My thesis is an intellectual inquiry into the moral debate over human genetic enhancements in children. To supplement the discussion of enhancement, I defined terms and concepts relevant to understanding the debate so that the following discourse is operating under the same premises. This included specific descriptions of reproductive technologies relevant to genetic engineering, such as *in vitro* fertilization and pre-implantation genetic diagnosis. I also included a section discussing scientific skepticisms of the ability to develop genetic enhancement technology and safely deliver the enhancement to the proper site in the genome. These scientific uncertainties about genetic engineering technology, however, should not preclude a theoretical based assessment of genetic enhancement. To compliment the scientific background, there is a section where I discuss the socio-cultural drive Americans have to use enhancement technologies.

As for the theoretical arguments, those against genetic enhancement argue from a gratitude framework, where as those for genetic enhancement argue from a creativity framework. I reviewed arguments representative of the pro and con positions, and analyzed them based on their ability to defend their position. I also looked to see if any argument could be employed as a normative policy consistent with the parameters of our pluralistic. The positions considered include the President’s Council on Bioethics’s stance in *Beyond Therapy: Biotechnology and the Pursuit of Happiness*, Michael Sandel’s hubris objection to enhancement, Francis Fukuyama’s appeal to human nature, John A. Robertson’s libertarian defense of procreative liberty, and Nicholas Agar’s claim for tolerance of liberal eugenics. To compliment the theoretical discussion, I apply the lessons learned from the use of synthetic human growth hormone in children of idiopathic short stature, a clear form of enhancement, to the dispute on genetic enhancement in children.

I found that Robertson’s libertarian notion of procreative liberty is not only defensible, but works normatively as a legally derived right of parents to procreate free from interference of the state. Furthermore, if there is no resolution of the enhancement debate, then society will operate on procreative liberty by default. The compromise I argue for is asserted by Françoise Baylis and Jason Scott Robert. They claim that genetic engineering is inevitable because science will advance, and therefore resources should not be wasted on an endless debate, but put towards ensuring the enhancement technology develops ethically and to serve the public’s desires. Their position is the most practical solution for our pluralistic society. It is respectful of procreative liberty,
but adamant about placing socially approved limitations to the use of enhancement technology. This compromise is also realistic in recognizing that science will proceed, but that society can influence the direction and type of progress it makes. I conclude that proponents should put aside their differences and work towards this end.