human cloning has not yet been perfected, and as such, is an entirely impractical process. Currently, there are no instances of successful human embryonic cloning (the only claim was determined to be false) and the success rate for mammals is very low – only about one or two percent. But even if a mammalian clone is created, the risk of genetic mutation is high and can potentially result in

horrible disfigurement and a profile similar to mine own (Cloning). My fate of eternal and abject misery due to the “horror of [my] countenance” is not something I shall ever dream of passing on to others (Shelley 35).

Although I fear the answer would weigh upon my hate-shriveled soul, I cannot help but wonder: would humanity fear its cloned offspring, were the dreams of decades of scientists to come to fruition, or treat them as a miracle? I have been shunned and cast away to wander forever in the dark, dank corners of my own mind, because they treated me as a mistake rather than a wonder. Humanity’s “vice has degraded me beneath the meanest animal” (Shelley 154). My question is: what will *they* become?

Works Cited

“Cloning Fact Sheet.” *Human Genome Project Information*. 11 May 2009. Human Genome Project, n.d. Web. 13 Nov. 2011.

Farina, Antonio. "Human Cloning." *The Gale Encyclopedia of Science*. Ed. K. Lee Lerner and Brenda Wilmoth Lerner. 4th ed. Vol. 3. Detroit: Gale, 2008. 2174-2177. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 13 Nov. 2011.

McGee, Glenn. "Human Cloning." *Encyclopedia of Science, Technology, and Ethics*. Ed. Carl Mitcham. Vol. 2. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005. 938-942. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 12 Nov. 2011.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. Ed. Paul Hunter. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996. Print. 13 Nov. 2011.