

BIOTECHNOLOGY, HUMAN DIGNITY, AND THE LIMITS OF ENHANCEMENT IN AFRICAN ETHICS

Etaoghene Paul Polo

Department of Philosophy, University of Delta, Agbor, Delta State, Nigeria

etaoghenepaulpolo@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1606-0273>

Adedayo Jenfa C.M.

Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos, Nigeria

jeffadedayo@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Advancements in biotechnology such as genetic engineering, cognitive enhancements, and neuroprosthetics unceasingly provoke global discussions on the future of humanity. In relation to these innovations, there exist two categories of thinkers whose views often shape ethical considerations. The first is the category of transhumanists, who completely endorse biotechnological breakthroughs, regarding them as essential measures for transcending the natural limitations of humans. The second category is that of African ethicists, who are committed to raising questions as to the moral implications of biotechnology-aided enhancements. Hinged on African communal values, particularly human integrity, human dignity, and social harmony, this paper seeks to explore the ethical limits of human enchantment. Precisely, the paper is aimed at determining whether the augmentation of human capabilities through biotechnology aligns with African moral values which stress balance, sacredness of human life, and relational personhood. Adopting a philosophical and qualitative methodology, as well as conceptual clarification, normative reasoning, analysis, and evaluation of relevant African philosophical texts, bioethical arguments, and transhumanist literature, the paper critically considers African communitarian ethics and enhancement-driven frameworks, with the aim of revealing the areas of convergence and tension. Themes such as moral status, identity, and socio-cultural implications of enhanced beings in African societies are given special attention. The ultimate argument of this paper is that while therapeutic applications of biotechnology may resonate with the African quest to restore human dignity and promote communal well-being, radical enhancements are at risk of distorting the moral fabric of African life. Aiming to contextualise global bioethical discourse by situating it in African traditions, the paper contributes to the growing body of literature. It concludes by proposing an ethically-grounded framework for biotechnological innovation; one that does not disrespect African notions of personhood and collective flourishing.

Keywords: Biotechnology, Human Dignity, Limits of Enhancement, African Ethics

INTRODUCTION

Advances in biotechnology, including genetic engineering, neuroprosthetics, and cognitive enhancement, have prompted profound global ethical discussions. On one hand,

transhumanists argue that such innovations offer unprecedented opportunities for surpassing biological limits and enhancing the human condition (Transhumanism, 2025). However, African ethical thinkers rooted in communal values challenge the assumption that enhancement inevitably contributes to human dignity. Their concern centres on whether such technologies truly align with traditions that emphasise relational personhood, human integrity, and social harmony.

This article explores whether augmentation of human capacities via biotechnology can align with African moral values, especially those grounded in communal responsibility, collective flourishing, and sacredness of life. Many therapeutic applications appear compatible with African ethics, particularly when they restore dignity and support communal well-being. However, radical enhancements, those extending beyond restoration into amplification of capabilities, risk undermining the moral balance foundational to African traditions.

Drawing on a philosophical and qualitative methodology, this article examines African philosophical and bioethical literature, including the influential relational moral theory of Thaddeus Metz. Through normative reasoning, conceptual analysis, and application of relevant texts, we explore points of convergence and tension between transhumanist ideals and African ethical principles. The aim is to clarify core ethical concerns, assess the merits of therapeutic versus radical enhancements, and propose an ethically grounded framework suited to African cultural contexts.

AFRICAN COMMUNITARIAN ETHICS: FOUNDATIONS AND MORAL ORIENTATION

African communitarian ethics offers a philosophical framework that places community at the centre of moral life. Unlike highly individualistic ethical systems prevalent in many Western traditions, African thought generally views persons as fundamentally relational beings whose identity and moral worth are defined by their connections with others (Mbiti, 1969; Menkiti, 1984). In this worldview, personhood is not merely an innate status but a moral achievement; one becomes a full person by participating in, and contributing to, the well-being of the community.

Thaddeus Metz (2010) captures this orientation by proposing that the central moral principle in African ethics is to promote harmony through shared identity and solidarity. Actions are judged ethically right when they foster communal relationships marked by empathy, reciprocity, and cooperation, and wrong when they cause discord or alienation. This communitarian ethos is evident in the widely cited maxim, *umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu* (“a person is a person through other persons”), which encapsulates the African belief that individual flourishing is inseparable from communal flourishing.

From this perspective, human dignity is not merely an intrinsic property of rational agents but a quality realised in the fulfilment of communal obligations and the respectful treatment of others (Wiredu, 1992). Biotechnology, therefore, must be assessed in terms of its potential to sustain or disrupt this moral fabric. If a technological intervention enhances an individual's abilities but isolates them socially or creates inequality within the community, it would be seen as morally problematic, regardless of its efficiency or novelty.

This moral orientation has significant implications for evaluating enhancement technologies. In African ethics, the pursuit of individual excellence detached from collective benefit may be viewed as morally deficient. Thus, any biotechnological enhancement that widens the gap between individuals, creating hierarchies of ability or privilege, could be seen as violating the values of solidarity and equality that underpin African communal life (Gyekye, 1997). The ethical challenge, then, lies in distinguishing between enhancements that promote collective flourishing and those that erode communal harmony.

BIOTECHNOLOGY AND THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN DIGNITY

The notion of human dignity occupies a central place in both global bioethics and African communitarian ethics, yet the two traditions often articulate it in distinct ways. In many Western philosophical and legal frameworks, dignity is understood as an inherent and inalienable quality possessed equally by all humans by virtue of their rational agency or moral capacity (Kant, 1996; Beyleveld & Brownsword, 2001). This view often translates into the principle that individuals have a right to self-determination in matters affecting their own bodies, including decisions about biotechnological interventions.

In contrast, the African communitarian perspective tends to conceive dignity as something that is both inherent and relational. While every human being possesses a basic dignity by virtue of being human, the fuller realisation of dignity is achieved through one's moral integration within the community (Menkiti, 1984; Metz, 2012). In this light, dignity is not purely an individual attribute but also a measure of the extent to which one lives harmoniously with others and contributes to the common good.

This divergence has profound implications for the ethics of human enhancement. A Western rights-based view might support an individual's autonomous choice to pursue cognitive or physical enhancement, so long as it does not harm others. The African relational view, however, would add a second evaluative criterion: whether such enhancement strengthens or undermines communal relationships. An enhancement that benefits the individual but disrupts social equality or harmony would be ethically questionable (Gyekye, 1997).

Furthermore, biotechnology challenges traditional conceptions of the boundaries between the natural and the artificial, raising the question of whether altering human capacities through technological means is compatible with respecting human dignity (Habermas, 2003). Critics

argue that certain forms of enhancement, particularly those aimed at non-therapeutic improvement, risk instrumentalising the human body, treating it as a modifiable object rather than a subject with intrinsic worth. Proponents, on the other hand, maintain that enhancing human capacities can be an expression of human creativity and self-determination, and thus compatible with dignity when pursued responsibly (Agar, 2014).

In African thought, this debate is filtered through the lens of communal wellbeing. The acceptability of enhancement would depend on its capacity to foster communal bonds, reduce suffering, and promote mutual respect. For example, genetic modifications that prevent hereditary diseases might be widely embraced if they are accessible to all and do not create divisions between the enhanced and the unenhanced. Conversely, enhancements that confer competitive advantages in education, employment, or social status, but are only available to a privileged few, could exacerbate inequality and weaken social cohesion, thereby undermining dignity in its communal sense.

Thus, the intersection between biotechnology and human dignity is not merely a question of individual rights but also of collective responsibility. Ethical assessment must therefore integrate both the individualist rights-based approach and the relational communitarian perspective if it is to be globally relevant.

BIOETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND HUMAN ENHANCEMENT

The four principles of bioethics, autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, provide a well-established framework for evaluating biomedical practices (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019). When applied to human enhancement through biotechnology, these principles require careful balancing, particularly when brought into dialogue with African communitarian ethics.

Autonomy and Communal Responsibility

In Western bioethics, autonomy refers to the right of individuals to make informed decisions about their own bodies and lives without undue interference (O'Neill, 2002). In the context of biotechnology, this principle supports an individual's choice to accept or refuse enhancement, provided that they have been fully informed of the risks, benefits, and alternatives. However, African communalism tempers autonomy with the idea that personal decisions should be made in light of their impact on the community (Menkiti, 1984; Wiredu, 1992). Decisions about enhancement are thus not purely private matters but carry moral weight in their potential to influence social harmony and equity.

For example, if a genetic enhancement is available only to wealthy individuals, a purely autonomy-based justification may fail to account for the social divisions it might exacerbate. The communitarian view would question the ethicality of such a choice, even if freely made, if it undermines solidarity and mutual care.

Beneficence and the Common Good

Beneficence requires that actions promote the wellbeing of individuals and, in broader terms, society. In biotechnology, this translates into ensuring that enhancements produce tangible benefits, whether in health, cognitive capacity, or quality of life, without imposing unreasonable risks (Harris, 2007). African communal ethics extends this principle by framing wellbeing in collective terms: what benefits the individual should also uplift the community. An enhancement that makes a person healthier or more capable but isolates them socially or creates envy and resentment may fail the communal test of beneficence.

From this perspective, therapeutic enhancements aimed at curing genetic diseases could be seen as strongly beneficent if distributed equitably, whereas enhancements designed solely for competitive advantage in sports or academics may have mixed ethical value depending on their social consequences.

Non-Maleficence and Social Harm

The principle of non-maleficence, expressed as “do no harm,” is traditionally interpreted in biomedical ethics as avoiding physical injury or health risks to the patient. However, in the African communitarian framework, harm is not limited to physical or psychological injury; it also encompasses social and relational damage. An enhancement that causes no physical harm to an individual but erodes social trust, stigmatises the unenhanced, or creates new forms of exclusion would be considered morally problematic (Metz, 2010).

This expanded understanding of harm becomes crucial when assessing the long-term societal effects of enhancement technologies. The creation of distinct “enhanced” and “unenhanced” classes could breed resentment, reduce cooperation, and destabilise social cohesion, constituting a form of communal harm even in the absence of direct injury.

Justice and Equitable Access

The principle of justice demands fair distribution of the benefits and burdens of biotechnological advancements. In a global context, justice also speaks to the need to avoid exacerbating existing inequalities between countries, regions, and socio-economic classes (Daniels, 2008). African communalism aligns strongly with this principle, viewing the fair allocation of resources as essential to maintaining harmony and mutual respect within the community (Gyekye, 1997).

Enhancement technologies that are accessible only to an elite few would contravene both the Western principle of justice and the African ideal of communal fairness. A just system would require policies ensuring that biotechnological benefits are shared widely, perhaps through public funding, regulatory controls, or international agreements that prevent monopolisation by private corporations.

Taken together, the four bioethical principles and African communal values do not necessarily conflict, but they do differ in emphasis. While Western bioethics tends to foreground individual rights and protections, African ethics situates these within a web of social obligations and collective wellbeing. A synthesis of the two could yield a more comprehensive evaluative framework, capable of addressing both personal freedom and social justice in the era of biotechnology.

AFRICAN COMMUNALISM AND THE MORAL LIMITS OF BIOTECHNOLOGY

African communalism is both a social philosophy and a moral worldview that emphasises the interconnectedness of persons within a community. Rooted in the understanding that “a person is a person through other persons” (*ubuntu*), it resists extreme individualism and insists that personal identity, moral worth, and social legitimacy are grounded in relational belonging (Menkiti, 1984; Mbiti, 1969). This perspective has significant implications for the moral evaluation of biotechnological interventions, especially in the realm of human enhancement.

The Relational Conception of Personhood

African philosophical anthropology often treats personhood not as an automatic status conferred at birth, but as a moral achievement developed through social participation, fulfilment of communal obligations, and cultivation of virtues (Gyekye, 1997). Menkiti’s (1984) thesis distinguishes between the “minimal” sense of personhood, which is biological and universal, and the “maximal” sense, which must be earned through socially recognised conduct.

When applied to biotechnology, this understanding shifts the moral focus from technological capability to moral responsibility. An enhanced cognitive ability or increased physical strength, for example, does not necessarily elevate a person’s moral standing unless these capacities are deployed in ways that benefit and sustain the community. In this sense, African communalism provides a moral counterweight to purely performance-oriented justifications for enhancement.

Communal Benefit as an Ethical Criterion

Unlike some strands of Western liberal thought that might accept an enhancement if it benefits the individual without infringing upon the rights of others, African communal ethics subjects enhancements to a higher bar: they must contribute positively to the welfare of the community as a whole. This means that the moral legitimacy of a biotechnology is contingent upon its alignment with collective well-being, social stability, and the promotion of mutual care (Wiredu, 1992).

This standard has practical implications. For instance, germline editing to eradicate a heritable disease could be justified under African communal ethics because it prevents suffering and

enhances the health of future generations. By contrast, enhancements aimed solely at giving individuals an edge in competitive domains, such as cosmetic genetic modifications for athletic advantage, may be morally suspected if they deepen divisions or undermine fairness within the community.

Caution Against Disrupting Social Harmony

A core value in African communal thought is social harmony, which Metz (2010) defines as the enjoyment of friendly relationships and the cooperative pursuit of shared goods. Biotechnology that creates significant disparities between people, whether in intelligence, physical ability, or lifespan, risks disrupting this harmony. Even if such technologies are safe and effective at the individual level, they may generate envy, resentment, or alienation, thereby corroding the trust that underpins communal life.

This is particularly relevant when considering the commodification of enhancement technologies. If these technologies are sold in markets where access is determined by wealth, they may exacerbate existing socio-economic inequalities, creating a stratified society where “enhanced” individuals wield disproportionate influence over the “unenhanced.” Such an outcome would be in direct tension with the communitarian emphasis on solidarity and shared dignity.

The Moral Limits of Human Enhancement

African communalism does not reject all forms of enhancement outright but imposes moral boundaries grounded in relational ethics. The following limits can be distilled from the communalist perspective:

- a.** Enhancements should serve communal flourishing, not merely personal ambition.
- b.** They must avoid creating or deepening social inequalities that fracture communal bonds.
- c.** They should preserve shared human vulnerability, which fosters empathy and mutual support.
- d.** They should respect cultural narratives and moral traditions that give meaning to life within the community.

By these standards, therapeutic enhancements aimed at preventing or curing disease are more ethically defensible than those pursued for purely competitive or aesthetic reasons. Furthermore, even therapeutically motivated interventions must be introduced in ways that ensure equitable access, public deliberation, and cultural sensitivity.

INTEGRATING AFRICAN COMMUNALISM INTO GLOBAL BIOETHICS

In the broader discourse of global bioethics, African communalism offers a corrective to overly individualistic frameworks. It insists that moral reasoning about biotechnology cannot be complete without considering its impact on social relationships and communal identity. This approach complements, rather than replaces, the four principles of bioethics, creating a richer ethical lens through which to assess the promises and perils of human enhancement.

For instance, while the principle of autonomy might allow an individual to choose a particular enhancement, African communalism would ask whether that choice upholds the social fabric and contributes to collective well-being. Similarly, while beneficence might be satisfied if an enhancement improves an individual's health, communalism would ask whether it also enhances social cooperation and inclusivity.

This integration could be operationalised through policies that require community consultation, public engagement, and distributive justice mechanisms before new biotechnologies are approved for use. In doing so, it ensures that technological innovation advances in a way that respects both individual dignity and collective flourishing.

Case Studies and Applied Ethical Analysis

To illuminate how the combined framework of the four bioethical principles and African communalism can be applied in practice, this section examines selected real-world and hypothetical scenarios of human enhancement. These cases will be assessed through the dual lenses of principlism (autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice) and African communal ethics.

Case Study 1: Germline Editing to Eradicate Sickle Cell Disease

Background

Sickle cell disease (SCD) is a genetic blood disorder prevalent in parts of Africa, causing severe pain, anaemia, and increased risk of infections. Germline editing using CRISPR-Cas9 technology has been proposed as a potential cure, enabling the correction of the defective gene in embryos before birth. This would permanently remove the mutation from the genetic lineage.

Principlism Analysis

- **Autonomy:** Parents have the right to make reproductive choices that prevent suffering in their children. Informed consent processes would need to ensure parents fully understand the benefits, risks, and uncertainties of the technology.

- **Beneficence:** The intervention promises to prevent immense suffering and improve the quality of life for future generations.
- **Non-maleficence:** Given the possibility of unintended genetic changes (off-target effects), strict safeguards, long-term monitoring, and rigorous preclinical testing are essential.
- **Justice:** Equal access is critical. Limiting this technology to wealthy families would exacerbate health inequalities.

African Communalism Analysis

From a communalist perspective, the intervention aligns with the principle of enhancing collective well-being. Eradicating SCD benefits not only individuals but also families and communities by reducing the economic and emotional burden of the disease. However, to fully align with communal ethics, policies must ensure that access is not determined by socio-economic privilege and that public dialogue includes affected communities in shaping the ethical guidelines for its use.

Conclusion

Under both principlism and African communalism, germline editing for SCD is ethically permissible if implemented with robust safety, equitable access, and community engagement.

Case Study 2: Genetic Enhancement for Athletic Performance

Background

A biotech company offers gene therapy to enhance muscle mass, endurance, and oxygen uptake in healthy individuals. Elite athletes are among the target clients, seeking a competitive advantage.

Principlism Analysis

- **Autonomy:** Athletes may voluntarily choose the enhancement, but the pressures of competitive sports may compromise genuine consent.
- **Beneficence:** Potential personal gains include improved performance and career advancement.
- **Non-maleficence:** Unknown long-term effects of genetic modifications could endanger health. The therapy might also undermine the integrity of sport and lead to coercive pressures on others to undergo similar enhancements.
- **Justice:** The enhancement would be available only to those with substantial financial resources, reinforcing socio-economic inequalities.

African Communalism Analysis

From a communalist standpoint, the enhancement is ethically suspected. It prioritises individual glory over communal harmony and risks fostering division within both the sporting community and the wider public. If such enhancements create a privileged “enhanced” class of athletes, communal solidarity and fairness in competition would be undermined.

Conclusion

While principlism may not categorically prohibit the enhancement (if risks are managed), African communalism imposes a stricter moral limit, rejecting enhancements that privilege individual advantage at the expense of collective integrity and fairness.

Case Study 3: Cognitive Enhancement in Education

Background

A pharmaceutical company develops a safe and effective neuro-enhancement pill that significantly improves memory, concentration, and learning speed. Initially marketed for students with learning disabilities, it becomes popular among healthy students seeking academic advantage.

Principlism Analysis

- **Autonomy:** Students and parents may freely choose to use the pill, though societal pressures and competitive academic environments could limit genuine voluntariness.
- **Beneficence:** Enhanced cognitive function could improve academic performance and career prospects.
- **Non-maleficence:** Potential side effects, dependency, or long-term neurological changes must be considered.
- **Justice:** Unequal access would create educational disparities, potentially widening the socio-economic gap.

African Communalism Analysis

Communal ethics evaluates the enhancement not merely by its effect on the individual but by its impact on shared educational equity. If cognitive enhancers become a prerequisite for academic success, those unable to afford them would be disadvantaged, leading to social division and diminished solidarity. Additionally, overreliance on pharmacological solutions could devalue communal practices of mentorship, collaborative learning, and moral education.

Conclusion

While principlism offers a conditional acceptance if safety and fairness are ensured, African communalism cautions against any enhancement that undermines collective equality and erodes cultural approaches to education.

Case Study 4: Lifespan Extension Biotechnology

Background

Advanced biotechnology promises to significantly slow ageing, potentially extending human lifespan to 150 years. Early adopters are wealthy elites, with high costs making access exclusive.

Principlism Analysis

- **Autonomy:** Individuals should have the freedom to choose lifespan extension if it is safe and effective.
- **Beneficence:** Longer life may offer opportunities for extended personal development and contributions to society.
- **Non-maleficence:** Extended lifespans could create social challenges, including overpopulation, resource strain, and generational inequities.
- **Justice:** Exclusive access to lifespan extension would deepen class divisions, creating a biologically privileged elite.

African Communalism Analysis

Communalism views lifespan within the context of generational interdependence and the cyclical renewal of community life. Dramatically extending lifespan for a selected few could hinder generational succession, limit opportunities for younger members, and upset the balance of communal responsibilities. Such technologies could also erode the shared human experience of ageing and mortality, which underpins empathy and solidarity.

Conclusion

Both principlism and African communalism raise serious justice concerns. While principlism may see lifespan extension as morally permissible if universally accessible and sustainably managed, African communalism questions whether the practice is compatible with the natural rhythms of communal life.

Synthesis of Insights from Case Studies

These case studies demonstrate that while principlism provides a strong framework for balancing individual rights, benefits, risks, and fairness, it can be enriched by the relational and solidarity-focused insights of African communalism. Principlism might accept certain enhancements under conditions of safety and fairness, whereas communalism adds further scrutiny, asking: Does this technology genuinely strengthen the bonds of community and promote shared flourishing?

The combined approach yields a more holistic ethical evaluation, ensuring that advances in biotechnology are not only medically sound and procedurally just but also socially harmonious and culturally resonant.

CONCLUSION

This study has explored the ethical viability of human enhancement technologies through the dual lens of the four bioethical principles, autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, and the relational moral framework of African communalism. The analysis has shown that while bioethics offers a robust, widely accepted set of evaluative criteria for emerging biomedical interventions, African communitarian thought adds an indispensable layer of moral reasoning grounded in the collective well-being, interdependence, and sacredness of life.

From a bioethical standpoint, therapeutic enhancements that restore lost functions or address medical needs can be ethically justified, provided they respect patient autonomy, promote well-being, avoid undue harm, and distribute benefits equitably. However, radical enhancements, aimed at augmenting human capacities beyond typical species norms, pose complex moral challenges. They often strain the principle of justice by creating or exacerbating socio-economic inequities and can raise concerns about informed consent in contexts of cultural or social pressure.

African communalism deepens this analysis by reframing the human person as inherently embedded in social relationships. In this view, human dignity is not an isolated attribute but a lived reality maintained through mutual recognition, contribution, and care. Enhancements that risk fragmenting communal bonds or undermining the moral agency of the person are therefore ethically suspected, even if they meet certain individualistic bioethical criteria. The African relational ethic also anchors dignity in the sacredness of life, which constrains interventions that could be perceived as overstepping the moral boundaries of human nature.

The synthesis of these frameworks offers a richer evaluative matrix for policy-making. Policymakers and bioethics committees should integrate African communitarian values into existing ethical review processes, ensuring that considerations of justice and dignity extend beyond individual rights to encompass the well-being of the community. Such integration can

help safeguard against technologically driven inequalities and promote socially sustainable innovation.

Ultimately, the ethical evaluation of human enhancement should not be reduced to a binary of acceptance or rejection. Rather, it should involve a nuanced, context-sensitive process that respects both universal bioethical principles and culturally embedded moral perspectives. The convergence of bioethics and African communalism presents a promising pathway for developing regulatory and ethical frameworks that are globally relevant yet locally resonant, preserving the delicate balance between individual aspirations and the collective good.

REFERENCES

- Agar, N. (2014). *Truly human enhancement: A philosophical defence of limits*. MIT Press.
- Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Beyleveld, D., & Brownsword, R. (2001). *Human dignity in bioethics and biolaw*. Oxford University Press.
- Daniels, N. (2008). *Just health: Meeting health needs fairly*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (2003). *The future of human nature*. Polity Press.
- Harris, J. (2007). *Enhancing evolution: The ethical case for making better people*. Princeton University Press.
- Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1797)
- Mbiti, J. S. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*. Heinemann.
- Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and community in African traditional thought. In R. A. Wright (Ed.), *African philosophy: An introduction* (3rd ed., pp. 171–181). University Press of America.
- Metz, T. (2010). African and Western moral theories in a bioethical context. *Developing World Bioethics*, 10(1), 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8847.2009.00273.x>
- Metz, T. (2010). Toward an African moral theory. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(3), 321–341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2007.00280.x>
- Metz, T. (2012). An African theory of dignity and a relational moral theory. *Human Rights Review*, 13(1), 19–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-011-0200-8>
- O'Neill, O. (2002). *Autonomy and trust in bioethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wikipedia. (2025, August). *Transhumanism*. In Wikipedia. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transhumanism>
- Wiredu, K. (1992). Moral foundations of an African culture. In K. Wiredu & K. Gyekye (Eds.), *Person and community: Ghanaian philosophical studies*, I (pp. 193–206). Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.