Shailaja Gada Saxena*

Ethical crossroads in reproductive genetics: Balancing rights, risks, and responsibilities

Abstract

The rapid evolution of genetic technologies has transformed reproductive medicine, enabling unprecedented insights into the genetic makeup of embryos and fetuses through prenatal diagnostics and preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD). These techniques allow for the detection of genetic abnormalities and inherited conditions before birth or even before implantation during in vitro fertilization (IVF). While such advancements offer substantial benefits, such as preventing severe genetic disorders and empowering reproductive choices, they also provoke deep ethical debates. Therefore, it is essential to critically assess the ethical implications of prenatal and preimplantation genetic testing, focusing on the rights of the mother and the unborn child, the controversial prospect of "designer babies," the philosophical concern of "playing God," disability rights critiques, and the contentious practice of screening for late-onset disorders.

Keywords: Reproductive genetics, prenatal diagnosis, moral status, autonomy, bioethics

The right of the mother: Autonomy and informed choice

Central to the ethical defence of prenatal and preimplantation genetic diagnosis is the principle of maternal autonomy. The right of the pregnant individual to make informed choices about her body, pregnancy, and potential offspring is foundational in reproductive ethics. PGD and prenatal diagnostics empower prospective parents with information that may shape their reproductive decisions—ranging from selecting embryos without genetic mutations to choosing whether

---

* Business Head of Diagnostics, Reliance MedLab, Reliance Life Sciences, Navi Mumbai, India. E-mail: shailaja.saxena@ril.com • ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8613-8487.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.12681/aprlp.254.3301

to continue a pregnancy based on fetal health.

However, ethical dilemmas emerge when the principle of autonomy intersects with social pressures and medical expectations. Critics argue that an over-medicalization of reproduction may subtly coerce women into making "rational" choices aligned with societal ideals of health and normalcy (Lippman, 1991). For instance, the availability of prenatal screening may generate implicit pressure to terminate pregnancies with detectable anomalies, even when parents may be inclined to accept a child with a disability. True autonomy requires not just access to information, but freedom from coercion, bias, and social stigma.

The right of the unborn child: Future interests and moral status

Balancing maternal rights are ethical concerns regarding the fetus or embryo, particularly its moral status and future interests. Although the legal status of the unborn varies across jurisdictions, bioethical discourse considers whether fetuses have rights or interests that merit protection—especially as genetic technologies enable proactive selection or de-selection of embryos.

One key ethical challenge is whether PGD and prenatal testing treat embryos or fetuses instrumentally, reducing their value to genetic fitness or conformity with social norms. For example, selecting embryos based solely on their genetic desirability raises questions about conditional acceptance of human life (Devolder & Harris, 2007). Are we valuing future persons for their intrinsic worth, or only for the absence of perceived imperfections?

Moreover, critics question whether selecting for or against certain genetic traits encroaches upon the future autonomy of the child. If a child is selected for specific traits (e.g., intelligence markers or sex), does this impose parental expectations on the future individual, potentially infringing on their right to an open future?

The designer baby debate: Enhancement vs. therapy

The possibility of selecting embryos not just to avoid disease, but to enhance desired traits, such as intelligence, physical attributes, or personality, has sparked intense ethical controversy. This so-called "designer baby" debate distinguishes between therapeutic uses of PGD (to prevent serious genetic conditions) and enhancement (to select non-medical traits). Critics argue that enhancement undermines the moral principle of equality and risks commodifying children.

While current technology largely limits selection to disease prevention, the boundary between therapy and enhancement is not always clear. For instance, is selecting an embryo with a higher predicted IQ a medical intervention or a social advantage? As our understanding of polygenic traits improves, the temptation to enhance embryos for competitive traits may grow—raising concerns about genetic stratification, inequality, and societal pressure to conform to genetic norms (Gyngell et al., 2017).

Supporters of enhancement argue for reproductive freedom, suggesting that if safe and effective, selecting traits could benefit individual children and society at large. Yet, opponents warn that such practices could create new forms of discrimination and deepen existing social divides based on genetic privilege.

Are we playing God? Theological and existential concerns

A frequent criticism of reproductive genetic technologies is that they represent humanity "playing God"—an expression of hubris that defies natural limits and assumes control over creation. While the term lacks precise philosophical definition, it captures unease about human overreach and the moral risks of manipulating life's foundations.

The "playing God" argument is often grounded in religious or existential worldviews that view human life as sacred or fundamentally beyond full human control. Critics worry that genetic selection undermines humility and fosters a culture of perfectionism and eugenics. From a theological view, such as that expressed by Meilaender (2013), altering the genetic future of a child for non-therapeutic reasons risks diminishing the unconditional acceptance of offspring.

Proponents counter that using genetic knowledge to alleviate suffering and empower choice is not hubris but a responsible use of human ingenuity. The question, then, is not whether we are playing God, but whether we are acting ethically with the powers we now possess.

Disability critique: The expressivist objection

Perhaps one of the most profound ethical critiques comes from the disability rights community, which argues that widespread prenatal screening and selective abortion send a message that lives with disabilities are less valuable or undesirable. This is known as the expressivist objection: that the practice of eliminating fetuses with disabilities expresses and reinforces discriminatory attitudes toward people living with those conditions (Parens & Asch, 2000).

For example, the near-elimination of Down syndrome births in some countries due to prenatal screening raises the question: what does this say about society's willingness to accommodate and include individuals with intellectual disabilities?

Defenders of screening argue that the choice to avoid suffering is not equivalent to devaluing persons with disabilities. Yet, the critique highlights a social context in which disability is often seen as a burden rather than as a form of diversity. Ethical practice in genetic screening must be mindful of these dynamics and ensure that reproductive freedom does not come at the cost of reinforcing ableist assumptions.

Screening for late-onset disorders: Ethical timing and uncertain futures

Another controversial application of PGD and prenatal diagnostics is the screening for late-onset genetic disorders—such as Huntington's disease, BRCA-related cancers, or Alzheimer's. These conditions may not manifest until adulthood, and in some cases, may never become symptomatic due to variable penetrance or future medical advances.

Screening embryos or fetuses for such conditions raises several concerns:

- Informed Consent: Future individuals are denied the choice to remain ignorant of their genetic predispositions.
- Psychological Harm: Knowledge of a likely but distant genetic fate may lead to anxiety, stigma, or fatalism.
- Moral Justification: Is it ethically justifiable to discard embryos based on a risk that might not materialize for decades?

Critics argue that screening for late-onset disorders oversteps ethical boundaries by promoting genetic determinism and undermining the unpredictability of human life. Proponents argue that families should have the right to avoid transmitting severe hereditary conditions, especially when no cure exists (Knoppers et al., 2006). The ethics here hinge on balancing reproductive rights with respect for uncertainty, psychological impact, and future autonomy.

Conclusion: Navigating ethical complexity in genetic futures

The ethical landscape of prenatal diagnostics and PGD is a complex intersection of reproductive rights, moral philosophy, and societal values. It invites a rethinking of autonomy, responsibility, and the meaning of health, disability, and human diversity. While these technologies offer tangible benefits in preventing suffering and enabling informed choices, they also risk reinforcing social inequalities, commodifying reproduction, and marginalizing those who do not conform to genetic ideals.

Ethical governance must ensure that these technologies are used in ways that uphold human dignity, respect individual autonomy without coercion, and foster inclusive societies that value all forms of life—regardless of genetic makeup. Policymakers, healthcare providers, and bioethicists must collaborate to establish frameworks that balance innovation with moral responsibility, always keeping in view the question: not just what we *can* do, but what we *should* do.

References

Devolder, K., & Harris, J. (2007). Enhancing evolution: The ethical case for making better people. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 33*(11), 659–663. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2007.021220.

Gyngell, C., Douglas, T., & Savulescu, J. (2017). The ethics of germline gene editing. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 34*(4), 498–513. https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.12249.

Knoppers, B. M., Sénécal, K., Alghrani, A., & Borry, P. (2006). Preimplantation genetic diagnosis: An overview of socio-ethical and legal considerations. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics, 7,* 201–215. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.genom.7.080505.115745.

Lippman, A. (1991). Prenatal genetic testing and screening: Constructing needs and reinforcing inequities. *American Journal of Law and Medicine, 17*(1–2), 15–50. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0098858800006264.

Parens, E., & Asch, A. (2000). Prenatal testing and disability rights. *Hastings Center Report, 30*(3), S1–S38. https://doi.org/10.2307/3528578.