



Moral Issues of Human Embryo Research

IN HIS ESSAY "MORALS AND PRIMORDIALS," Louis M. Guenin's thesis is that the use of embryos in research is morally acceptable "not because experiment and derivation are distinguishable, but because both are permissible" (*Science's Compass*, 1 Jun., p. 1659). With regard to the position of the Catholic Church on this issue, however, Guenin does not follow the logic of his own argument. As he states, the Catholic Church does not hold in vitro fertilization, cryopreservation of embryos, or destruction of embryos to be morally permissible. Therefore, by his own logic, the Church should hold research on these embryos to be wrong—which it does.

Guenin's counterargument, that because "in vitro fertilizations nonetheless occur" we are therefore morally justified in using the resulting embryos, is specious. This same argument—akin to "I didn't personally do it, and somebody else was going to do it anyway, so it's all right for me to benefit from it"—has been advanced to justify buying clothing made by sweatshop labor and to defend downloading child pornography from the Internet. The argument doesn't work in those cases, either. If it is wrong to create the "product" in the first place, then it's wrong to receive it and wrong to benefit from it.

DAVID MUNN

Program in Molecular Immunology, Institute of Molecular Medicine and Genetics, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA 30912, USA. E-mail: dmunn@mail.mcg.edu

Response

MUNN TAKES ME TO NEGLECT COMPLICITY IN wrongdoing. The putative wrong is in vitro fertilization (IVF). First, I observe that when it is wrong to effect x , it is not always wrong to benefit from x . The Catholic Church does not condemn research on donated abortion tissue if the investigator has in no way induced the abortion (1). Complicity is a function of the nexus between

wrongdoer and accomplice. Consumers of the products of slavery and child pornography are complicit in such practices, if they are, because demand coaxes supply. But, for example, we do not regard parents as complicitous in all wrongdoing by their offspring. Stem cell science neither motivates nor facilitates IVF. On the other hand, stem cell investigation induces embryo destruction. After drawing attention to the moral nexus between immunosurgery to obtain blastomeres and the subsequent study of derived stem cells, I defend such immuno-



Is embryonic stem cell research completely incompatible with the current teachings of the Catholic Church?

surgery as morally superior to what would otherwise occur. I urge that we not plunge epidosembryos (2) into autoclaves when, at the behest of epidosembryo donors, we can aid others by deriving stem cells.

Second, one could reply that fertility patients effect no wrongdoing in which to be complicit. Catholic teaching disapproves of IVF on the grounds that it is nonconjugal and could lead to eugenics. Consider then a married woman who conceives nonconjurally with no thought of eugenics. Can anyone know that God disapproves? Alternatively, it may be objected that IVF is immoral precisely because it invariably orphans some embryos. That objection lacks force because clinicians either transfer or freeze IVF embryos before the 14 days of development needed to establish individuation, a necessary condition of personhood. Nor do possible persons correspond to embryos that will never enter a womb. Lastly, we have the case of creating embryos solely for use in research or therapy in aid of oth-

ers. In this case no illicit reproduction occurs. Still, may it obtain that to every cell type corresponds a purpose, and that it is wrong to hijack gametes for a nonreproductive purpose? Aristotelian teleology has lost its former hold on our thought. We welcome instances in which cells prove beneficially adaptable. For gametes, we may find new medical uses. When consumed on day 5 in research or therapy, the products of combined gametes—and the products of somatic cell nuclear transfer—have not become persons. Esteem for life furnishes a compelling moral reason to create, donate, and use unenabled, undivided embryos in beneficent research and therapy.

LOUIS M. GUENIN

Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA. E-mail: guenin@hms.harvard.edu

References and Notes

1. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae* (Vatican City, 1987).
2. As I defined it in my Essay, an epidosembryo is a human embryo that "(i) was created in vitro in an assisted reproduction procedure, (ii) remained in storage after completion of all intrauterine transfers requested by the mother, and (iii) has departed parental control according to instructions to the attending physician that the embryo shall be given to research...."

Stem Cell Research Has Only Just Begun

IT IS TRUE THAT NO ADULT STEM CELL HAS yet been shown to differentiate as effectively as embryonic stem cells (ESCs) into several cell types that show great promise for treating some diseases. However, contrary to some statements in Gretchen Vogel's News Focus article "Can adult stem cells suffice?" (8 Jun., p. 1820), some adult stem cells can be grown well enough in the laboratory to be considered for therapeutic applications.

More than 20 years ago, Friedenstein and then others (1) grew adult stem cells from bone marrow called mesenchymal stem cells or marrow stromal cells (MSCs). MSCs differentiate into bone, cartilage, fat, muscle, and early progenitors of neural cells. Human MSCs can be expanded up to a billionfold in culture in about 8 weeks (2). Preliminary but promising results have appeared on the use of MSCs in animal models for parkinsonism, spinal cord defects,