

Committee Secretary,  
Community Affairs Committee,  
Department of the Senate:

I am writing in regard to the suggestion that parliament will soon consider one or possibly two Bills which aim to introduce the recommendations of the Lockhart Report for human cloning. Below is my submission to this inquiry.

## **Why clone?**

I am writing to question why the consideration of cloning is even an issue today. Was not Hwang Woo Suk, the researcher on whose findings a great deal of the Lockhart Report (19<sup>th</sup> December 2005) was based upon, shortly thereafter (4 days) found by a Seoul University internal review panel that he had intentionally faked his 2004 and 2005 research? He claimed to have created patient-matched embryonic stem cells through cloning did he not?

Since Hwang's work has now been proven false and there is no other case of peer-reviewed patient specific embryonic stem cells anywhere in the world at this point in time, it begs the question why some people are still trying to achieve something that as yet has no scientific basis.

Furthermore, if cloning creates a living human embryo, it seems logical that we should never try to dehumanize the cloned embryo! Regardless when the embryo is solely for research (questionably named 'therapeutic' cloning) or for birth (rightly named 'reproductive' cloning), they both produce a living embryo which is then cloned by the standard method using SCNT (somatic cell nuclear transfer). Thus, cloning simply understood is SCNT and SCNT is cloning no matter which way we word it.

In addition, cloning also seems very unnecessary today as well. It even lacks basic 'proof of principle' in animals, while adult stem cell studies undertaken in Australia are proving safe and effective in humans. It also seems likely that cloning for research will perfect the technique needed for cloning for live-birth and for commercial fetal organ harvesting. By commercializing women's ovaries and risking their health, or using animal eggs to make a human-animal hybrid where will this lead us?

One should then ask "Are we playing God" by our actions and intentions here? Could we ultimately produce a 'frankenstein fetus' one day? What then would make us any different than Adolph Hitler trying to attain his 'dream' of creating the 'Superior Arian race'. He thought that lesser humans deserved to be exterminated at the expense of the chosen race. Why would we be much different than he himself who approved of ghastly scientific experiments performed on prisoners with little regard for human life? If possessed the technology we possess today would he not have already have used it for his own purposes, the same as some hope to do today? Before we go one step too far on a morally wrong path, we the Australian people must examine this step or something or someone will inevitably stop us as it did Hitler and his out-of-control dream.

Creating one life in order to destroy it for the benefit of another life seems plain and simply wrong – regardless if we use a living human embryo for 'reproductive cloning' and choose to save it, or 'therapeutic cloning' and choose to destroy or tamper with it.

Sincerely,  
Daniel Kalpakoff,