Review Article

Ethics of Human Cloning: A Comparative Study of Western Secular and Islamic Bioethics Perspectives

Sharmin I[1], Ruslin BN[2], Hanapi BMN[3], B Rani[4]

Abstract

The comparative approach regarding the ethics of surrogacy from the Western secular and Islamic bioethical view reveals both commensurable and incommensurable relationship. It is not either straight forward 'commensurable' or straight forward 'incommensurable.' Islamic bioethics is straight-forward in prohibiting reproductive cloning on its own features and also guess social chaos and anarchy. Western secular bioethics has both arguments and counter arguments both for and against this scientific innovation. Both are eager to highlight the welfare of the society as a whole but the approaches are not always the same.

Introduction

Cloning is nowadays a familiar talk in scientific seminar, symposium. It is becoming a growing attention day by day for its outstanding technological merit. At the same time, as a very latest intervention of medical science, all of its medical dimensions, religious bindings, juristic dimensions and ethical challenges are still in infancy.

The English word 'clone' has a Greek origin. It is derived from the Greek word 'klwn' which means 'twig' and there is a very good reason for this.[1]

For instance, when we successfully cultivate a houseplant cutting, we are doing cloning. Here we are deliberately propagating a copy of the parent producing a multitude of plants (clones) all genetically identical to the prized parent. So, many fruits and vegetables are genetically identical clones from plants with some desirable qualities and quantities. But cloning could not gather world wide interest and enthusiasm until the birth of a Scottish sheep clone 'Dolly'. Scientists began busy with the task to think if trees can be cloned, if animals can be cloned then why not humans?

Simply speaking, cloning is a method of producing an animal or human child that has almost the same genetic makeup as its parents. The technology of somatic cell neuclear transfer (SCNT) is the root cause of cloning. In the process of cloning, the neucleus of a somatic cell is transferred into an anucleated ovum, under specific circumstances. Consequently, this ovum which is fertilized by a somatic nucleas, acted as an ovum fertilized by a sperm, entered into the cascade of cell division and finally become a fetus.

Medical Benefits of Human Cloning

Several possible scenarios can be imagined regarding the use of human cloning. It is a great means to overcome either male infertility, female infertility or even both male and female infertility. As a kind of assisted reproductive technology, human cloning can offer prospects to sufferers from intractable infertility.

Human cloning solves the problem of infertile husband. People who are crazy to have children but fail to have it through some techniques of assisted reproductive medicine can theoretically have it through cloning. For example, if the husband's sperm is not workable, he may exhibit total germ cell failure. Then the wife is not needed to marry another person to be a mother to a child genetically related to the father. Through the application of cloning technique, the husband can provide his DNA from cell taken from any part of his body and the nucleus of that cell which contains the DNA could be fused with the ovum of the wife. The resulting embryo then could

1. Dr. Sharmin Islam, Asstt Professor, Northern University Bangladesh
2. Prof. Rusli Bin Nordin, Ex-Deputy Dean, School of Dental Sciences (PPSG), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Malaysia.
3. Prof. Ab. Rani Shamsuddin, Ex-Dean, School of Dental Sciences (PPSG), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Malaysia.
4. Prof. Hanapi Bin Mohd. Noor, Ex-Director, Islamic Centre (Pusat Islam), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Health Campus, KotaBharu, Malaysia.

Corresponds to: Dr. Sharmin Islam, Asstt Professor, Northern University Road # 4/A, House: 54, Dhanmondi R.A, Dhaka-1205, Bangladesh. ***E-mail:*** Sharmin320@hotmail.com

be implanted in the uterus of the wife up to the period of delivery. So the wife can contribute important constituents that are her mitochondrial genes, intrauterine influences and subsequent nurture. So, male infertility is not a problem. The need for the sperm is eliminated. Moreover, the spouse in this case, would not to rely on any anonymous donor sperm. In fact, the child is 100% genetic. There is great pleasure in having a fully genetic child than a child born with the help of donor sperm.

Wife's infertility is not a problem now. The wife's fertility problem may be of two types: problem with ovum or problem with uterus. She may not be able to produce effective ovum or she may not have uterus, or the uterus is affected with cancer or any other disease, or she may not be willing to use the uterus etc. In case of the absence of ovum, she can use the ovum of another woman to fuse it with the DNA of the husband and the resulting embryo can be gestated by the wife up to term and give birth to the child. Similarly, the wife can donate only egg and after the egg is enucleated with the DNA of the husband, a surrogate can gestate it up to a fixed time and after delivery can hand it over to the contracting couple through surrogacy arrangement. But this is possible through surrogacy arrangement or IVF technique also. What is the novelty of cloning? Actually the novelty is no need of sperms. This is the main advantage of cloning technique. Still we cannot deny the necessity of ovum and gestation. Even if we require an egg we do not need a viable egg. So in reproductive process, we are now in a position to procreate with the help of woman only. No need of a man! It is a period of Brave New world, where a woman is free to reproduce amongst themselves that is fusing a woman's DNA from a somatic cell with her ovum and finally bear the fetus in her uterus and give birth to it. The child would exclusively her without any contribution of male participation. How reproductive freedom she is enjoying! Even if she has no uterus, then she can hire another woman as a gestate and use her DNA to fuse her ovum.

Human cloning avoids the risk of having children with a genetic disease. A spouse may have a genetic disposition toward an unwanted serious disease such as Tay-Sachs disease, spina bifida, Down's syndrome etc. To avoid the risk of any genetically affected child, the couple may undergo cloning technique.

Sometimes, a child may be in need of obtaining tissue or organ for transplantation. If his disease is not genetic, then he can be cloned to have an embryo and to collect the desired tissue from the resulting embryo. This technique is more feasible than the technique through which the parents reproduce an embryo which will have correct tissue type to serve the sibling, for example, as a bone marrow donor for the diseased sibling.

An existing person who is in death bed can be cloned. In that case, the parents will have an exact replica of the lost person.

This technique is capable of producing outstanding and admired personalities, another Einstein, another Max Plank, another Russell, and another Mother Teresa! If we can collect their genome, why is not possible to clone them and have their identical twins?

Embryonic clone of children can be freezed by the parents so that if any of them dies, genetic twin of the cloned embryo could be produced from the freezed embryo. In that case, one of the cell nuclei of the kid could have been transplanted into one of the mother's enucleated ova and kept frozen. Freezing embryonic clone of a person would be beneficial if the person concerned later needs a bone marrow, kidney or liver transplant. Then the clone would be implanted in a gestational surrogate and developed. Scientists are thinking about enhancing the longevity of life through this technique. For example, if we can perpetuate gene line, we can do it. Suppose some body lived 80 years, we can clone him and the cloned person would have enjoyed better nourishment and other environmental and health standards, is it not possible to give him a 100 years old life. But all these are still hypothesis. We have to think seriously about all of these possibilities if we have a scientific and progressive mind. So, 'reproductive cloning' is not the only medical use of the technology. There are also some important medical uses without production of whole human beings.

Human Cloning: Western Secular and Islamic Bioethical Perspectives

There are a lot of verses in the Holy *Qur'?n* which reflect the facts about human creation. Allah (S.W.T) utters, "And He it is who creates [all life] in the first instance, and then brings it forth anew: and most easy is this for Him, since His is the essence of all that is most sublime in the heavens and on earth, and He alone is almighty, truly wise"[2]

Allah (S.W.T) has created mankind from male and female. He says,

"O Mankind! Be conscious of your Sustainer, who has created you out of one living entity, and out of it created its mate, and out of the two spread abroad a multitude of men and women. And remain conscious of God, in whose name you demand [your rights] from one another, and of these ties of kinship. Verily, God is ever watchful over you!"[3]

Hence, the appropriate way of producing offspring is through proper union of sperm and ovum of a legally married couple. In that case the child carries the genes of both father and mother and it ensures a balanced personality. But in human cloning, a single cell production is feasible.

Similar conclusion can be found if the issue is explained from another angle. The question of quality of life arises in the case of human cloning. The cloned product will not have the same quality as we know it in humans today, because human beings are a combination of matter and spirit. During the first trimester of intra-uterine development the soul (*ruh*) is inserted into the body of the fetus by Allah (SWT). There is one soul (*ruh*) for every fetus. Thus, the cloned product will have all the biological properties of the ordinary human being, but not the soul (*ruh*). In other words, it will be devoid of the spiritual qualities. Hence, the life of the cloned product will be of little or no quality.[4]

In fact, the majority of Islamic scholars view human cloning as *har?m* (prohibited) on its own features. Others label it as forbidden as a way to prevent a cause of harm. But their opinion is that if exceptional cases arise in the future, they should be considered to verify compliance with the *Shar?'ah*. [5]

Although reproductive cloning is not allowed in Islam, there should be no restriction upon therapeutic use of cloning. Scientific-jurisprudence seminar in Jordan permitted to use cloning technology to introduce human genetic material into bacteria or animals ova aiming at production of medical materials necessary to treat or prevent human diseases.[6,5]

There are a lot of negative responses to human cloning in the world of Western secular bioethics which are capable to capture aspects of the negative public sentiment. Similarly there are bioethicists who talks in favor of human cloning

It is argued in Western secular bioethics that human cloning would create great confusion in family structure. Suppose, it is done taking cell from the husband and wife, still there is question what would be the relation between the cloned child and the wife, what would be the relation between the husband and the cloned being. So the legal and social status of the child is obscure in cloning technology. The disparity between the child's genetic and social identity is not good for the stability of a family. An intrinsic difference between other reproductive technologies and cloning is that the existence of genetic "doubles" is moved to a new location in the family where the clone's genetic twin would be older. This new kinship of genetic twinning intersects with the chance of 'objectification' or means-to-end control of the child.[7]

Although some critics are worried about complicated relationship created by cloning technology, others are not persuaded by such criticisms. They argue on different lines. They argue that children born through other assisted reproductive techniques also paves the way to peculiar relationships to genetic, gestational and rearing parents, so what is wrong with cloning. They also add that there is no evidence that confusion over family roles has harmed children born through assisted reproductive technologies although the subject has not been carefully studied.[8] This argument is in favor of cloning and diminishes the objection that cloning is a threat to good family relationship, family harmony.

Islamic bioethics issues negative stance in this matter. With reference to the procedures of *masalik al-'illah* it can be argued that the right *'illah* or way of producing offspring is the use of sperms rather than any other way. The procedure initially identifies an original ruling. Then it follows a series of procedures, i.e., *takhrij al-'illah*(extraction of possible *'ilal*), *tanqih al-'illah* (purification of the *'ilal*) and lastly *tahqiq al-'illah* where the application of the old ruling can be applied to the new case by way of applying the appropriate *'illah* [For elaborate discussion of these procedures, please refer to Bakar, 1996:1-25]. As in human cloning, sperms of the male are not a prerequisite, Islamic ethics cannot allow it.[9]

Finally, children born through cloning would be his

or her not their. Besides, human cloning is unable to apply different rules and regulations of *Shar?'ah* such as rules of marriage, inheritance, custody, *Maharim*, forbidden degrees of consanguinity.

Furthermore, as cloning is an exact replication of the donor DNA, the resulting baby would be the later biological twin of the donor DNA. If the donor is the husband, he cannot be considered as the father of the child but the much earlier twin. But the wife would still be regarded as the mother as she is the provider of ovum and gestates the baby. In such a situation, it would cause upheavals to the very formation of family relations. [9]

It is alleged in Western secular bioethics that human psychology cannot support human cloning. Every man is concerned about his origin, about his past history. Who am I and from where have I come? He cannot overlook these types of quarries. Human cloning bears a strong psychological harm to the cloned person. He may suffer from an inferiority complex that he is the identical twin of his ancestor and his birth was manipulated. It is a threat to his personality and hampers his sense of uniqueness. How he will define himself if he is a cloned being. In a word, human cloning would produce great distress and harm to the later twin. [8]

Conversely, some may compare cloning with identical twin and say that as in identical twin there is no risk of psychological harm to the children so why there be any complain against human cloning that it violates individual uniqueness. In fact, we should remember that twinning is the product of natural reproduction, it is not manipulated reproduction. The scenario is possible in which being a later twin confers a psychological benefit on the twin; for example, having been deliberately cloned with the special genes the later twin has might make the later twin feel especially wanted for the kind of person he is. Nevertheless, if experience with human cloning confirmed that serious and unavoidable psychological harms typically occurred to the later twin that would be a serious moral ground to avoid the practice.[10]

Sometimes it is suggested to limit the number of cloned persons in order to avoid psychological harm on the created person. For example, Dan W. Brock wants to emphasize that cloning by means of embryo splitting, as carried out and reported by Hall and colleagues at Georgetown University in 1993, has limits on the number of genetically identical twins that can be cloned. He argues that cloning has no limits to the number of genetically identical individuals who might be cloned, intuitively, many of the psychological burdens and harms noted above seem more likely and serious for a clone who is only one of many identical later twins from one original source, so that the clone might run into another identical twin around every street corner. This prospect, he says, could be a good reason to place sharp limits on the number of twins that could be cloned from any one source. [10]

Jonas said that cloning is always a crime against clone. The crime here is the crime of depriving the clone of his or her "existential right to ignorance" of facts about his or her origin that are likely to be "paralyzing for the spontaneity of becoming himself" or herself. This advance knowledge of what another person has or has not accomplished with the clone's genome destroys the clone's "condition for authentic growth" in seeking to answer the perennial question of people, "Who am I?" Jonas says further, "The ethical command here entering the enlarged stage of our powers is: never to violate the right to that ignorance which is a condition of authentic action; or: to respect the right of each human life to find its own way and be a surprise to itself." Jonas's argument here is correct. This is not the right approach to say that a cloning technique that limits the liberty and choices of the resulting child can be justified on the grounds that cloning expands the liberty and choices of would-be-cloners. [11]

Kass criticizes SCNT on the ground that a child originated by SCNT will have a " troubled psychic identity" because she or he will be "utterly" confused about his social, genetic and kinship ties. Even he guesses the possibility that this child will be like a child of "incest" and may if originated as a male from the father, have the same sexual feelings towards the wife as the father. Besides, Kass thinks that an older male might in turn have strong sexual feelings toward a young female with his wife's genome. [12]

In response to Kass's objection that children born out of cloning would have "a troubled psychic identity", G.E. Pence argues that if this were so, any husband of any married twin might have an equally troubled psychic identity because he might have the same sexual feelings toward the twin as his wife.

Besides, those in relationships with twins claim that the individuals are very different.[12]

It is also argued that even if we were convinced that clones are likely to suffer particular burdens that would not be a sufficient point to reject this technology. The child of a poor family also is to face specific, hardships and burdens. But we do not resist their birth despite the financial hardships. In fact, no one's life is totally free of hardships and burdens.[13]

John Robertson says that adults have a right to procreate in anyway they can. Besides the interests of the children is no matter here because they would not have any existence at all without cloning. But this argument amounts to a tautology, argues G.J. Annas. His view is that it applies equally to every existing man, because none would have existence had it not been for the precise and unpredictable time when the father's sperm and the mother's egg met. This biologic fact does not justify that our parents have no obligations to us as their future offspring. If it did, it would be equally acceptable from the child's side to be gestated in a great ape, or even a cow or to be composed of a mixture of ape genes and human genes.[11]

Several possible bad outcomes of reproductive human cloning have already been delineated both from Western secular and Islamic bioethics perspectives. But more important concern is whether this achievement is possible or merely a speculation. Cloning is still a dream and not proved scientifically. Islamic scholars are inclined not to deal with this issue as it is not a proved fact. Islamic law and ethics discourages speculative thinking about hypothetical events. Issues are discussed from the legal and ethical aspects after they have taken place. Detailed discussion of cloning should not take place until it has occurred and we see its implications in practice.[4]

Besides, *maslahah* should be general and should not be in conflict with any provision of the *Qur'?n* and *Sunnah* or *Ijm?*. But as a hypothesis or just a speculation, it does not fulfill this condition.

Dehumanization is not a very respectful attitude towards human beings. But some critics claim that somatic cell nucleus transfer dehumanizes people by considering them object instead of person. "Personhood" is an inborn human right. But human cloning treats people as objects other than person. There are significant differences between a person and an object. An object does not possess any self-esteem, personality, integrity and so on. But a person has all these qualities. A person is a moral agent capable of decision-making but an object is not. So a person is a direct contrast to an object. An object is an expression of the manipulated desires of a person, such as we make a table according to our choice of type of wood, color and so on. Similarly, human cloning amounts to 'making' rather than 'begetting' children. Legal scholar Margaret Radin compares object and person in this way, "The person is a subject, a moral agent, autonomous and self-governing. An object is a non-person, not treated as a self-governing moral agent….[By]" objectification of persons", we mean, roughly, "what Kant would not want us to do."[8]

To put it differently, through human cloning, a person's worth or value becomes diminished because in this case, human being can be manufactured or handmade. We think this objection is more appropriate in therapeutic cloning than reproductive cloning. Sometimes it is used for organ transplantation that is it is planned only to supply a good organ.

But some critics in Western secular bioethics differ in this respect. Their view is that it is a mistake to think that a human being created by human cloning is of less value or is less worthy of respect than one created by sexual reproduction. It is the nature of a being not how it is reproduced on which the worthiness depends. We value a person on the basis of his nature.[14]

The approach of Islamic bioethics is quite different on this issue. It labels human cloning as a move from the natural way of creation. Man was ordained to live in harmony with nature. Human cloning is inconsistent with the pattern of creating things in pair as is mentioned in the Holy *Qur'an*,

"And in everything have We created opposites, so that you might bear in mind [that God alone is One"[15].

To quote from the Holy *Qur'an*,

"and that it is He who creates the two kinds - the male and the female - out of a [mere] drop of sperm as it is poured forth".[16]

Allah (S.W.T) also says,

"Was he not once a [mere] drop of sperm that had been spilt, and thereafter became a germ-cell - whereupon He created and formed [it] in accordance with what [it] was meant to be, and fashioned out of it the two sexes, the male and the female?"[17]

It is argued in Islamic ethics that cloning is a threat to human personality, human dignity and honor.[18] Islam views human being as a manifestation of the body through a spirit, that is mind. But human cloning endeavors to create a genetic replica of a human being. Is it not dehumanization of mankind? Certainly it lowers the status of human being. Man is after all not a machine. It has the characteristics of thinking, feeling and cognitive capacity. This problem is expressed beautifully in the writings of Munawar A. Anees, "By negating inviolability of the human body, cloning is an intrusion into the primum mobile of the genetic ecosystem. Even in the primordial experiment, not much was accomplished without introducing synthetic elements. The vigor of this invasive procedure will only be enhanced by an awesome command of parallel computing power augmented by genetic cartography. There are little barriers to an explosive mix of computers and biology in the service of cloning. Is our body only a bundle of genes, tissues and, organs? What is a person? A body? What is the essence of owning a body? What is that quintessence that gives us an intensely personal experience of bodily pleasures? In this Cartesian duality of body vs. person, how far one can go in denying existential identity vis-a-vis its proximity with the organic composition?"[19]

Human cloning has the potential for physical harm also. 'Do no harm' is an important principle of Western Bioethics. Critics are suspicious whether human cloning technique can satisfy this principle. Dolly was successful after 276 failures. It indicates that the procedure is not so easy and feasible. If it is done in human being there is risk of hormonal manipulation in the egg donor, multiple miscarriages in the birth mother and possibly severe developmental disorders in the resulting child. The use of a medical drug or device on a human being on the basis of such a preliminary study and without much additional medical research would not permitted by standard practice in Biomedical science and clinical care. Furthermore, when risks are taken with an innovative therapy, the justification lies in the prospect of treating an illness in a patient, whereas, here no patient is at risk until the innovation is employed. Thus, no conscientious physician or Institutional Review Board should approve attempts to use cloning technology to create a child at this moment. [8]. At the same time it is also true that the actual risks of physical harm to the child born through human cloning cannot be known with certainty unless and until research is conducted on human beings. In fact, if we insisted on absolute guarantees of no risk before allowing any new medical intervention to be attempted in humans, this would severely hamper if not halt completely the introduction of new therapeutic interventions including assisted reproductive technologies. Therefore, to stop human cloning on the plea that it is experimentation for the child's benefit is not persuasive.[8]

Brock also opines that it is too soon to say whether unavoidable risks to the clone would make human cloning unethical. At the minimum level, further research on cloning animals, as well as research to better define the potential risks to humans is essential. Anticipating possible bad outcomes, we should not set aside risks to the clone on the grounds that the clone would not be harmed by them since its only alternative is not to exist at all. It would be a bad argument. Nevertheless, we should not insist on a standard that requires risks to be lower than those we accept in sexual reproduction, or in other forms of assisted reproduction.[10]

[Therefore, Western secular bioethics still is examining different ifs and buts of human cloning technology before issuing any conclusive judgment regarding its ethical permissibility. On the other hand, although there is dispute about the permissibility of this technique in Islamic bioethics, a majority of the scholars still express negative judgment about it. Ethical question arises whether human cloning is incompetent with social values or not. Critics of somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning ask us to imagine a world in which cloning human beings via somatic cell nuclear transfer were permitted and widely practiced. What type of people, parents and children would we become in such a world? Creating children through cloning may disrupt the interconnected web of social values, practices and institutions that support the healthy growth of children. This technique might encourage the undesirable attitude that children are to be valued according to how closely they meet parental expectations, rather than loved for their own sake. The opponents

claim that a world in which such cloning was widely practiced would give implicit approval to vanity, narcissism and avarice. To these critics, changes that undermine those deeply prized values should be avoided if possible. At a minimum, such undesirable changes should not be fostered by public policies.[8]

In any case, the child created would be valued not for its intrinsic value that is humanness but as an instrumental value that is expectation of a particular genome's phenotype. We can consider the example that a couple has lost their child of 6 years and are very upset. We can suggest them to clone the dead child to have an exact replica of him. But would it ultimately satisfy their full desire. Naturally they would never value the cloned child as same as the previous one.

Islamic ethics is also against cloning for the greater interest of the society. An important legal principle of Islamic jurisprudence is *maslahah* (public interest). It may seem that as it is a form of reproduction through a valid married couple, for the benefit of public interest, it can be permitted. But here the concept of *maslahah* should be analyzed within its hierarchy. For being a *maslahah darurah* (necessity), it must be to the extent where the livelihood must depend on it. But having children cannot be declared as a *dururah* for it would not cause any harm on the couple. In fact, it is a *malahah hajjiyyah* and not a *darurah*. As human cloning would disrupt family relations and cause confusion in lineage, it may not even be viewed as a *maslahah hajjiyyah*, but rather fall under the status of *mafsadah*(causing evil or corruption) [20]

Sometimes it is guessed that human cloning will be threat upon traditional social value system if it would be widely used. Bio-ethicist Leon Kass noted, "Almost no one sees any compelling reason for human cloning. Almost everyone anticipates its possible misuses and abuses. Many feel oppressed by the sense that there is nothing we can do to prevent it from happening and this makes the prospect seem all the more revolting. Revulsion is surely not an argument….But…in crucial cases repugnance is often the emotional bearer of deep wisdom beyond reason's power fully to articulate it" [21]

In opposition to Kass's argument, Pence argues that the predicted harms of human cloning are widely exaggerated and stem from irrational fears of the unknown. These predictions are often based on the armchair psychological speculation of amateurs. He further argues that once studies prove SCNT as safe as normal sexual reproduction in non-human mammals, the harm objection will disappear. In fact, the argument that SCNT would harm children is a weak one which needs to be weighed against its many potential utility.[22]

Human cloning is inconsistent with social values because it can be used for commercial gain. We may imagine that like surrogate motherhood, human cloning would have the possibility to be used on commercial purpose. We cannot ignore this possibility even though firstly human cloning would be successful. In a capitalist society, it is not unlikely that laboratories will be in a competitive mode to offer a catalogue of different embryos cloned from people with a variety of I.Q, appearance or other desirable qualities.

Human cloning will have the possibility of aiming at selective breeding. It will be a means of deciding which human traits and characteristics would be favored which is an enterprise that rests on the notions of selective human superiority that have long been linked with racist ideology. In fact, it is a path that humanity has treaded before, to its everlasting shame. Therefore, it is a path to whose return the science of cloning should never be allowed to give even the slightest support.[8]

In this context, Islamic bioethics also gives more or less similar views. It holds the view that in a world, where every one is same would be a very boring place. Beauty of humanity lies in the differences we see in each other. But human cloning would remove surprise and predict expectancy. In a word, cloning of human being paves the way for genetic determinism for the coming creature that is yet to be composed of a body and a spirit. Human cloning with the intention of producing geneous people or creating some body with special characteristics would lead to the kinship being lost and mixed. The fact that the entire human race may be genetically identical means that the entire race is at great risk from a single pathogen. It would be detrimental in terms of a great viral disaster. Another negative effect of it would be inbreeding. Cloning would give humanity a big head start to cataclysim because if it is relied upon for reproduction and we lose the ability to clone, everyone will have the same genotype.

Besides, to keep reproducing within ourselves would lead us to our own extinction.[23]

The above comparative study reveals the fact that Islamic bioethics is concerned with what life is worth living. But the missing thing in human cloning is that instead of increasing the quality of life, it created confusion and haphazardness to the basic concept of family, motherhood, fatherhood etc. It is also vague in cloning how the individual is going to relate him or herself to the communal connections, interconnections which Islam is aspiring to establish. Human relationships are the center of complete religiosity in Islamic law. Freedom in Islamic ethics is very much integrated to accountability of how to exercise that freedom. Hence, it is a kind of relational ethics which concentrates both on rights and obligations. Therefore, in taking decisions about our future generations, we are accountable in recognizing their rights and how they would look at their ancestors as their legacy for these children.[24]

It is not that Western secular bioethics is reluctant about the collective aspect of ethics and only concentrates on individual aspect. It is also very much eager to balance the autonomy of the to be parents and that of the cloned child. It shows the way how to reconcile the autonomy of both so that freedom of both the parents and the child are safeguarded and remains in force.[25-26] But the only difference between these two approaches is while in Western secular bioethics, this dichotomy exists between two parties that are parents and children, in Islamic bioethics; this dichotomy exists between God and human being as whole.

Conclusion

The discussion of ethics of cloning in comparative perspective makes one point clear that although in Western secular bioethics there are arguments and counter arguments in judging the moral worth of this ART, Islamic bioethics denounces the practice to follow the five purposes of the *Shar?‘ah.* Still it encourages it for therapeutic purposes. We should conclude that the debate regarding cloning will last for the days coming and it will not stop as we are free to cultivate our own reason to judge the morality of cloning. But the overall analysis shows that benefits are less than its harm. Still research should go on to find out the scientific benefit, if it has any, in future.

References

1. Beddington, R. Cloning-Mill Hill Essays, National Institute for Medical Research :2006. [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web:http://www.nimr.mrc.ac.uk/millhillessays/1997/cloning.htm.
2. Glorious Qur'n, Chapter 30, Verse 27.
3. Glorious Qur'n, Chapter 4, Verse 1.
4. Kasule, OH. Human Cloning :2006[Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web:www.missionislam.com/health/cloning.htm.
5. Mishal, AA. Cloning and Advances in Molecular Biotechnology. *In*: H.E. Fadel, (ed). *FIMA Year Book 2002*.Islamabad: Federation of Islamic Medical Associations in collaboration with Medico Islamic Research Council (MIRC) and Islamic international Medical College: 33-47.
6. Al Qaradawi, Y. Cloning and Its Dangerous Impacts . (2006) [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web:http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?pagename=IslamOnline-English-Ask_Scholar/FatwaE/FatwaE&cid=1119503544346.
7. Cahill, LS. (1999) No Human Cloning: A Social Ethics Perspective. *Hofstra Law Review* **27**(3):487-501.
8. National Bioethics Advisory Commission, 2000:327-40.
9. Zawawi, M. (2002) Human Cloning-Ethical And Legal Perspectives. *In*: ABA. Majeed, (ed). *Bioethics: Ethics In The Biotechnology Century.* Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Islamic Understanding:123-60.
10. Brock, DW. (2003) Cloning Human Beings: An Assessment of the Ethical Issues Pro and Con. *In*: B. Steinbock, JD. Arras, AJ. London, (ed). *Ethical Issues in Modern Medicine*. 6th Ed. NY: McGraw-Hill: 631-43.
11. Annas, GJ. (2001) Why We Should Ban Human Cloning? *In*: C. Levine, (ed). *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Bioethical Issues*. 9th Ed. U.S.A: McGraw-Hill: 200-6.
12. Pence, GE. (2000) Will Cloning Harm People? *In*: LP. Pojman, *Life and Death: A Reader in Moral Problems*. Belmont: Wadsworth: 349-59.
13. Wachbroit, R. (2001) Genetic Encores: The Ethics of Human Cloning. *In*: TA. Mappes & D. Degrazia, *Biomedical Ethics*. 4th Ed. NY: Mc Graw-Hill:571-577.
14. Goldman, A. (2003) The Refutation of Medical Paternalism. *In*: B. Steinbock, JD. Arras, AJ. London, (ed). *Ethical Issues in Modern Medicine*. 6th Ed. NY: McGraw-Hill: 56-64.
15. Glorious Qur'?n, Chapter 51, Verse 49.
16. Glorious Qur'?n, Chapter 53, Verse 45-46.
17. Glorious Qur'?n, Chapter 75, Verse 37-39
18. Siddiqi, MH. (2006) Human Cloning: An Islamic Perspective [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: http://www.peoplecrescentlife.com/wellness/human_cloning_islamicperspective.
19. Anees, MA. (2006) Re-defining the Human: Triumphs and Tribulations of Homo xeroxiens [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: http://www.iol.ie/~afifi/Articles/human.htm.
20. Zawawi, M. (2002) Human Cloning-Ethical And Legal Perspectives. *In*: ABA. Majeed, (ed). *Bioethics: Ethics In The Biotechnology Century.* Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Islamic Understanding:123-60.
21. Kass, L. (2001) Why We Should Ban the Cloning of Human Beings. *In*: TA. Mappes & D. Degrazia, *Biomedical Ethics*. 4th Ed. NY: Mc Graw-Hill: 561-564.
22. Pence, GE. (2000) Will Cloning Harm People? *In*: LP. Pojman, *Life and Death: A Reader in Moral Problems*. Belmont: Wadsworth: 349-59.
23. Nawash, 2006.
24. Sachedina, A. (2006) Human Cloning: Religious Perspectives [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: http://pewforum.org/events/index.php?EventID=8.
25. Choo, DR. (2006) Two Master Arguments in the Ethics of Human Cloning vs. Autonomy of the Future Clones [Online]. [Accessed 10th October 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: http://www2.unescobkk.org/eubios/ABC4/abc4402.htm.
26. Musa Mohd Nordin. Human genetic and reproductive technologies-an international medico-legal-religious impasse? *Bangladesh Journal of Medical Science* 2010; **10** (1):.1-10. DOI: 10.2239/bjms.v10i1.7311