

Medical Miracle or Modern Eugenics? Gene Modification in the 21st Century

Mira Lalani

Abstract

The rapid development of gene-editing technologies has introduced new possibilities for preventing disease and enhancing human traits. From TALENs to CRISPR-Cas9, scientific abilities have stretched beyond what was once thought possible. Nevertheless, the emergence of these innovations raised profound ethical concerns about the future of human reproduction and the boundaries of scientific intervention. This paper examines the ethical implications of gene editing by placing it within the historical context of eugenics, a movement that sought to improve human populations through controlled reproduction and selective breeding. By analyzing both early twentieth-century eugenic practices in the United States and Nazi Germany, in addition to various contemporary advancements, this study evaluates whether gene editing represents a medical breakthrough or a modern continuation of selective human engineering. Drawing on the ethical principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and autonomy, this paper argues that although gene editing offers significant potential to reduce suffering and eliminate hereditary disease, its application, particularly in germline modification, poses serious risks to social inequality and long-term ethical instability. Ultimately, this paper concludes that gene editing is not yet ethically permissible due to insufficient regulation, limited understanding of long-term consequences, and the potential to deepen existing social and global inequalities.

Introduction

CONTEXT

Gene-editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-Cas9, offer possibilities for preventing hereditary disease and altering human traits while raising ethical questions about reproduction, disability, human diversity, and scientific intervention.

RESEARCH QUESTION & AIM

Does modern gene editing represent a medical breakthrough or raise ethical concerns reminiscent of historical eugenics?

This study compares contemporary gene editing with eugenics through **beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice**.

BACKGROUND & LITERATURE GAP

Historical eugenics reinforced racial, ableist, and socioeconomic inequalities. Modern gene editing emphasizes consent and choice but raises related questions about desirable traits, access, and governance.

WHY THIS MATTERS

This study connects **eugenics, disability ethics, reproductive autonomy, and global inequality** to examine how gene editing should be ethically governed.

Results

1. MEDICAL BENEFITS & RISK

Gene editing may prevent hereditary disease and reduce suffering, but unintended changes, mosaicism, and unknown long-term effects remain concerns.

2. HISTORICAL EUGENICS

U.S. eugenics shows how scientific authority can control reproduction and reinforce racial, socioeconomic, and ableist hierarchies. Modern gene editing differs, but raises related questions about desirable traits.

3. DISABILITY & HUMAN VARIATION

Disability scholarship challenges the assumption that all medically defined conditions should be prevented, emphasizing identity, community, and human diversity.

4. JUSTICE & ACCESS

High costs could deepen existing socioeconomic inequalities.

5. GOVERNANCE

Fragmented, often non-binding regulation highlights the need for transparency, accountability, cooperation, and public engagement.

Discussion

FINDINGS

The findings support the concern that gene editing raises ethical challenges beyond scientific safety.

EUGENICS & GOVERNANCE

Modern gene editing differs from historical eugenics through greater emphasis on reproductive choice, but questions about **desirable traits, access, and governance** remain.

ETHICAL FRAMEWORKS

Disability ethics and global inequality expand the discussion beyond **beneficence and non-maleficence** to include autonomy, identity, human variation, and justice.

CONCLUSION

Germline editing’s ethical permissibility cannot be determined by medical benefit alone and requires careful consideration of **safety, regulation, autonomy, disability, and equitable access**.

Conclusion

Human gene editing, particularly germline modification, is **not yet ethically permissible**. While CRISPR-Cas9 may prevent hereditary disease and reduce suffering, concerns about long-term safety, regulation, informed consent, and equitable access remain. Historical eugenics highlights risks when scientific authority influences reproductive decisions without protecting dignity and autonomy. However, modern therapeutic gene editing is not inherently equivalent to historical eugenics. Future research should address long-term effects, strengthen international regulation, promote equitable access, and prevent discrimination and coercive genetic selection before germline editing is widely adopted.

References

[1] Frangoul, H. et al. (2020). CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β -thalassemia. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 384(3).

[2] Reilly, P. R. (2015). Eugenics and involuntary sterilization: 1907–2015. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, 16, 351–368.

[3] Cohen, A. (2016). The Supreme Court ruling that led to 70,000 forced sterilizations. *NPR*.

[4] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2020). *Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race*.

[5] Corcoran, J. (2022). Dawn of the “designer baby”: The He Jiankui affair and implications for future ethical editing. *Mason Institute Blog*.

[6] Rubeis, G., & Steger, F. (2018). Risks and benefits of human germline genome editing: An ethical analysis. *Asian Bioethics Review*, 10(2), 133–141.

[7] UNESCO. (2005). *Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights*.

[8] World Health Organization. (2021). *Human Genome Editing: Recommendations*.

[9] Sufian, S., & Garland-Thompson, R. (2021). The dark side of CRISPR. *Scientific American*.

[10] Ayanoglu, F. B., Elcin, A. E., & Elcin, Y. M. (2020). Bioethical issues in genome editing by the CRISPR/Cas9 technology. *Turkish Journal of Biology*, 44(2), 110–120.

Methods

STUDY DESIGN

Qualitative literature review examining the ethical implications of human gene editing through historical and contemporary scholarship.

LITERATURE SEARCH

Databases included **Google Scholar, PubMed, JSTOR, and NHGRI**, covering January 2025 to June 2026. Search terms included CRISPR-Cas9, gene-editing ethics, eugenics, disability ethics, reproductive autonomy, justice, and regulation.

SOURCE SELECTION

Sources were selected for scholarly or institutional credibility, relevance, and contribution to the research question. Peer-reviewed, governmental, historical, legal, and bioethics sources were included.

ANALYSIS

Sources were analyzed thematically using **beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, disability ethics, and global equality**.

Ethics

UTILITARIANISM

Evaluates gene editing by its consequences and impact on well-being. Therapeutic editing may reduce suffering, but benefits must be weighed against inequality and individual rights.

DEONTOLOGY

Focuses on duties, rights, and human dignity. Gene editing may prevent suffering but raises concerns about treating future children as means to preferred outcomes.

DISABILITY ETHICS

Challenges assumptions about “normal” or desirable bodies and emphasizes disability, identity, accessibility, and human variation.

JUSTICE & INEQUALITY

Examines how benefits and burdens are distributed. Unequal access could deepen socioeconomic and global healthcare disparities.