1. One of the main arguments against cloning (therapeutic) is that the process ends the development of human life. Adults, however, have stem cells stored in their bone marrow. While these cells are more mature and have less potential for differentiation, they still have some capability. Do you think this is an option we should explore related to stem cell research? Why or why not?
2. While reproductive cloning has been known to be costly with a relatively low success rate, some believe the potential benefits outweigh the costs. One of the biggest potential benefits is the idea of being able to save endangered species from extinction. Do you think this is something science should explore? What would the environmental impact be if we did/did not pursue this research?
3. Some people have suggested that exploring cloning options, whether therapeutic or reproductive, should be allowed but there should be more regulations in place. What regulations would need to be in place (either existing already or added) for cloning research to continue? Who should enforce these regulations (answer should include more than just “the government” or “a private company”…who would it consist of, how would their positions be funded, what authorities do they have, how frequently are they around, etc.)?
4. Knowing what you know now, have your opinions about cloning changed from the beginning of the semester? Why or why not?

1. One of the topics discussed during the debate was the idea of utilizing reproductive cloning in cases where a family has lost a child. If reproductive cloning were available for human applications, do you think this would be a good option? Why or why not?