

MISSOURI AMENDMENT 2 PROTECTS HUMAN CLONING

MYTH: Would the Missouri cloning amendment (Amendment 2) ban all forms of human cloning?

FACT: NO! Amendment 2 would actually make human cloning for destructive research (i.e. “therapeutic cloning”) a constitutional right. Although Amendment 2 purports to ban human cloning, the fine print reveals that it gives biotech firms the constitutional right to conduct “somatic cell nuclear transfer” (SCNT), a process which clones human embryos. SCNT is the scientific phrase for cloning, the same method used to clone Dolly the sheep.

MYTH: Does “somatic cell nuclear transfer” (SCNT) allowed under Amendment 2 involve human cloning?

FACT: YES! The President’s Council on Bioethics unanimously concluded: “The product of ‘SCNT’ is not only an embryo; it is also a clone, genetically virtually identical to the individual that was the source of the transferred nucleus, hence an embryonic clone of the donor.” On Terminology, Human Cloning and Human Dignity: An Ethical Inquiry, 2002.

MYTH: Does human research cloning (“therapeutic cloning”) allowed under Amendment 2 produce a human “embryo”?

FACT: YES! Commissions under both President Clinton and President Bush found that human research cloning (“therapeutic cloning”) produced a human embryo. President Clinton’s National Bioethics Advisory Commission, in its 1997 report “Cloning Human Beings”, explicitly stated: “any effort in humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo, with the apparent potential to be implanted in utero and developed to term.”

MYTH: Is there a scientific difference between “therapeutic cloning” and “reproductive cloning”?

FACT: NO! The only difference is the purpose for cloning embryos – whether the cloned embryo is implanted (reproductive cloning) or destroyed (therapeutic cloning). The cloned embryo, regardless of the purpose for which it was created, is fully capable of developing into a cloned baby.

MYTH: Would Amendment 2 pave the way for “reproductive cloning”?

FACT: YES! Even some proponents of “therapeutic cloning” have



FAMILY RESEARCH
COUNCIL
801 G STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC
20001

(202) 393-2100

ORDER LINE:
1-800-225-4008

WWW.FRC.ORG

admitted that therapeutic cloning will make reproductive cloning that much easier: “It is true that the techniques developed in CRNT [a.k.a. therapeutic cloning] research can prepare the way scientifically and technically for efforts at reproductive cloning.” Robert P. Lanza, Arthur L. Caplan, Lee M. Silver, Jose B. Cibelli, Michael D. West, Ronald M. Green.

MYTH: Would the Missouri cloning amendment legalize cloning banned in countries such as France and Canada?

FACT: YES! French law criminalizes the cloning of human embryos for research and reproduction. Canada has also banned all human cloning. The Missouri cloning amendment would constitutionally protect the cloning of human embryos for research.

MYTH: Is the Missouri Amendment 2 cloning amendment necessary because it alone offers unique cures?

FACT: NO! Therapeutic cloning has not produced a single cure in animal models for any disease, nor has it produced any cures in human clinical trials. Indeed, reports in 2005 that the South Koreans cloned human embryos and obtained stem cells turned out to be a complete fraud.

In contrast, adult stem cells have already been used successfully in over 72 peer-reviewed studies to treat humans. For example, adult stem cells have already been used to treat cartilage defects in children, restore vision to patients who were legally blind, relieve systemic lupus, multiple sclerosis, and rheumatoid arthritis and cure severe combined immunodeficiency disease, and to treat various types of cancer such as leukemias, solid tumors, neuroblastoma, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, renal cell carcinoma and heart disease.

MYTH: Would the Missouri cloning amendment yield cures for millions of patients?

FACT: Not likely. There is a growing skepticism about the clinical applications of research cloning: "...Ministers in Britain have too easily swallowed the line that cloning human embryos is essential to medical progress. It is not. "...Like stuck records, ministers and policy makers continue to enthuse about therapeutic cloning even though the majority of bench scientists no longer think it's possible or practicable to treat patients with cells derived from cloned embryos. They have already moved on to investigating the alternatives." - Editorial, "Brave New Medicine", Dec 1, 2001

MYTH: Would Missouri Amendment 2 cloning amendment lead to the exploitation of women by turning their eggs into commodities?

FACT: YES! Under Amendment 2, biotech firms will be given the right to pay women to harvest their eggs, which are necessary to make cloned embryos. Millions of eggs will be needed for the kind of cloning experimentation this amendment would allow. This amendment is not only deceptive, but it ignores the exploitation of women that will result.

"Because embryo cloning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy and, with virtual certainty, lead to the production of 'experimental' human beings, we are convinced that the line must be drawn here." Judy Norsigian, feminist and pro-choice co-author of *Our Bodies, Ourselves for the New Century*.