

1. The major thesis to the “yes” side of the stem cell debate is that a fertilized egg should not be considered a human being. The potential benefits of the research far outweigh the hang-ups about whether or not a fertilized egg should be considered a human life or not.
2. The major thesis of the “no” side is that stem cell research is unethical because using human embryos, which are living organisms with the potential to become human beings, is the same as deliberately killing another human being.
3. There are over 100,000 fertilized eggs frozen in maternity clinics across the United States. Harvard University has recently formed a \$100 million dollar stem cell research facility
4. The human embryo is a living organism. Apple seeds are not a grove of trees.
5. Professor Hart believes that a potential child should not be considered a human being. The possibility of finding cures for diseases through research justifies using human cells that would otherwise be destroyed.
6. Ponnuru thinks that research on cloned fetuses will be popular in the future. He also believes that allowing research using human embryos threatens the basic rights and equality of those embryos and humans in general.
7. The assertion that human beings are deliberately destroyed every day. The statement is misleading because he is referring to the fertilized egg cells in maternity clinics, but he uses it as a justification for using the same cells for research. The statement makes the reader feel that all of these fertilized eggs are just going to go to waste every day, so why not experiment with them too? The comparison between fertility clinic practices and research on stem cells is misleading.

8. Ponnuru compares stem cell research to killing a five-year-old child to find a possible cure for cancer. This is a logical fallacy because using embryonic cells for research is not exactly the same as killing a child.

9. I personally feel that embryonic stem cell research is justified. I don't feel that stem cells should be considered a human life based on their potential. I think this type of research does have the potential for creating an even larger divide between the classes. The people that can afford the benefits of this type of research is another issue altogether. After reading the articles, I do feel apprehensive about the cloning of human beings. I think there are some risks to that sort of practice especially when stem cells are a suitable alternative. In general I think that the "yes" argument is more correct.

10. I thought that Hart's article was based more on empirical evidence than the other article. The statements in the article were well supported and there was less opinion and rhetoric.

11. A possible reason for Ponnuru's article being less scientific is that he probably feels strongly about killing human beings and cannot separate stem cell research from killing. It may be a matter of his personal religious beliefs or simply his moral principles. I'm certain that Ponnuru believes that a fertilized egg, having the potential to become a human being, deserves the same treatment and right to life as any other human being. In that regard he has totally excluded all of the possible benefits and developments that could result from the research.