EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES
(EEJMMS) ISSN: 2992-4103
©EEJMMS Publications Volume 6 Issue 1 2025

Exploring the Ethics of Gene Editing in Society

Bwanbale Geoffrey David

Faculty of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Gene editing has emerged as a revolutionary advancement in biotechnology, with the potential to treat genetic disorders, enhance agricultural productivity, and redefine human capabilities. While techniques such as CRISPR-Cas9 offer promising applications, they also raise complex ethical, societal, and regulatory concerns. The modification of somatic and germline cells introduces questions about consent, equity, genetic determinism, and unintended consequences. This paper examines the ethical frameworks guiding gene editing, including deontological and utilitarian perspectives, while examining historical precedents and the role of governance in ensuring responsible innovation. By analyzing the risks, public perception, and media representation of gene editing, this study highlights the need for global regulatory frameworks that balance scientific progress with ethical responsibility.

Keywords: Gene Editing, Bioethics, CRISPR-Cas9, Germline Modification, Biotechnology Regulation, Public Perception, Genetic Engineering, Policy Frameworks.

INTRODUCTION

Rapid advancements in gene editing have enhanced our ability to modify any organism's genome, including humans. These technologies hold great promise for health improvements, yet they also bring substantial ethical, scientific, governance, and regulatory challenges. Current techniques in genome editing pose various risks and complexities, as clinical trials have yet to prove their effectiveness in ensuring safety. Evaluating the health risks of genome editing must consider existing treatments like in vitro fertilization. This discussion focuses solely on health concerns related to somatic and germline gene editing in humans, while additional negative effects will be addressed separately. While genome editing could yield positive social impacts, significant ethical and societal concerns necessitate further dialogue on its acceptability, covering applications like human enhancement, its role in sports, and genetic testing. Unlike regulations governing human reproductive tissues and cells, genome editing lacks specific oversight. The Council contends that using genome editing in human reproductive cells to alter offspring characteristics goes against a proper assessment of safety and health. To assist policymakers in navigating the acceptability of biotechnology advancements, critical considerations for gene editing have been outlined, rooted in responsible innovation principles and ethical frameworks that require societal endorsement. This guidance aims to help legislators understand innovative gene editing technologies, their potential impacts, and how to govern them for the public good, emphasizing that those ethical and social issues must complement scientific understanding [1, 2].

Definition and Techniques

Gene editing involves methods to modify DNA in living organisms or alter single-celled embryos, impacting their development. It allows the correction of abnormal genes and the introduction of new traits. Germline gene editing targets single-celled embryos, creating changes that are heritable for the individual and future generations. This process alters germline cells in ways that ensure changes persist through cell divisions and affect offspring. When the nucleus of an unfertilized egg is replaced with DNA from a mature cell, it can develop into an offspring without altering the original genome. However, this genetic modification does not qualify as germline editing, which aims for permanent, heritable changes [3, 4].

Historical Context of Gene Editing

Gene editing, involving the manipulation of genetic material, has a long history in clinical applications. Key areas include "germline therapy," the "three-generation rule," the ban on federal funding for human

germline research, and calls for studying recombinant DNA implications. In 1971, a group of scientists proposed a moratorium on recombinant DNA experiments until potential risks and societal impacts were assessed, urging self-regulation without government intervention. Initially supported by 150 scientists, this call for caution was largely ignored as the drive for experimentation took precedence over safety concerns. The term "germline therapy" emerged in 1973 at a molecular biology conference, coinciding with the early discussions around recombinant DNA. A press release from that meeting highlighted the need for a broad inclusion of scientists and bioethicists in ethical and policy discussions, underscoring the importance of governance in research. Today, society forms "working groups" to tackle ethical issues, integrating scientists, bioethicists, legal experts, government regulators, and public policy stakeholders [5, 6].

Milestones in Gene Editing Technology

There are three gene-editing systems made of DNA, RNA, and a nuclease, an enzyme that cleaves bonds. Only endonucleases can cut DNA or RNA. While the systems differ slightly in DNA cut sequence lengths, they operate similarly. The CRISPR-Cas9 system is a more complex and user-friendly version, enhancing the diversity of users and fields utilizing this technology. It has led to breakthroughs in oncology and gene therapies, showcasing advantages from CRISPR and its derivatives. These technologies employ various molecular machines that cut DNA at specific sites, generated using long RNAs that match target DNA segments. The speed and accuracy of these machines differ based on their construction method. When a cut is made, the cell's repair system interprets it as damage, activating two repair pathways. The first is the non-homologous end-joining pathway, which can delete DNA or connect free ends, potentially leading to mutations. Alternatively, during the add-in method, a repair DNA template guides the proper placement of broken DNA pieces. Although each method focuses on targeting genes, they represent the most efficient pathways after being integrated into specific genomic sites, often resulting in precision in genome editing [7, 8].

Ethical Frameworks in Bioethics

Ethical frameworks in health care and medical science have historically centered on four principles: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. This model is inadequate, especially when principles conflict. Despite its limitations, this framework remains central to ethical discussions in genomic science. Alternative approaches have emerged, scrutinizing the framing of contemporary bioethics, including narratives, and recognizing the political influences of liberal individualism. Attempts to address the model's shortcomings have led to relativized, pluralist, and particularized approaches. However, major reports by regulators still largely adhere to the principles, leading to familiar arguments about genome editing—whether it should be prohibited, permitted, or promoted—based on how many principles are fulfilled and their importance. This paper will not delve into these familiar debates but will revisit the principles' limitations, reflect on broader workshop discussions, and explore possible frameworks that have evolved through these engagements [9, 10].

Deontological Ethics

One fundamental principle of deontological ethics is that treating people merely as a means to an end is wrong. Viewing individuals as replaceable resources threatens essential values and prompts the conclusion that we should not genetically edit humans. Ethics become inversely proportional to what is being calculated, such as profit versus notions of good. Opponents of genetic editing argue that practical consequences are irrelevant. Many claim that all modifications compromise the intrinsic value of sentient beings and strive for perfection through chemical manipulation. Respecting others as autonomous agents is vital for society's functioning. Each individual holds inherent value. If we value legitimate political liberalism, which sometimes limits personal choices, we believe the ideal society maximizes freedom while enhancing value. Thus, creating beings for future generations who remain unknown to us risks undermining core societal beliefs [11, 12].

Applications of Gene Editing in Society

The potential applications of gene editing techniques in society are substantial, with many unknowns regarding their influence beyond the lab. The decision to develop and use new genetic technologies, such as genome editing, should not rest with scientists alone, as these questions resonate deeply with societal values and our future. Intentional human germline editing may guide us forward, but it is highly controversial and carries potential risks. Despite these concerns, the gradual evolution into gene editing isn't entirely unexpected. Gene therapy trials in somatic cells have been ongoing for over twenty-five years, serving as a framework for addressing the ethical and social dilemmas of human gene editing. Germline genome editing surprised the international community when scientists modified disease-related genes in human embryos unfit for implantation, demonstrating the ability to alter traits in future

generations. This announcement sparked significant media backlash and bioethical concerns about a possibly edited human society [13, 14].

Agriculture and Food Security

The use of genetic technologies in agriculture has focused on enhancing crop productivity, nutritional value, and stress tolerance, benefiting various environments. These technologies also help engineer probiotics that may protect against certain cancers or aid metabolic health. Gene-editing tools can align with broader goals, such as improving gender balance and engaging diverse stakeholders in agricultural development. However, there is a lack of consensus on evaluating the ethical, social, and policy implications of a regulatory framework for gene editing. The existing regulatory approach evaluates risk based on potential impacts but does not consider application methods. Consequently, current policies could worsen some aspects of our food system and synthetic biology use in plant metabolic engineering [15, 16].

Potential Risks and Concerns

Gene editing for reproductive and research purposes is a contentious process, with opponents citing moral and ethical concerns about its use on human embryos. Critics often make negative assertions that can exaggerate expectations, especially following the Human Genome Project. However, there are important ethical issues that require careful consideration. 5.2 Potential harms and risks Concerns have been raised regarding the unforeseen and unsettling effects of gene editing on human biology and populations. For instance, in gene drive applications for insect control, engineered traits may enable organisms to propagate these traits, potentially leading to a population of engineered hosts. In human medical applications, unexpected reactions to gene editing can present risks to the health of embryos, children, and adults, impacting future generations as well. The risks can increase with unforeseen safety issues and when employing fewer effective gene editing methods that may lead to numerous off-target mutations [17, 18].

Off-Target Effects

The paper examines key ethical aspects of gene editing in humans and crops, addressing issues like germline gene editing testing, implementation in plants, regulatory frameworks, and the implications for market access and trade. The essays progress logically from basic concepts, such as genetic engineering simplification using retroviruses in CRISPR, to more specific applications in various crops. It delves into agricultural law and risk regulation perspectives and concludes with economic law viewpoints. Gene editing targets genetic material for specific outcomes. In molecular genetics, methods like ZFNs, TALENs, and CRISPR, including spCas9 analogues, are employed for heritable genome editing in domesticated species necessary for sustainable food production. A significant challenge remains the risk of off-target mutations affecting non-target genes, which may have severe consequences. This inherent risk correlates with the number and type of genetic modifications made, especially concerning permanent changes that can persist for generations [19, 20].

Regulatory Landscape and Guidelines

The value of gene editing has prompted calls for regulatory changes. An international commission was formed to address scientific, social, and ethical concerns surrounding human gene editing, supporting research meant for widespread use. In the U.S., regulations are governed by multiple entities, including the Department of Defense, the FDA, and the EPA. Public opinion has also influenced scientists to adopt self-regulatory practices, exemplified by the successful Recombinant DNA Guidelines. This chapter reviews the legislative and regulatory framework for genome editing in U.S. research and clinical use, contextualizing findings from our empirical research, three public forums, and a national survey. Our study explores the interaction between regulation and public attitudes towards memory-modifying technologies, which impact social policy and notions of personal autonomy, identity, and human rights. The implications of these technologies could have extensive effects beyond individual health interests [21, 22].

International Regulations

Although many countries have heritable gene editing legislation, only China used CRISPR technology on human embryos in November 2018 without authorization. In response, the International Commission proposed an initiative for discussions involving around 70 countries to address 'genetic disorders and health management.' This includes the Straightforward Care Principles for Human Genome Editing. The Commission, with governance and expertise in reforms, aims to promote ethics and justice in genomic research, ensuring responsible development and collaboration in genomics. They focus on pre-notification of diseases and enhancing medical applications of genome editing, fostering communication among diverse medical, scientific, and legal professionals. The Commission maintains a network of accredited

experts and organizations for public engagement in genome editing research. They hold a significant percentage of applications not directed toward human cells. If established standards are not met, the proposed policy window may close, and the Commission could alter its role in the International Manual to oversee future research effectively. Lack of regulation has also increased costs in this field [23, 24].

Public Perception and Awareness

In the UK, GM extension covers GM crops and food, such as GM potatoes, tomatoes, maize, and soya. Applications for GM maize and soya have reached the Food Safety Authority, but the most significant application is for GM potatoes. In December 2001, the EC directive allowed for the resumption of GMO approvals after a moratorium. No application has been made to the UK Food Standards Agency, but EC registration is required for any GM food application. The regulatory framework is prepared for such applications. Public debate primarily centers on GM crops and food while including GM animal research. Future UK applications in other areas are not addressed. Public engagement remains pivotal in UK GM policy. The GM Nation public debate aimed to educate the public on GMOs' benefits and risks and gather opinions. It encouraged UK citizens to research and understand the potential benefits and concerns surrounding GM, considering diverse viewpoints and noting changes in opinion. Following GM Nation, a summary of scientific responses and policy views was published. By the end of GM Nation, Scotland's GM debate resulted in a research strategy endorsing GM crops and food research, aiming for positive agriculture and environmental outcomes, facilitated by bodies like the GM Forum [25, 26].

Media Representation

Media is not completely independent of societal values but reflects and reinforces them. The results of the analysis of media frames and their sources provide a picture of media portrayal of gene-editing technology's ethics and the role of society in discussing and shaping it. The media plays a vital part in reflecting, shaping, and communicating topics within society. Journalism is a significant source of information, and concern about media framing and media power regarding gene-editing technology ranges from news organizations' extensive influence on public opinion, policymakers, and scientists to norms of news management and communication efforts about media gatekeepers and journalists. The media will portray societal framing of gene-editing technology issues, guide the level and nature of public discussion about them, and shape their status as societal problems. Given the power of the media and their interpretative tendencies, they could frame gene-editing technology in a way that is bound to affect the promotion of debates on the ethical, legal, and societal issues surrounding it, or promote a more general understanding of how societal debate affects the modulation of the potential normative impact of scientific knowledge, and of the necessity to reconsider the classical approach to controversy, placing it within broader scientific and ethical issues [27, 28].

Case Studies in Gene Editing

This paper provides various sections on gene editing avenues currently being examined, focusing on editing human embryonic and adult stem cells, along with associated technologies. It discusses significant analyses, including the potential for permanent cures for genetic conditions like alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency, our growing genetic understanding, and the controversial potential of creating designer humans. Issues also include the creation of prohibited GMOs and pathogens similar to smallpox or H5N1 viruses that could affect humans, as well as technologies for geoengineering the planet. These concerns reflect real-world challenges tied to potential life-saving developments in gene editing, yet they contribute to public alarm and worst-case scenarios. Understanding gene editing research and issuing warnings about potential pitfalls are essential for raising awareness. Ethical warnings from the public have primarily focused on editing human reproductive cells compared to embryonic stem cell research, highlighting significant distinctions. Gene editing allows researchers to manipulate broad genomes, risking unintended consequences across generations, including fostering genetic systems or eugenics. The emergence of CRISPR technology raises moral debates and fears over the future application of gene editing in population biology. It is crucial to address the divides in regulatory bodies like HFEA, RAC, and IRB as we navigate these new dimensions of gene editing technology [29, 30, 31].

CRISPR-CAS9 in Human Embryos

The CRISPR-Cas9 system for gene editing has the potential to revolutionize our understanding of genes in human biology and their role in diseases. This technology could lead to innovative therapies, yet the debate around genetically modifying embryos raises important ethical questions. The discussion surrounding bioethics and regulation is becoming more urgent as these technologies move closer to reality. While gene therapies using CRISPR-Cas9 remain largely theoretical, there is a growing consensus for somatic cell editing for therapeutic and enhancement purposes, building over three decades since the first recombinant DNA technology trial. Notably, the clinical trial using CAR-T cells modified

with TALENs for lung cancer marks a significant milestone in global acceptance. Gene editing in embryos is distinct from other medical practices, necessitating different moral considerations due to the unique nature of gametes and embryonic changes [32, 33, 34].

CONCLUSION

The ethical implications of gene editing remain a subject of extensive debate, requiring interdisciplinary collaboration between scientists, ethicists, policymakers, and the public. While gene editing holds the potential to revolutionize medicine and agriculture, its long-term consequences must be carefully evaluated. A regulatory balance is essential to prevent ethical breaches while fostering responsible innovation. Societal endorsement, transparent governance, and ethical oversight are critical to ensuring that gene editing serves humanity without exacerbating existing inequalities. Moving forward, continued dialogue and inclusive policymaking will be crucial in shaping the responsible development of gene-editing technologies.

REFERENCES

1. Marchant GE. Global governance of human genome editing: what are the rules?. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics. 2021 Aug 31;22(1):385-405. annualreviews.org
2. 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
3. Doxzen K. EDITING HUMANITY: THE CRISPR REVOLUTION AND THE NEW ERA OF GENOME EDITING. Jurimetrics. 2023;63(2):197-211.
4. Eski N, Asif H, Crespo J, Bayar Y. Exploring the Role of CRISPR-Cas9 in Genetic Engineering: Advancements, Applications, and Ethical Issue. London Journal of Interdisciplinary Sciences. 2025 Feb 9(4):38-51. londonic.uk
5. Mendell JR, Al-Zaidy SA, Rodino-Klapac LR, Goodspeed K, Gray SJ, Kay CN, Boye SL, Boye SE, George LA, Salabarria S, Corti M. Current clinical applications of in vivo gene therapy with AAVs. Molecular Therapy. 2021 Feb 3;29(2):464-88. cell.com
6. 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.
7. Verdezoto-Prado J, Chicaiza-Ortiz C, Mejía-Pérez AB, Freire-Torres C, Viteri-Yánez M, Deng L, Barba-Ostria C, Guamán LP. Advances in environmental biotechnology with CRISPR/Cas9: bibliometric review and cutting-edge applications. Discover Applied Sciences. 2025 Feb 22;7(3):167. springer.com
8. Wani AK, Akhtar N, Shukla S. CRISPR/Cas9: regulations and challenges for law enforcement to combat its dual-use. Forensic science international. 2022 May 1;334:111274.
9. Cheraghi R, Valizadeh L, Zamanzadeh V, Hassankhani H, Jafarzadeh A. Clarification of ethical principle of the beneficence in nursing care: an integrative review. BMC nursing. 2023 Mar 30;22(1):89. springer.com
10. Coghlan S, Leins K, Sheldrick S, Cheong M, Gooding P, D'Alfonso S. To chat or bot to chat: Ethical issues with using chatbots in mental health. Digital health. 2023 Jun;9:20552076231183542. sagepub.com
11. Megías A, De Sousa L, Jiménez-Sánchez F. Deontological and consequentialist ethics and attitudes towards corruption: A survey data analysis. Social Indicators Research. 2023 Nov;170(2):507-41.
12. Sahlins M. Reports of the Death of Cultures have been Exaggerated. InWhat Happens to History 2014 Jun 11 (pp. 189-213). Routledge.
13. Agrawal A, McHale J, Oettl A. Artificial intelligence and scientific discovery: A model of prioritized search. Research Policy. 2024 Jun 1;53(5):104989.
14. Bird KA, Jackson Jr JP, Winston AS. Confronting scientific racism in psychology: Lessons from evolutionary biology and genetics. American Psychologist. 2024 May;79(4):497.
15. Deeks SG, Archin N, Cannon P, Collins S, Jones RB, de Jong MA, Lambotte O, Lamplough R, Ndung'u T, Sugarman J, Tiemessen CT. Research priorities for an HIV cure: international AIDS society global scientific strategy 2021. Nature medicine. 2021 Dec;27(12):2085-98. nature.com
16. Scheufele DA, Krause NM, Freiling I, Brossard D. What we know about effective public engagement on CRISPR and beyond. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2021 Jun 1;118(22):e2004835117. pnas.org
17. De Wert G, Heindryckx B, Pennings G, Clarke A, Eichenlaub-Ritter U, Van El CG, Forzano F, Goddijn M, Howard HC, Radojkovic D, Rial-Sebbag E. Responsible innovation in human

germline gene editing. Background document to the recommendations of ESHG and ESHRE. Human reproduction open. 2018;2018(1):hox024.

18. Yunes MC, Osório-Santos Z, von Keyserlingk MA, Hötzel MJ. Gene editing for improved animal welfare and production traits in cattle: Will this technology be embraced or rejected by the public?. Sustainability. 2021 Apr 28;13(9):4966. mdpi.com
19. Movahedi A, Aghaei-Dargiri S, Li H, Zhuge Q, Sun W. CRISPR variants for gene editing in plants: biosafety risks and future directions. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2023 Nov 13;24(22):16241. mdpi.com
20. Chen J, Sheng CW, Peng Y, Wang K, Jiao Y, Palli SR, Cao H. Transcript level and sequence matching are key determinants of off-target effects in RNAi. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry. 2023 Dec 22;72(1):577-89. [HTML]
21. Nagai H, Nakazawa E, Akabayashi A. The creation of the Belmont Report and its effect on ethical principles: a historical study. Monash bioethics review. 2022 Dec;40(2):157-70.
22. Nelson JP, Selin CL, Scott CT. Toward anticipatory governance of human genome editing: A critical review of scholarly governance discourse. Journal of Responsible Innovation. 2021 Sep 2;8(3):382-420.
23. Song L, Joly Y. After He Jianku: China's biotechnology regulation reforms. Medical Law International. 2021 Jun;21(2):174-92.
24. Paul-Chima UO, Ugwu CN, Alum EU. Integrated approaches in nutraceutical delivery systems: optimizing ADME dynamics for enhanced therapeutic potency and clinical impact. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2024 Oct;3(4):rqae024.
25. Chen Y, Tao S, Chen J, Li W. After He Jiankui's case: Chinese legislative modifications in human embryo gene editing. Human gene therapy. 2022 Nov 1;33(21-22):1121-5.
26. Kato-Nitta N, Tachikawa M, Inagaki Y, Maeda T. Public perceptions of risks and benefits of gene-edited food crops: an international comparative study between the US, Japan, and Germany. Science, Technology, & Human Values. 2023 Nov;48(6):1360-92. sagepub.com
27. Shen C, Yin XC, Jiao BY, Li J, Jia P, Zhang XW, Cheng XH, Ren JX, Lan HD, Hou WB, Fang M. Evaluation of adverse effects/events of genetically modified food consumption: a systematic review of animal and human studies. Environmental Sciences Europe. 2022 Dec;34:1-33. springer.com
28. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.
29. Selfa T, Cummings C, Dahlstrom M, Lindberg S, Peters D, Wolf C, Bain C. Gene editing in agriculture: Social concerns, public engagement, and governance. Science, technology, & human values. 2023 Nov;48(6):1249-59. nsf.gov
30. Edyedu I, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI. The role of pharmacological interventions in managing urological complications during pregnancy and childbirth: A review. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41381.
31. Davies G, Gorman R, McGlacken R, Peres S. The social aspects of genome editing: publics as stakeholders, populations and participants in animal research. Laboratory Animals. 2022 Feb;56(1):88-96. sagepub.com
32. Ongesa TN, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Optimizing emergency response systems in urban health crises: A project management approach to public health preparedness and response. Medicine. 2025 Jan 17;104(3):e41279.
33. Bolton RL, Mooney A, Pettit MT, Bolton AE, Morgan L, Drake GJ, Appeltant R, Walker SL, Gillis JD, Hvilsom C. Resurrecting biodiversity: advanced assisted reproductive technologies and biobanking. Reproduction and Fertility. 2022 Jul 1;3(3):R121-46. bioscientifica.com
34. Sang Q, Ray PF, Wang L. Understanding the genetics of human infertility. Science. 2023 Apr 14;380(6641):158-63.

CITE AS: Bwanbale Geoffrey David. (2025). Exploring the Ethics of Gene Editing in Society. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES, 6(1):63-68