

Finally, Growing Scientific Consensus Human DNA Research Is Mostly Erroneous, Need Vigorous Debate!

 lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_245researcherroneous.html

Dianne N. Irving

March 10, 2019

©Prof. Dr. Dianne N. Irving, M.A., Ph.D.

Reproduced with Permission

I. Introduction:

Finally, a multitude of scientists have debunked most so-called "human DNA research" and are calling for a vigorous international debate! The recent article, "**Precision medicine's rosy predictions haven't come true. We need fewer promises and more debate**", by Joyner and Paneth, copied in full at the end, notes that the findings of the **Human Genome Project** "were predicted to transform medical care" -- but that a growing scientific consensus concludes that, "**these predictions haven't come to pass.**" Instead what we have created is referred to as nothing more than an absurd "**genetic reductionism**". Collaborators listed in the article include: physicians, physiologists, many other professionals in genetics, cell biology, molecular biology, immunology, microbiology, pharmacology, ontology, physiology, anthropology, epidemiology, cardiology, health psychology, public health, and law.

If the scientific claims about human DNA are erroneous, then *all* scientific research grounded in that erroneous "science" would be erroneous as well -- not to mention how such erroneous "science" has already impacted and degraded local, state and federal laws and regulations, the drugs/devices industries, human clinical trials involved, etc. This applies to **any and all DNA research**, including human embryo research, stem cell research, iPS research, genetic engineering, synthetic biology, nanotechnology, various forms of cloning, CRISPR genome editing, most a-sexual human reproductive processes (of which there are many), etc. Mindboggling! Imagine all the good, scientifically accurate, fruitful scientific research that could have been funded over the last 20 years instead ... [See extensive scientific documentation and references covering several of these human DNA research fields in Irving articles, "GENERAL ARTICLES" and "ARTICLES RE INVITED LEGAL, CONGRESSIONAL, GOVERNMENT, OTHER PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS RE: HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH, HUMAN CLONING, HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH", copied after the article at the very end] As

the ole philosopher Aristotle wisely noted, "A small error in the beginning leads to a multitude of errors in the end" -- and **what a multitude of errors we now have**. Time to take a long hard look at that "**beginning**": "The" Human Genome Project" debacle.

II. "The" Human Genome Project Debacle:

As the scientists note in their article, "the deterministic view of the genome that underpinned the Human Genome Project in the 1990s **was not settled science**"! Well, if it wasn't "settled science", then why has it been allowed to be used as the "*scientific*" *starting point* for all that DNA research over the last 2+ decades?? As I and so many others have pointed out over the years, here's just an example of just how "unsettled" that DNA "science" was.

First, note that the accurate science documents that for the human species **the term "genome" includes ALL THE DNA in a human cell, including BOTH nuclear DNA and mitochondrial DNA (in the cytoplasm of the cell):**

- -- Benjamin Lewin, Genes VII (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000):
 - -- **A genome** consists of the **entire set of chromosomes for any particular organism**, and therefore comprises a series of DNA molecules, each of which contains a series of many genes. The **ultimate definition of a genome** is to determine the sequence of the DNA of each chromosome. (p. 4)
 - -- **Genes not residing within the nucleus are generally described as extranuclear**; they are transcribed and translated in the same organelle compartment (mitochondrion or chloroplast) in which they reside. By contrast, nuclear genes are expressed by means of cytoplasmic protein synthesis. ... One type of uniparental inheritance is seen in higher animals. Maternal inheritance can be predicted by supposing that the mitochondria are contributed entirely by the ovum and not at all by the sperm. So the mitochondrial genes are derived exclusively from the mother; and in males they are discarded each generation. (p. 81)
- -- Tom Strachan and Andrew P. Read, Human Molecular Genetics 2 (2nd ed.) (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1999):
 - -- In animal cells, **DNA is found in both the nucleus and the mitochondria**. (p. 10)
 - -- The mitochondria also have ribosomes and a limited capacity for protein synthesis. (p. 18)
 - -- The **human genome is the term used to describe the total genetic information (DNA content) in human cells. It really comprises two genomes: a complex nuclear genome which accounts for 99.999d% of the total genetic**

information, and a simple mitochondrial genome which accounts for the remaining 0.0005%. ... Mitochondria possess their own ribosomes and the few polypeptide-encoding genes in the mitochondrial genome produce mRNAs which are translated on the mitochondrial ribosomes. (p. 139)

Thus with specific reference to "The" Human Genome Project, the **accurate objective empirical facts prove** that its "scientific" claims are truly bogus. For example:

- **1.** There is **no such thing as "the" human genome**, as every human being is genetically unique.
- **2.** As is well known, even as noted on the **official government website** for "**The Human Genome Project**", even the billion-dollar and decades-old efforts to decode "THE" Human Genome has still **decoded only about 15%** (if that!) of the genes in "the" human chromosome.
- **3.** A single chromosome is composed of genes -- called "**introns**" (when they compose the middle of the chromosome, constituting up to over **85% of the chromosome**) and "**extrons**" (when they are at either end of the chromosome, constituting roughly **15% of the chromosome**). The "**extrons**" are the only genes they've addressed and tried to "**decode**".
- **4.** They have **still not decoded the introns -- the 85% of the human genome that they call "junk DNA" (because they don't know what's there!)**.
- **5.** Also, they decoded **only the nuclear DNA of the "extrons"** (not the mitochondrial DNA which by definition is also part of the human genome), and
- **6.** The **various samples used were from multiple people all over the world that were pooled all together**. So how, then, could that sample in any way represent "THE" human genome?
- **7.** What is now scientifically documented is that **all of that "junk" DNA critically REGULATES what the other DNA does, and more!**

Why aren't any of these documented empirical facts ever mentioned -- in the research articles, media hype, etc.?? Even a high school biology student can figure out that any claims for genuine accuracy in any of this research involving genes are inherently false.

This is critically relevant to all these debates involving "genetics" and "DNA" -- including CRISPR human germ line gene editing, multiple human cloning techniques, those DNA "kits", "regenerative medicine", "stem cell research", genetic engineering/synthetic biology/nanotechnology, etc. -- not to mention all the "**foreign**" DNA from the "**vectors**" used (**bacteria, viruses, molds**, etc.) during the experiment to slip the "desired" foreign DNA into a gene or chromosome. Worse, when such DNA products are inserted into human beings to "cure

their diseases", the human **patients' immune system** is not so stupid and recognizes these injections as "non-self", thus releasing devastating immune rejection antibodies that cause serious physical damage, even death, to those human patients!

All of these "irregularities" in the claims about human DNA have been known and documented for a long time now. See, for example:

- **** Official website of The Human Genome:** (project started in 1990, and was to last for 15 years), at: http://web.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/project/index.shtml. See especially "How many genes are in the human genome?" and following for their own admissions.
- **** See over 589,000 articles on "Junk DNA" on Google at:** https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei=x097XKuNOuaH0gL28bKoCw&q=%22junk+DNA%22&btnK=Google+Search&oq=%22junk+DNA%22&gs_l=psy-ab.3..0l10.1979.3427..7469...0.0..0.174.665.9j1.....0....1..gws-wiz.....0..0i131j0i10.oEXJcjl8JBQ
- **** "DNA is actually not well understood. 97% of human DNA is called ³junk² because scientists do not know its function.** The workings of a single cell are so complex, no one knows the whole of it. **Yet the biotech companies have already planted millions of acres with genetically engineered crops**, and they intend to engineer every crop in the world." Genetic Engineering and "Junk" DNA, Genetic Engineering, at: <http://www.authorstream.com/Presentation/ramyasekaran-1541143-genetic-engineering/>
- **** The Astonishing Powers of "Junk" DNA** http://www.khouse.org/enews_article/2012/1982/
- **** Junk DNA - Not So Useless After All** "Researchers report on a new revelation about the human genome: **it's full of active, functioning DNA, and it's a lot more complex than we ever thought**, at: <http://healthland.time.com/2012/09/06/junk-dna-not-so-useless-after-all/>
- **** Hit-and-Miss Genetic Testing**, at: <https://www.geneticsandsociety.org/biopolitical-times/hit-and-miss-genetic-testing>
- **** Government Cracks Down on Fake DNA-Based Medicine**, at: <http://inthecapital.streetwise.co/2014/05/13/government-cracks-down-on-fake-dna-based-medicine/>
- **** Direct-to-consumer genetic testing: a case of potential harm**, at: <https://scienceandsociety.duke.edu/direct-to-consumer-genetic-testing-a-case-of-potential-harm/>
- **** DNA Double Take**, at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/17/science/dna-double-take.html?pagewanted=1&r=2&ref=science>
- **** Excel Created Major Typos in 20 Percent of Scientific Papers on Genes**, at:

http://www.slate.com/blogs/future_tense/2016/08/24/excel_created_major_typos_in_20_percent_of_scientific_papers_on_genes.html

- **** "CRISPR CAS9 blocked by the human immune system?"**, at: <http://www.genethique.org/en/crispr-cas9-blocked-human-immune-system-69029.html#.WmeNM9-KSpo>
- **** "CRISPR-CAS9 - The 'Genetic Scissors' responsible for hundreds of uncontrolled mutations"**, at: <http://www.genethique.org/en/crispr-cas9-genetic-scissors-responsible-hundreds-uncontrolled-mutations-69972.html#.WzZhCMty-po>
- **** "Twins get some 'mystifying' results when they put 5 DNA ancestry kits to the test; One set of identical twins, two different ancestry profiles"**, at: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/about-cbc-news-1.1294364>

III. Conclusion:

Long past time that this human DNA research hoax be exposed, as the scientists in the article below assert. Let the genuine debates begin! Put simply, there is no such thing as "precision medicine" any more than there is such a thing as accurate scientific knowledge about "The" Human Genome *on which such medicine is supposedly based*. The scientific field of genetics has been grossly damaged per se, clinical trial human volunteers are precluded from giving ethically and legally valid "informed consent", thousands of drugs and devices based on this false science are fraudulently sold to millions of consumers, and *when inserted into human patients these fraudulent injections cause severe immune rejection responses, even death*. Need more reasons?

<https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/07/precision-medicine-needs-open-debate/>

STAT News

February 7, 2019

Precision medicine's rosy predictions haven't come true. We need fewer promises and more debate

By MICHAEL J. JOYNER and NIGEL PANETH

Twenty years ago, Dr. Francis Collins, who was then director of the National Center for Human Genome Research, made rosy predictions in his Shattuck Lecture about the health benefits sure to flow from the Human Genome Project. His , "Medical and Societal

Consequences of the Human Genome Project," published in the New England Journal of Medicine, provided an early template for the precision medicine narrative of the past two decades.

Collins' fundamental idea was that the technology and insights of the Human Genome Project would demonstrate tight causal links between variation in DNA sequences and complex human traits, including the disorders that dominate human illness and death. The findings of the Human Genome Project were predicted to transform medical care (by the year 2010), evoke behavior change in genetically at-risk individuals, generate new drugs, and improve the effectiveness of old drugs by matching them to patients' genes - thoughts later captured in the precision medicine mantra "the right drug for the right patient at the right time." Another prediction was that gene therapy would be used to cure both rare and common diseases.

Although some niche applications have been found for precision medicine, and gene therapy is now becoming a reality for a few rare diseases, **the effects on public health** are minuscule while the costs are astronomical.

Our Viewpoint article is part of an ongoing - and growing - movement that seeks to articulate scientifically warranted dissent to a culture of thought that, ever since the discovery of DNA, has come to pervade biomedical research: the dominance of gene-centric paradigms.

This emphasis on reducing biomedical explanations to genetic pathways, known as **genetic reductionism**, comes at the expense of all other molecular, cellular, physiological, and epidemiological approaches. The dissenters have made their voices heard in the popular press and medical journals, such as Viewpoints in JAMA. Most recently, a special edition of the journal Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, titled "The Precision Medicine Bubble," includes contributions **questioning genetic reductionism by well-established investigators from genetics, cell biology, immunology, microbiology, pharmacology, physiology, anthropology, epidemiology, public health, and law.**

What are the **foundational elements of our dissent**? Both of us are physicians: one (M.J.J.) a physiologist who studies how humans respond to complex stresses such as exercise, the other (N.P.) an epidemiologist who considers risk, exposure, and causation at the population level. How is it that we and several of our colleagues, **each tackling biomedical research from a different perspective, are so unified in our conviction that the massive investment that has been poured into studying the human genome is failing to massively advance human health as predicted by the enthusiasts?**

We have seen time and time again that whole-body physiological responses are robust and remain basically intact even when lower-order systems are attenuated, or in modern parlance, knocked out. This **leads us to question the deterministic assumption that there is always a "gene for" a biological process.**

Epidemiologists recognize that all large-scale human health benefits must ultimately be measured at the population level. Anecdotal evidence of benefits here and there are not sufficient to drive public policy. Genetic associations with disease are not exempt from the problems of confounding and bias. The **environmental context in which genes operate is, for most human disease, overwhelmingly important.**

After the two of us met and started to collaborate in 2015, **investigators from other disciplines joined our effort.** They have taught us about many additional concerns regarding the DNA-centric worldview. From **geneticist and anthropologist Ken Weiss** we learned that **the deterministic view of the genome that underpinned the Human Genome Project in the 1990s was not settled science.** From **cell and molecular biologists Dr. Sui Huang, Dr. Carlos Sonnenschein, and Dr. Ana Soto** we learned there were

From **public health authorities Dr. Sten Vermund and Dr. Sandro Galea** we learned that before embarking on a "transformation-of-everything" narrative, it is has explained how **population-wide interventions**, often derided by precision medicine advocates as , **have led to an 80 percent reduction in cardiovascular mortality in the U.S. over the past 60 years.** **Epidemiologist and health psychologist Cecile Janssens** has reminded us and others that **genetic biomarkers are not privileged and need to be rigorously modeled and evaluated like all screening tools.**

Beyond these core questions about biomedical research, the dominance of the precision medicine program raises additional worries about whether biomedical science is now advancing appropriately. Cancer biologist Yuri Lazebnik wonders how a fundamentally creative activity like scientific research can succeed **when subject to "businessification" or ideological considerations.** Does this lead to **groupthink and excessive careerism?** **Microbiologist and immunologist Dr. Arturo Casadevall** has noted a **major decline in biomedical breakthroughs in recent decades. Is this a sign of blunted innovation in science?** **Huang** has dissected in detail how has described the **unsavory effects of hype and overpromising on science.** **Do these undermine public trust in biomedical research?**

While we are occasionally told that we are Luddites or nihilists (generally without much debate of the merits of our position), **the most frequent communications we receive have been**

along the lines of "I agree with you, but can't speak up publicly for fear of losing my grants, alienating powerful people, or upsetting my dean." This atmosphere cannot be good for the culture of science.

We are calling for an open debate, in all centers of biomedical research, about the best way forward, and about whether precision medicine is really the most promising avenue for progress. It is time for precision medicine supporters to engage in debate - to go beyond asserting the truism that all individuals are unique, and that the increase in the volume of health data and measurements combined with the decline in the cost of studying the genome constitute sufficient argument for the adoption of the precision medicine program.

Enthusiasts of precision medicine must stop evading the tough questions we raise. The two of us have learned enormously from the free and open exchange of ideas among our small band of dissenters, and **we look forward to a vigorous debate engaging an ever-larger fraction of the scientific community.**

Michael J. Joyner, M.D. is an anesthesiologist and physiologist at the Mayo Clinic. Nigel Paneth, M.D., MPH is an epidemiologist and pediatrician at Michigan State University. The views in this article are their own. We appreciate the valuable comments of Sui Huang, M.D.

Irving References:

I. General Articles

[[Anyone reading any of my articles written before 2015 using URLs for the Carnegie Stages of Human Embryonic Development need to use the updated URLs: "**Caution Again: Need to Use Newer URL's for Carnegie Stages for Issues Concerning the Early Human Embryo**" (Jan. 1, 2015), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_226new.url.html]]

- -- **IPS Research: Accurate Objective Scientific Facts Render it Unethical** (Feb. 19, 2019), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_244ips.researchunethical.html
- -- **'Identical Twins' Are Human Clones A-Sexually Reproduced Both Naturally and Artificially** (January 13, 2019), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_243identicaltwins.html
- -- **Fake Science News? Yamanaka's iPS Stem Cell Admissions -- and the Other Elephants in the Room** (January 29, 2017), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_236fakesciencenews.html
- -- **"References: CRISPR Gene 'Editing', 'The' Human Genome Project, Personalized**

Medicine', 23&Me -- and Genetic Junk" (November 30, 2015), at:

http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_230references.html

- -- **What you need to know about "IVG" (in vitro generated gametes)**, (March 20, 2014), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_221invitrogeneratedgamete.html
- -- **Irving Re Gardner's Rejection of Herranz's New "Theory" on Human MZ Twinning** (March 14, 2014), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_220rejectionherranztheory.html
- -- **Rebecca Taylor, Cloning, and Intellectual Integrity!** (Sept. 6, 2013), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_215rebeccataylor.html
- -- **Beware New Pro-life Calls for Human Cloning "Bans"** (June 3, 2013), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_213beware.html
- -- **Let's Be Clear About the Science and Ethics of iPS Cell Research and Its Reproductive Possibilities** (October 23, 2012), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_205ipscellresearch1.html
- -- **"In Vitro Fertilization (IVF) and Artificial Reproductive Technologies (ART): Pandora's Box Now Opened"** (April 16, 2012), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_196pandoraboxopened.html
- -- **"Any Human Cell - iPS, Direct Programmed, Embryonic, Fetal or Adult - Can Be Genetically Engineered to Asexually Reproduce New Human Embryos for Purposes of Reproduction ('Infertility')"** (November 2011), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_194cellasexuallyreproduce1.html
- -- **On iPS Research: "The Moral Frontiers of Stem Cell Research"** (December 6, 2010), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_179moralfrontiers.html
- -- **Irving Comments: "Adult stem cells said to 'forget' retooling; Embryonic alternative [iPS stem cell research] suffers setback"** (July 21, 2010), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_69ipsstemcell.html
- -- **Irving and Kischer, "Responses to Dr. Condit's 'Science' in National Catholic Register Interview"** (January 6, 2010), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_172responsetocondit.html
- -- **'Pluripotent' Stem Cell (iPS) Research is Not the Usual 'Adult' Stem Cell Research** (April 8, 2009), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_138ips_notadultstemcell.html
- -- **"So You Think That 'Reproductive Cloning' Isn't Done Yet? Guess Again"** (July 18, 2008), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_130reproductivecloning.html
- -- **"Ethical and Scientific Concerns About Induced Pluripotent Stem Cell Research -- Yamanaka and Thomson"** (June 1, 2008), at:
- -- **"Framing the Debates on Human Cloning and Human Embryonic Stem Cells: Pluripotent vs. TOTIPOTENT"** (July 23, 2005), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_100debatecloning1.html
- -- **"Quick Scientific References: Human Cloning, Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research"** (Aug. 31, 2004), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_76quickreferences.html

- -- **"Scientific References, Human Genetic Engineering (Including Cloning): Artificial Human Embryos, Oocytes, Sperms, Chromosomes and Genes"** (May 25, 2004), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_25scientificrefer1.html
- -- **Some scientific references; 'totipotency' and 'twinning'"** (May 2, 2003), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_01references.html
- -- **"Cloning: When word games kill", written on request of the Free Congress Foundation** (May13, 1998), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_06wordgame.html

II. Articles RE Invited Legal, Congressional, Government, Other Public Submissions
RE: Human Embryo Research, Human Cloning, Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research:

- -- **"American Medical Association's "Narrow Definitions", Legal "Re-definitions" ... and Reproductive Cloning"** (October 9, 2009), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_170ama1.html
- -- **"Ohio 'prolife' Bill to 'Ban' Human Cloning; Needs Homework"** (June 13, 2008), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_128ohio.html
- -- **"Wisconsin Bishops' Pastoral Letter On Stem Cell Research"** (May 2, 2008), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_125wisconsinbishops.html
- -- **"Analysis: Delaware House Passes Fraudulent Human Cloning 'Ban'"** (January 18, 2006), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_115delawareban.html
- -- **"Analysis: Local Illinois School District Science Textbook Misleads Students on Stem Cell Research"** (Oct. 18, 2005), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_106textbook.html
- -- **"Analysis: Delaware Regenerative Medicine [Stem Cell] Bill SB 80"** (June 25, 2005), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_96sen_venables.html
- -- **"Analysis: California's Current Cloning Law Allows Both 'Therapeutic' and 'Reproductive' Cloning; Sets Up Arbitrary Regulatory Committee"** (Oct. 26, 2004), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_83californiacloninglaw.html
- -- **"Analysis of Legislative and Regulatory Chaos in the U.S.: Asexual Human Reproduction and Genetic Engineering"** (Oct. 20, 2004), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_81chaosasexgen1.html
- -- **"Analysis: Stearns' Congressional Human Cloning Fairy Tale 'Ban'; New Age and Transhumanist Legislation for 'Converging Technologies'?"** (Sept. 8, 2004), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_77stearncloningtale1.html
- -- **State of Delaware human cloning "ban": Loopholes Form Blueprints for Human Genetic Engineering** (April 14, 2004), requested by Delaware RTL, at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_30delawarecloningban1.html
- -- **"Requested submission to State of Maryland, Committee Hearings on HB-481 and SB-472 on 'Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2004'"** (March 5, 2004), Committee number 410-841-3770, submitted to Maryland Catholic Conference, Annapolis, Maryland;

at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_28maryland.html

- -- **Analysis: "Irving: Speaking Out About The Costa Rican Cloning 'Bust' At The United Nations"** (Nov. 23, 2003), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_18costaricanbust.html
- -- **Analysis: "Costa Rican cloning proposal at United Nations won't ban all human cloning"** (Sept. 29, 2003), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_15costarican.html
- -- **Analysis: "State of New Jersey human cloning 'ban'"**, Assembly Bill No. 2840/Senate Bill No. 1909 (2003): http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2002/Bills/A3000/2840_11.PDF. See Irving invited testimony, "Legally valid informed consent: Individual Testimony before the New Jersey State Senate Health and Human Services Committee on Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research, Ethical and Public Policy Considerations", New Jersey State Senate Committee on Health and Human Services, Trenton, New Jersey (November 4, 2002) at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irvi/irvi_10newjersey1.html, and at http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_14legalconsent1.html
- -- **"Analysis: Stem cells that *could* become embryos: Implications for the NIH Guidelines on stem cell research, the NIH stem cell report, informed consent, and patient safety in clinical trials"** (July 22, 2001); written as consultant on human embryology and human embryo research as Fellow of The Linacre Institute (CMA), The Catholic Medical Association (USA), and The International Federation of Catholic Medical Associations (FIAMC), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_39anlystemcel1.html
- -- **"University Faculty for Life: Submission of Concern to the Canadian CIHR Re the 'Human Stem Cell Research Recommendations 2001'"**; written as UFL Board Member on behalf of UFL; submitted to Dr. Alan Bernstein, President, Canadian Institutes of Health Research Working Group on Stem Cell Research, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (June 3, 2001), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_60canadiancihrrecomm1.html
- -- **"University Faculty for Life: Submission of Concern to the British House of Lords Re the 'Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Research Purposes) Regulations 2001'"**; written as UFL Board Member on behalf of UFL; submitted to Tony Rawsthorne, Select Committee, House of Lords, London (June 1, 2001), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_61ufl_greatbritain1.html; <http://www.parliament.the-stationeryoffice.co.uk/pa/ld200102/ldselect/ldstem/83/8313.htm>; [[[acknowledgment]]] <http://www.ufl.org/irving/irvlords.htm> [[[full text]]]
- -- **"University Faculty for Life: Letter of Concern to Sen. Brownback and Congressman Weldon Re the 'Human Cloning Bill 2001'"**; written as UFL Board Member on behalf of UFL;
- submitted to Sen. Brownback and Congr. Weldon, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. (May 27, 2001), at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_52weldonbrownback1.html
- -- **"Invited Congressional testimony: The *immediate* product of human cloning is a human being: Claims to the contrary are scientifically wrong"**, Congressional witness (oral and written testimony), Scientific Panel (one of 5 panelists), on "Cloning: Legal,

Medical, Ethical, and Social Issues", Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Room 2125, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. (February 12, 1998); CSPAN video of my testimony: video: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?100465-1/cloning-issues&start=3> [me = 02:23:05 (times at top of screen; also in Q & A follow-up)]; also in Linacre Quarterly May 1999, 66:2:26-40, at: <http://books.google.com/books?id=ldMJAQAAMAAJ&pg=RA1PA26&dq=%22Dianne+N.+Irving%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tYQU7zcAnt0gG4u4DYBg&ved=0CEIQ6AEwBQ#v=onepage&q=%22Dianne%20N.%20Irving%22&f=false>. Also at: <http://www.uffl.org/irving/irvhouse.htm>; http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_09cloninghuman1.html; also at: <http://www.all.org/abac/dni005.htm>.

- -- "**Affidavit in support of petition for injunction of the NIH Human Embryo Research Panel, Mary Doe v. Donna Shalala, et al,**" U.S. Dist. Ct. MD, No. PJM-94-1703, filed Aug. 1994, cert denied; at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_47affidavit.html.
- -- "**Background material on the scientific and moral status of the early human embryo: The 'personhood' debates**" (June 1, 1994), Briefing to the United States Congressional Caucus (sponsored by Rep. Chris Smith), (RE: The NIH Human Embryo Research Panel), at the Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1994. Other briefer, Dr. C. Ward Kischer, human embryologist, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_30personhooddebate1.html
- -- **Amicus curiae brief, *Scientific and Philosophical Inaccuracies in Fetal Personhood Arguments***, prepared for Gil Messina, Esq., Red Bank, NJ, and submitted by Daniel Gray, Esq., to the United States Supreme Court (February 17, 1994), in support of Alexander Loce vs. The State of New Jersey, and Krail vs. The State of New Jersey; *ibid.*, in support of J.M. vs V.C. (July 3, 1993); at: http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/irv/irv_48amicicuriaebriefs1.html.

Website copyright © 2000—2019 Lifeissues.net Kochi, Japan

Article copyrights are held solely by author.