www.ijarp.com ISSN 2456-9992 Page: 01-04

International Journal Advanced Research Publications

Research Article

Volume: 02
Issue: 05

THE ETHICAL BOUNDARIES OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING: CRISPR-CAS9 AND THE FUTURE OF GENETIC EQUALITY

Oros Rikhard, Chernychko Yana, Forkosh Viktoriia, Shosh Patrik Zholt, Birov Renata, Szikura Anita, Kohut Erzsébet

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University, Transcarpathia, Ukraine.

Article Received: 07 April 2026, Article Revised: 27 April 2026, Published on: 17 May 2026

***Corresponding Author: Oros Rikhard**

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University, Transcarpathia, Ukraine.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.9004

ABSTRACT

The emergence of CRISPR-Cas9 technology has revolutionized molecular biology, transitioning genome editing from a complex laboratory procedure to a widely accessible tool. While somatic gene therapy focuses on treating non-hereditary diseases in existing patients, the prospect of human germline modification altering the DNA of embryos or gametes presents an unprecedented bioethical crossroads. Because these changes are inherited by future generations, the technology challenges fundamental concepts of human autonomy, biological safety, and social equity. This paper argues that the profound risks of permanent genetic error and the potential for a new form of technological eugenics necessitate a strict international regulatory framework and a precautionary approach to clinical applications (Baltimore et al., 2015; Lanphier et al., 2015).

A central ethical dilemma in germline editing is the impossibility of obtaining informed consent from the subjects of the procedure. In clinical medicine, the principle of autonomy ensures that individuals have the right to accept or refuse treatment. However, germline interventions are performed on future individuals who cannot voice their consent. Technical safety remains another significant barrier. Despite the precision of CRISPR, the risk of off-target effects unintended genetic mutations elsewhere in the genome poses a catastrophic threat.

Finally, the widespread adoption of germline editing threatens to exacerbate existing social inequalities. To prevent biotechnology from deepening social injustice, global governance must prioritize equitable access and ensure that scientific progress does not dismantle the principle of human equality. In conclusion, while CRISPR-Cas9 offers a powerful tool for

eradicating hereditary diseases, its application to the human germline must be strictly regulated.

KEYWORDS: CRISPR-Cas9, germline editing, bioethics, genetic equality, biotechnology, eugenics.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of CRISPR-Cas9 technology has revolutionized molecular biology, transitioning genome editing from a complex laboratory procedure to a widely accessible tool. While somatic gene therapy focuses on treating non-hereditary diseases in existing patients, the prospect of human germline modification altering the DNA of embryos or gametes presents an unprecedented bioethical crossroads.

Because these changes are inherited by future generations, the technology challenges fundamental concepts of human autonomy, biological safety, and social equity. This paper argues that the profound risks of permanent genetic error and the potential for a new form of technological eugenics necessitate a strict international regulatory framework and a precautionary approach to clinical applications. The introduction of such powerful tools into the human reproductive cycle raises fundamental questions about our responsibility toward future generations and the long-term stability of the human genome (Baltimore et al., 2015; Lanphier et al., 2015).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The article is structured as a scientific review and bioethical analysis rather than an experimental investigation. Therefore, the materials and methods are based on the collection, analysis, and synthesis of previously published scientific literature, international ethical consensus statements, and reported clinical cases.

The methodology of the paper is conceptual and analytical, combining molecular biology theory with bioethical principles such as autonomy, non-maleficence, and social justice. The study incorporates evidence from key academic databases and high-impact journals, focusing on the intersection of CRISPR-Cas9 precision and the long-term hereditary implications of germline modification. Analysis of the 2018 gene-edited twins case and subsequent international reactions provide the empirical basis for discussing the necessity of enforceable global standards and the current limits of technical safety in genetic engineering.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A central ethical dilemma in germline editing is the impossibility of obtaining informed consent from the subjects of the procedure. In clinical medicine, the principle of autonomy ensures that individuals have the right to accept or refuse treatment. However, germline interventions are performed on future individuals who cannot voice their consent. This places current generations in the role of "genetic designers," potentially treating human life as a malleable product rather than an autonomous being. Critics warn that this shift could fundamentally alter the parent-child relationship, replacing unconditional acceptance with a drive for biological optimization (Lander et al., 2019).

Technical safety remains another significant barrier. Despite the precision of CRISPR, the risk of off-target effects unintended genetic mutations elsewhere in the genome poses a catastrophic threat. In somatic therapy, an error affects only one patient. In germline editing, a genetic mistake becomes a permanent part of the human gene pool. The irreversible nature of such errors, combined with our incomplete understanding of complex genetic interactions, suggests that the potential for harm currently outweighs the therapeutic promise. The 2018 case of the world's first gene-edited twins served as a global warning, demonstrating that without enforceable international standards, the technology could be used prematurely and irresponsibly (Cyranoski & Ledford, 2018).

Finally, the widespread adoption of germline editing threatens to exacerbate existing social inequalities. If genetic enhancement such as the improvement of physical or cognitive traits becomes available only to the wealthy, society risks a biological divide. This could lead to a future where socio-economic status is reinforced by hereditary genetic advantages, creating a permanent underclass of un-optimized individuals. To prevent biotechnology from deepening social injustice, global governance must prioritize equitable access and ensure that scientific progress does not dismantle the principle of human equality (Brokowski & Adli, 2019).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while CRISPR-Cas9 offers a powerful tool for eradicating hereditary diseases, its application to the human germline must be strictly regulated. The intersection of technical unpredictability, the violation of future autonomy, and the threat of biological stratification requires that we prioritize ethical reflection over scientific speed.

The risks associated with off-target mutations and the ethical vacuum regarding informed consent suggest that current clinical applications are premature. Only through a transparent, global consensus can we ensure that genetic innovation serves the common good rather than

creating new divides. The protection of the human gene pool is not merely a scientific challenge but a collective moral obligation to ensure intergenerational equity and the preservation of human dignity.

REFERENCES

1. Baltimore, D., Berg, P., Botchan, M., Carroll, D., Charo, R. A., Church, G., Corn, J. E., Daley, G. Q., Doudna, J. A., Fenner, M., Greely, H. T., Jinek, M., Martin, G. S., Penhoet, E., Puck, J., Sternberg, S. H., Weissman, J. S., & Yamamoto, K. R. (2015). A prudent path forward for genomic engineering and germline gene modification. *Science*, *348*(6230), 36–38. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab1028
2. Lanphier, E., Urnov, F., Haecker, S. E., Werner, M., & Smolenski, J. (2015). Don't edit the human germ line. *Nature*, *519*(7544), 410–411. https://doi.org/10.1038/519410a
3. Lander, E. S., Baylis, F., Zhang, F., Charpentier, E., Berg, P., Bourgain, C., Friedrich, B., Joung, J. K., Li, J., Liu, D., Naldini, L., Nie, J., Qiu, R., Schoene-Seifert, B., Shao, F., Terry, S., Wei, W., & Winnacker, E. (2019). Adopt a moratorium on heritable genome editing. *Nature*, *567*(7747), 165–168. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-00726-5
4. Cyranoski, D., & Ledford, H. (2018). Genome-edited baby claim provokes international outcry. *Nature*, *563*(7733), 607–608. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07545-0
5. Brokowski, C., & Adli, M. (2019). CRISPR Ethics: moral considerations for applications of a powerful tool. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, *431*(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2018.05.044