EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES
(EEJMMS) ISSN: 2992-4103
©EEJMMS Publications Volume 6 Issue 2 2025

Exploring the Ethics of Genetic Editing in Humans

Chelimo Faith Rebecca

Department of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry Kampala International University Uganda
Email: rebecca.chelimo@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

The development of CRISPR-Cas9 and related gene-editing technologies has revolutionized biomedical science, offering unprecedented possibilities for treating and even eliminating genetic diseases. While somatic cell editing presents a relatively well-supported application for therapeutic purposes, germline editing where changes are heritable raises profound ethical, legal, and societal concerns. This paper explores the ethical dimensions of genetic editing in humans, contextualizing its historical development, technological evolution, and ethical frameworks. It examines the potential benefits and risks of genetic manipulation, public perceptions, regulatory landscapes, and major controversies, including the first gene-edited babies in China. Through a synthesis of case studies and scholarly discourse, the paper calls for a global, interdisciplinary approach to governance that balances innovation with human dignity, safety, and equity. A moratorium on heritable human genome editing is proposed until universally accepted ethical and legal guidelines are established.

Keywords: CRISPR-Cas9, gene editing, human germline modification, bioethics, somatic cell therapy, genetic enhancement, regulatory frameworks, personhood.

INTRODUCTION

CRISPR-cas9 is a pivotal 21st-century discovery, offering a straightforward and cost-effective method for genome editing. However, its rise has sparked intense ethical debates surrounding human genome modification. Historically, the applications of CRISPR-cas9 in research, agriculture, and therapies are well-documented; however, ethical considerations, especially regarding human genetic alterations, have gained less attention. Two significant events the modified babies incident and the creation of gene-edited human embryo banks in China ignited global discussions and brief anti-gene-editing campaigns. This article aims to elucidate the background of human genome editing and its ethical ramifications, enhancing understanding of current debates. Life and health are essential for human progress, yet genetic diseases over 500 monogenetic types and countless multi-genetic variants pose significant challenges, affecting individuals and families profoundly. Genetic disorders can arise from de novo mutations during fertilization or from inherited traits. Currently, couples often undergo screenings for high-incidence birth defects and invasive testing for fetal genetic mutations during pregnancy, while prenatal diagnostics may lead to termination before 14 weeks. This "waiting and seeing" approach often induces anxiety and regret in expecting parents. Thus, embryonic gene editing, before embryo transfer, holds promise in mitigating diseases linked to parental genetic variations [1, 2].

Historical Context of Genetic Editing

Prior to CRISPR/Cas9, a few gene therapy techniques had been attempted and discussed in both scientific and bioethics literature. Most were variants of viral vector approaches. Contextually, gene therapy, and even more so the development of germline genome editing, has historically been connected to therapeutic concerns – specifically the prospect of treatment for genetic and genetic risk variants conferring rare diseases. In fact, β-thalassemia caused by a mutation of the HBB gene was the ex vivo target of the first CRISPR experiment on human embryos, published in late 2013. Beta-thalassemia was also the condition that prompted the well-publicized gene editing experiment on human embryos in China in 2017, which led to controversy, condemnation, and scientific outcry, as well as much speculation into the circumstances of the research itself. Prior to this most recent string of genetic editing, concurrent

with outcry surrounding the Chinese embryo work, discussions around gene therapy more generally and germline genome editing in particular flourished in the bioethics literature. Bioethicists and scholars deployed the term "enhancement" in the context of both foreseeing and condemning germline gene editing research on, or transfer to, human subjects. Some discussions keyed in on the way that this enhancement work would not only have an ethical and legal public health aspect, but would also be sociologically vexing, determining who would be the agents to decide on the research itself, and ultimately the transfers, on behalf of their progeny; bioethics commentators fluctuated between despairing that parents would choose to enhance their offspring's cognitive abilities, and confident that longstanding moral, ethical, and societal discussions would preclude, if not fully halt, the advancements [3, 4].

Types of Genetic Editing Technologies

Genetic editing encompasses recombinant DNA technology and the various alterations of the genetic material that are possible due to the technology. Although there have been many recombinant DNA technologies, some novel ones such as CRISPR-Cas9-based gene editing technology are generating much more interest than the others, including those well-established ones like zinc-finger nucleases technology and transcription activator-like effector nucleases. There are two different medications achieved through genetic editing technology. The first application is somatic cells in human tissues which do not pass on the information to future generations. The second application is germline cells comprising the reproductive cells that produce the sperm and egg. Editing of the germline can mean heritable editing, where the change is passed on to the offspring. The germline editing is of interest because, being heritable, it passes on the change to every cell in the individual and to every descendant of that individual. Thus, the ethical stakes of germline editing for humans are considerably higher than those of somatic editing. Germ-line editing of humans raises some of the technical concerns raised in somatic editing, but this is a more complex undertaking and raises other totally new concerns. A recent exciting advance in genetic editing technology has been made. Variety of designs of the CRISPR system exist among the species within the Archaea domain. Two proteins created using this technology are RNA-guided DNA endonuclease enzymes that, given a proper RNA guide, determine where in the genome to cleave the DNA to edit and repair it. The CRISPR-Cas9 editing system relies on this class of proteins and RNA, an RNA-guided DNA endonuclease called Cas9. Attempted new medications consist of CRISPR components, guiding RNA and Cas9 protein, delivered with viral vectors into host human cells. This same technique requires an RNA guide that results in inappropriate cuts in places other than those targeted, with only a few amino acid differences between a targeted site and such off-target sites. Thus far, most CRISPR attempts at human genetic editing have used non-viable human embryos [5, 6].

Ethical Frameworks in Genetic Editing

Throughout history, biotechnological advancements have imposed ethical challenges to responsibly regulate the new and emerging ethical dilemmas. The ethical consideration surrounding gene-editing technology, CRISPR-Cas9, garnered bioethical discussions in the past decade. In light of this, the ethical consideration of genome editing is highlighted as a foundation to regulate its future use, biotechnological advancements, and emerging ethical dilemmas. As the panorama of biotechnology advances, some terms regarding the future of humanity, personhood, and the definition of germline genetic inheritance are discussed. Codifying, prohibiting, and tempering were posed as possible frameworks when deliberating on the ethical implications. Codifying framed the ultimatum regarding moral acceptance and social consent. As possibilities are comprehended, the consequentiality of the use of improper use results in unnecessary, grave, and irrevocable ethical implications. Prohibitions stem from preexisting rules to control humankind's most heinous intentions. Ones like the Geneva Conventions faced criticism due to actors flouting such agreements. Similar apprehensions are presented with tempering, a balance of cautioning the bioethical nuances of gene editing with pathways for support. After establishing the grotesque ramifications arising from outlying the ethical implications as permissible, bioethical concepts appropriated to the deliberation of technology use must be evaluated. Some frameworks such as that of personhood, rights, and dignity question the ramifications on persons – as in sentient beings with a sense of self, entity quintessentially worthy of rights, and having moral status, and then deformations of said beings resulting in unjust harm. Similarly, a framework suggested for germinal selections focuses on the cascading ramifications that would cause every beneficial germline alteration to enlist a new kind of human [7, 8].

Potential Benefits of Genetic Editing

The past decade has raised suspicions about reckless genome editing, especially after the secretive first successful germline editing of a human embryo. Investigations followed concerning the licensing of reproductive gene editing. However, the biopolitical risks are not confined to human germline editing; they extend to somatic gene editing in humans and germline editing in nonhuman organisms. Alarm bells have been sounded in recent years, yet no steps have been taken toward responsible governance of the technique. While there is a push for progress that may benefit humanity, the ethical complexities surrounding somatic gene editing complicate the discourse. Social unease regarding genome editing is relatively new, driven by scandals and broader biotechnology concerns. Preferences for specific editing forms hinge on their characterization as "natural" or "artificial," with the former being more accepted. The emergence of complex life forms has rendered traditional views of embrace versus control inadequate. As cultural narratives evolve, they reflect new ethical considerations in scientific governance, influenced by rapid developments in life sciences [9, 10].

Risks and Concerns

Gene editing scientists advocate for careful discussions about heritable human gene editing due to concerns regarding genetic pleiotropy at disease mutation sites. Rather than effectively treating diseases, gene editing may unintentionally introduce recessively lethal mutations, elevate risks for other diseases, and contribute to premature aging. Human diseases should be managed with medicinal alternatives rather than gene editing, which should be approached with caution. Pre-existing conditions need comprehensive study, and patients should be treated urgently. While not everyone can afford treatment, the governance of drug and gene editing is crucial for ensuring safety and equity. Gene editing should be a last resort, with scientists held accountable for potential outcomes similar to those of complex surgeries. The risks of unintended off-target mutations pose significant safety concerns, potentially exacerbating existing diseases or creating new ones, causing genetic inactivation and transcriptomic alterations. The implications on human genomes link to various diseases, revealing the complexity of gene editing, including unintended structural variations and epigenetic changes that may disrupt development. Understanding side effects of gene editing platforms is vital prior to clinical application. Insufficient screening may overlook side effects, complicating genome coding. Off-target effects result from stress mechanisms and genomic shifts, affecting tissue phenotypes and signaling interactions. Thus, designed screening is essential to identify epigenetic impacts and understand the frequency and nature of gene editing implementations [11, 12].

Regulatory Landscape

The regulation of gene editing technologies involves important ethical and policy issues that go beyond pure risk assessment and safety perspectives, for example environmental and clinical risk assessments, protection of public health and food safety, and control over commercialization of biotechnology. The regulation of gene editing technologies and products involves spatial dimensions that are tied to the nature of the technologies and practices involved, and calls for broader considerations about inclusiveness, outreach and legitimacy of governance . The regulation of gene editing thus raises important issues of public engagement, alternative forms of legal governance beyond public regulation, the status of organisms and the role of non-human actors. The promise is great, but so are the ethical and policy concerns. Society should ask: How can gene editing be governed responsively? How can regulations take the worries of society seriously? Gene editing technologies and products pose science-based ethical and policy issues. A distinction has been made between legitimate concerns about safety and other, wrongfully designated, non-scientific concerns based on ethics and philosophy. Regulation of gene editing in humans is hugely pertinent, as there are serious political, ethical and social concerns around its use. In November 2018 a Chinese biophysicist announced he had altered two twin girls, possibly the world's first genetically engineered humans, to protect them from HIV and other infections. The proceedings foremost chlorinated regulators and necessitated to answer the ethical and legal questions arising, whether this is something that ought to be allowed and if so, how to regulate it. In the aftermath of this event, countries around the world including China tightened legislation around this procedure and forked regulations that range for capital punishment in China to ordinary biotechnology issues in 2Africa. There have been speculations about a global study of this technology via the combined resources and knowledge of the key countries and subsequently, international agreements or at worst bio-chemical conventions restricting or banning such tests, treatments and improvements [13, 14].

Public Perception of Genetic Editing

The public perception of genetic editing and its moral implications are still not well understood. Recent focus groups in the U.S. examined attitudes toward gene editing, particularly in food production. However, human applications have drawn significant public interest and concern. The use of CRISPR technology to modify human embryos in China led to global outrage, with accusations of genetic racism and ethical breaches coming from scientists, governments, and major organizations. This incident prompted the journal Nature to stop publishing content on human germline editing and led to statements from Chinese authorities acknowledging the misuse of gene editing. The Chinese government announced regulations while the scientific community called for clearer ethical frameworks. A letter in Nature, signed by 130 researchers, condemned the embryo modifications and advocated for a moratorium on germline editing until proper safeguards are established. Conversely, a panel led by Nobel laureate Charles M. Rice supported the continuation of basic research, igniting further debate within the scientific community [15, 16].

Case Studies

This study examines the legal and ethical implications of human genetic and germline editing technologies. These advancements could potentially lead to cures for severe diseases, yet debates regarding their moral implications remain limited. Central to the controversy is whether an embryo possesses full moral standing similar to humans or is merely disposable. Establishing the legal status of personhood and embryo rights is essential to address germline genome editing (GGE) concerns. This topic demands careful regulation due to its profound impact on humanity's future. An examination of prior discussions and academic literature indicates a consensus favoring somatic gene editing, provided it undergoes rigorous ethical and legal scrutiny, including safety tests and transparency. However, the majority of countries and organizations oppose germline genetic editing technologies. A deeper understanding of ethical and moral implications must precede any regulation. Recent literature has primarily focused on the ethical concerns of GGE or the legal status of embryos, yet few have examined them together, despite their intrinsic connection. The critical turning point may involve creating hybrid embryos with human cells or working with hybrid embryos containing human stem cells [17, 18].

Future Directions in Genetic Editing

As more dramatic human application for CRISPR–Cas9 gene editing are proposed, such as the in utero editing of genes for hypermuscularity or intelligence, bioethicists continue to argue over the morality of germline gene editing. Was the conclusion of the Committee on Human Gene Editing a triumph of ethics? Everyone agrees the technology must be used humanely, but what does that mean? Subjecting every proposed human gene editing experiment to an unfathomably broad and vague test of its necessity or proportionality? Unleashing a fierce debate over the scope and definition of the permissible that will stagnate its application outside extremely rare inherited disease cases? In this symposium, 10 bioethicists examine the key issues about gene editing's ethical concerns and future directions. Consider a more modest notion: let the conversation on germline genome editing unfold publically, honestly, and in the open. Unlike other bioethics topics, CRISPR in the germline has a fresh set of moral dilemmas. Bioethicists have deep roots in the human genome project and decades of bioethics principle development in animal biotechnology, yet it is as if this all existed in another world when CRISPR entered the human domain. Societal views of biotechnology are abstract and dated hymns to the wonder of the genome. One side dares not say what it does want and the other dares not say exactly what it is afraid of. There is little dangerous or absurd about a GGE experiment that does not edit an embryonic tumor suppressor or designer embryo plucked from preimplantation genetic sequencing or laughed at crude efforts to edit an embryo for athletic ability. The societal blind spots exposed by DRD4, a 7-repeat polymorphism of the dopamine receptor implicated in novelty seeking and risk taking, need examination. Eventually there should be recognition that Jerry- and Jaime-sized standard-state babies will one day be common in many societies, alongside naturally born specimens of indeterminate origin; and this possibility might be considered tolerable by geneticists, sociobiologists, and ethologists, just as natural blindness and deafness are tolerated today [19, 20].

CONCLUSION

Human genetic editing represents both a groundbreaking scientific advance and a critical ethical frontier. While the therapeutic potential of somatic editing in treating genetic diseases is promising, germline modifications introduce complex and far-reaching implications. These include the risks of unintended mutations, intergenerational consequences, societal inequities, and philosophical debates about

personhood and human identity. Public reaction, coupled with controversial incidents, has highlighted the need for strict oversight and global consensus. Ethical frameworks such as personhood, dignity, and justice must guide policymaking in this evolving field. Regulatory systems should be inclusive, transparent, and adaptable, ensuring that progress in biotechnology aligns with fundamental human values. Until globally harmonized ethical standards are developed, a cautious and moratorium-based approach to heritable human genome editing is warranted to prevent irreversible harms and uphold the integrity of scientific practice.

REFERENCES

1. Sapna FN, Raveena FN, Chandio M, Bai K, Sayyar M, Varrassi G, Khatri M, Kumar S, Mohamad T. Advancements in heart failure management: a comprehensive narrative review of emerging therapies. Cureus. 2023 Oct 4;15(10). cureus.com
2. Farhud DD, Zokaei S. Ethical issues of artificial intelligence in medicine and healthcare. Iranian journal of public health. 2021 Nov;50(11):i.
3. Demirci S, Leonard A, Essawi K, Tisdale JF. CRISPR-Cas9 to induce fetal hemoglobin for the treatment of sickle cell disease. Molecular Therapy Methods & Clinical Development. 2021 Dec 10;23:276-85. cell.com
4. AL O, EX F, RIMENTAL P, ICAL BM, IEN S. Revisiting Gene Therapy Approaches for Beta-Thalassemia. Journal of Experimental and Basic Medical Sciences. 2023;4(2):104-9. researchgate.net
5. Ranisch R, Trettenbach K, Arnason G. Initial heritable genome editing: mapping a responsible pathway from basic research to the clinic. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy. 2023 Mar;26(1):21-35. springer.com
6. Gutaker RM, Chater CC, Brinton J, Castillo-Lorenzo E, Breman E, Pironon S. Scaling up neodomestication for climate-ready crops. Current Opinion in Plant Biology. 2022 Apr 1;66:102169. [HTML]
7. Gostimskaya I. CRISPR–cas9: A history of its discovery and ethical considerations of its use in genome editing. Biochemistry (Moscow). 2022 Aug;87(8):777-88.
8. Piergentili R, Del Rio A, Signore F, Umani Ronchi F, Marinelli E, Zaami S. CRISPR-Cas and its wide-ranging applications: From human genome editing to environmental implications, technical limitations, hazards and bioethical issues. Cells. 2021 Apr 21;10(5):969. mdpi.com
9. Botelho A. The insights of radical science in the CRISPR gene-editing era: A history of science for the people and the cambridge recombinant DNA controversy. Science as culture. 2021 Jan 2;30(1):74-103.
10. Greely HT. CRISPR people: the science and ethics of editing humans. MIT Press; 2022 Mar 1.
11. Xue Y, Shang L. Governance of heritable human gene editing world-wide and beyond. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022 May 31;19(11):6739.
12. Brokowski C. Do CRISPR germline ethics statements cut it?. The CRISPR journal. 2018 Apr 1;1(2):115-25.
13. Dixit S, Kumar A, Srinivasan K, Vincent PD, Ramu Krishnan N. Advancing genome editing with artificial intelligence: opportunities, challenges, and future directions. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology. 2024 Jan 8;11:1335901. frontiersin.org
14. Wang JY, Doudna JA. CRISPR technology: A decade of genome editing is only the beginning. Science. 2023 Jan 20;379(6629):eadd8643.
15. Critchley C, Nicol D, Bruce G, Walshe J, Treleaven T, Tuch B. Predicting public attitudes toward gene editing of germlines: the impact of moral and hereditary concern in human and animal applications. Frontiers in Genetics. 2019 Jan 9;9:704.
16. McFadden BR, Rumble JN, Stofer KA, Folta KM, Turner S, Pollack A. Gene editing isn't just about food: comments from US focus groups. GM Crops & Food. 2021 Dec 31;12(2):616-26.
17. Martin PA, Turkmendag I. Thinking the unthinkable: how did human germline genome editing become ethically acceptable?. New Genetics and Society. 2021 Oct 2;40(4):384-405.
18. Van Dijke I, van Wely M, Berkman BE, Bredenoord AL, Henneman L, Vliegenthart R, Repping S, Hendriks S. Should germline genome editing be allowed? The effect of treatment characteristics on public acceptability. Human Reproduction. 2021 Feb 1;36(2):465-78. nih.gov
19. Segers S. Heritable genome editing: ethical aspects of a developing domain. Human Reproduction. 2023 Nov 1;38(11):2055-61.

20. Ranisch R. Germline genome editing and the functions of consent. The American Journal of Bioethics. 2017 Dec 2;17(12):27-9.

CITE AS: Chelimo Faith Rebecca (2025). Exploring the Ethics of Genetic Editing in Humans. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES, 6(2):34-39