

Designer Babies: Exploring the Controversies Surrounding Genetic Engineering in Human Embryos.

Vernham Baucom*

Department of Transgenic Technology, University of Pennsylvania, United States

Introduction

The advent of genetic engineering technologies has brought forth the possibility of designing babies with specific desired traits, giving rise to ethical, social, and moral debates. This concept, often referred to as "designer babies," involves manipulating the genetic makeup of embryos to enhance traits such as intelligence, physical appearance, or disease resistance. While the potential benefits are alluring, the ethical considerations surrounding the practice are profound and complex. In this article, we delve into the controversies surrounding genetic engineering in human embryos, examining the ethical dilemmas, societal implications, and regulatory challenges associated with the concept of designer babies [1].

Genetic engineering in human embryos involves the manipulation of the embryo's DNA to introduce, modify, or remove specific genes. This can be achieved through techniques such as CRISPR-Cas9, a revolutionary gene-editing tool that enables precise modifications to the genetic code. With CRISPR-Cas9, researchers can target and edit genes associated with inherited diseases, potentially eliminating genetic disorders before birth [2].

While the primary focus of genetic engineering in embryos has been on preventing genetic diseases, the concept of designer babies takes the technology a step further by allowing for the selection of desired traits unrelated to health. This could include traits such as height, intelligence, athletic ability, or even cosmetic features like eye color or hair texture [3].

The concept of designer babies raises profound ethical dilemmas that touch upon fundamental questions about human nature, autonomy, and equality. One of the central concerns is the potential for genetic enhancement to exacerbate existing social inequalities, creating a divide between those who can afford to access genetic technologies and those who cannot. This could further perpetuate socioeconomic disparities and widen the gap between the privileged and the disadvantaged [4].

Moreover, the pursuit of genetic perfection raises questions about the value of diversity and the acceptance of human differences. By promoting a narrow definition of what constitutes an "ideal" or "desirable" trait, genetic engineering in embryos risks undermining the richness and diversity of

the human experience, erasing valuable variations in physical appearance, cognitive abilities, and personality traits [5].

Furthermore, there are concerns about the long-term consequences of genetic manipulation on future generations. The heritable nature of genetic modifications means that changes made to the embryo's DNA will be passed on to subsequent generations, potentially altering the human gene pool in unforeseen ways. This raises questions about the moral responsibility of parents, researchers, and policymakers to consider the implications of their actions for future generations [6].

In addition to ethical concerns, genetic engineering in human embryos poses significant societal implications and regulatory challenges. The commercialization of genetic technologies could lead to a commodification of human life, where traits are valued based on their marketability rather than their intrinsic worth. This could further reinforce societal pressures to conform to unrealistic standards of perfection and beauty [7].

Moreover, there are concerns about the potential misuse of genetic technologies for non-medical purposes, such as selecting embryos for cosmetic enhancements or enhancing cognitive abilities beyond normal human limits. Without adequate regulation and oversight, the widespread adoption of genetic engineering in embryos could lead to unintended consequences, including the creation of genetically modified "superior" humans and the erosion of human dignity and autonomy [8].

In navigating the complexities of genetic engineering in human embryos, it is essential to uphold principles of bioethics, including respect for human dignity, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. This requires careful consideration of the potential risks and benefits of genetic manipulation, as well as the broader societal implications and ethical implications of designer babies [9].

Furthermore, robust regulatory frameworks are needed to ensure that genetic technologies are used responsibly and ethically. This includes oversight mechanisms to monitor research involving genetic engineering in embryos, guidelines for informed consent and patient autonomy, and safeguards to prevent the misuse of genetic technologies for non-medical purposes [10].

*Correspondence to: Vernham Baucom, Department of Transgenic Technology, University of Pennsylvania, United States, E-mail: vernham@upenn.edu

Received: 02-Apr-2024, Manuscript No. AABB-24-134783; Editor assigned: 04-Apr-2024, Pre QC No. AABB-24-134783 (PQ); Reviewed: 16-Apr-2024, QC No. AABB-24-134783; Revised: 23-Apr-2024, Manuscript No. AABB-24-134783 (R); Published: 30-April-2024, DOI:10.35841/aabb-7.2.195

Conclusion

The concept of designer babies presents a compelling vision of a future where genetic technologies offer the promise of enhanced health, intelligence, and beauty. However, the ethical dilemmas, societal implications, and regulatory challenges surrounding genetic engineering in human embryos cannot be overlooked.

References

1. Mulvihill JJ, Capps B, Joly Y. Ethical issues of CRISPR technology and gene editing through the lens of solidarity. *Br Med Bull.* 2017;122(1):17-29.
2. Savulescu J, Pugh J, Douglas T. The moral imperative to continue gene editing research on human embryos. *Protein Cell.* 2015;6(7):476-9.
3. Baylis F. The ethics of creating children with three genetic parents. *Reprod Biomed Online.* 2013;26(6):531-4.
4. Camporesi S, McNamee M. *Bioethics, genetics and sport.* Routledge; 2018.
5. Kaczor C. *The ethics of abortion: Women's rights, human life, and the question of justice.* Routledge; 2022.
6. Krinsky S. *GMOs decoded: A Skeptic's view of genetically modified foods.* MIT Press; 2019.
7. Prozorov S, Rentea S. *The Routledge handbook of biopolitics.* Routledge; 2017.
8. National Academies of Sciences. *Human genome editing: science, ethics, and governance.* National Academies Press; 2017.
9. Castle D. *Hopes against hopeful monsters.*
10. UNESCO U. *Universal declaration on the human genome and human rights.* 1998.