

PLAYING GOD ARGUMENT AND THE TRANSHUMANISTS' DREAM OF A BRAVE NEW WORLD

[Tanrı Rolü Argümanı ve Transhümanistlerin Cesur Yeni Dünya Hayali]

Ndukaku Okorie

Ph.D., Obafemi Awolowo University, Department of Philosophy

ncokorie@oauife.edu.ng

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-003-3098-3303>

Oluwaseun Funke Ogunsoto

Obafemi Awolowo University

oluwaseundaniella@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The dream, passionate desire and aspiration of creating a brave new world where human beings are not only free from all biological constraints but also greatly enhanced with super qualities that surpasses what is obtainable in humanity has been subjected to serious normative interrogation in bioethics. One of the major objections levelled against this dream is the “Playing God” argument. This argument states that any act to intervene in nature or usurp

powers or roles assigned to God is morally wrong or reprehensible. That is, an attempt to enhance and transform human beings beyond what is currently obtainable amounts to “playing God” thereby challenging God’s “masterpiece”. On the contrary, this paper argues that the Playing God Argument is not only baseless, unfounded, and weak; it fails to establish a strong and logical objection against the transhumanist dream for a brave new world.

Keywords: Playing God Argument, transhumanism, bioethics.

ÖZET

İnsanların tüm biyolojik kısıtlamalardan özgür olduğu ve aynı zamanda insanlıkta mevcut olandan çok daha üstün niteliklerle donatıldığı bir “Cesur Yeni Dünya” yaratma arzusu, biyoetikte ciddi normatif tartışmalara konu olmuştur. Bu hayale yöneltilen temel itirazlardan biri “Tanrı Rolü Oynama” argümanıdır. Bu argümana göre, doğaya müdahale etmek veya Tanrı’ya atfedilmiş güç ve rolleri üstlenmek ahlaken yanlış veya kınanması gereken bir eylemdir. Yani, insanları mevcut sınırlarının ötesinde geliştirme girişimi, “Tanrı rolü oynama” anlamına gelir ve Tanrı’nın “başyapıtına” meydan okur. Ancak bu makale, Tanrı Rolü Oynama Argümanının dayanaksız, temelsiz ve zayıf olduğunu; transhümanistlerin Cesur Yeni Dünya hayaline karşı güçlü ve mantıklı bir itiraz oluşturmakta yetersiz kaldığını savunmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Tanrı Rolü Argümanı, transhümanizm, biyoetik.

Introduction

One of the major arguments raised against the transhumanist dream of a brave new world is the Playing God Argument. (Coady, 2009, p.155). Proponents of this argument object the desire to have a new world on the basis that such desire places man in the position of exercising authority and powers strictly reserved for God or acting in the capacity of God in the Universe. This paper examines this argument and argues first that this argument is not only unfounded and baseless but also fails to establish a strong and logical objection against transhumanism. Second, the playing God argument is vague, ambiguous, and runs on the assumption that there is a concise understanding of nature and what it means to “Play God”. Hence, it does not count as a viable criterion for the moral evaluation of transhumanism. To do this, this paper is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the transhumanist dream of a brave new world. What it entails and the expectations. In the second section, the playing God argument is presented as an attack on the aspiration for a brave new world. The last section established that Playing God objection fails to adequately prove the moral implausibility of transhumanism. That is, the objection does not adequately establish the implausibility of the transhumanists’ dream of a brave new world.

The Transhumanist Project for the Creation of a Brave New World

The desire to create a brave new world where humans are no longer restricted and confined by biological limitations such as diseases, pains, sufferings, and death but are also enhanced with super capacities is intrinsic since the dawn of humanity. According to Bostrom, this desire dates to the period when prehistoric men and women longed and worked towards extending and enhancing the human condition. (Bostrom, 2005, p.1). Prehistoric humans expressed this desire through their quest for “immortality Elixir.” Ancient Greek mythology reveals how alchemists made efforts to overcome sickness and death by getting medicine that would make humans live forever.

Also, in the ancient Chinese book titled Liezi that was written by Lie Yukou in the 10th century B.C., a story was narrated that pointed to the origin of robotics and artificial intelligence, one of the tools for achieving the brave new world. The story is about a craftsman known as Yanshi who crafted an actor, which is a replica of a human. This actor can interact and behave like a human being. Yanshi, who happens to be the friend of the King- Zhou Mu- presented the actor

to the king, and as the king had a contact with the actor, it began to sing. When Yanshi then held the actor's hand, it began to dance. The actor executed complex performances and behaviours according to the directions of its master. The robotic actor had internal organs, bones, muscle, skin, hair, and teeth like a human—but all were artificial. (Mccollum, 2013, p. xvi).

Several mediums to achieve this desire have not yielded expected results. The recent advancement in science and technology, which cumulated in the emergence of sophisticated biotechnologies, presented the opportunity of overcoming limitations inherent in humanity while also moving humanity to the next stage. This development appears to move humanity towards achieving the age-long dream of becoming super beings who are not only free from diseases, pains, and avoidable sufferings but also have super intellectual, emotional, and physiological capacities that are far above what can be seen in any human beings.

The completion of the human genome project in the late 20th century further led to the rise of the movement called transhumanism that is driven by the agenda of creating a new world with new species. Although transhumanism is a twentieth-century movement, the agenda it stands to promote started at the onset of the Renaissance/Enlightenment period in the 17th and 18th centuries. (More, 2013, p.9-10). Its origin has also been traced to Darwin's theory of evolution in the 1850s. Darwin, in his work titled *On the Origin of Species*, conceived man as an evolving being that transited from an earlier form of being to the present human form and is capable of transforming into any kind of species. (Darwin, 2003, p.1-7).

Transhumanism is a bit difficult to define due to the multifarious nature of the movement; however, the most cited definition of transhumanism was given by Nick Bostrom in the Transhumanist FAQ. According to him:

Transhumanism is an intellectual and cultural movement that defends the possibility and desirability of fundamentally improving the human condition through applied or rational reason, especially by developing and making use of widely available technologies to eliminate biological constraints and to greatly enhance human intellectual, physical, and psychological capacities. (Transhumanist FAQ Various, 2003, p.1)

Transhumanism is a cultural and philosophical movement. It is not a mere technological phenomenon cooked up by some group of people. It is a diverse movement that has roots in

various intellectual traditions such as humanism, enlightenment rationalism, and even science fiction. (More, 2013, p.4-6). Part of the movement whose root is in enlightenment rationalism is considered the classic transhumanism. The movement is associated with Nick Bostrom and David Pearce. While others known as contemporary transhumanism which is associated with FM 2030 (known as Fereidoun M. Esfandiary), Max More, and Natasha Vita-More among others is often seen as the original transhumanism.

Transhumanism, as its name suggests, is an attempt to go beyond or radically transcend humanity in all its limitations using emergent biotechnologies. Transhumanism is the mediate stage between humanity and posthumanity, which is proposed to be the last stage of human evolution. (Bostrom, 2003, p. 6). It defended the fact that it is possible to fundamentally enhance or improve the human condition. The process of improving human condition envisaged by the transhumanists is guided by rational thought and scientific knowledge rather than superstition, dogma, or unchecked technological enthusiasm. This suggests that the proposed approach by transhumanism is both methodical and ethical.

The foundation of the transhumanist perspective on the future is the idea that the human species in its current form does not represent the conclusion of our development but rather a relatively early stage. (Bostrom, 2003, p.6). A stage characterised by lots of inadequacies, limitations, and constraints. They consider the human species as a work-in-progress that remains half-baked and requires more baking. (Bostrom, 2005, p.1). This baking, however, cannot be done through natural evolution because it is too slow. Relying on natural evolution will take us millions of years to complete this huge task. Hence, there is a need to hasten the process through the use of science and technology. Through the application of existing, present, and emerging technologies, humans can become a species no longer accurately described as humans by our current standards but as transhumans. (Bostrom, 2005, p.2-5). In the creation of a brave new world, they aimed at achieving three goals, which are; elimination of aging or achieving immortality, and the enhancement of human intellectual, physical, and psychological capacities. (Bostrom, 2013, p.29).

Transhumanists, however, differ on the basis of the degree and extent to which the human condition would be altered, what the transhuman would look like, and potential technologies for its actualisation. These differences are responsible for the existence of different variants of transhumanism. However, despite the differences on these, transhumanism is driven by several

guiding ideas or themes that include; “the desirability of human self-design, the complete liberation of the human race from its biological constraints, the radical transformation of human nature, the elimination of all unnecessary suffering, the expansion of human autonomy and immortality, and the ultimate defeat of human nature”. (Tirosh-Samuelson, 2010, p.28).

Transhumanists propose two possible scenarios for the possibility of posthumans. The first scenario entails either redesigning the human organism using advanced nanotechnology or radically enhancing existing human species using some combination of technologies such as genetic engineering, psychopharmacology, anti-aging therapies, neural interfaces, advanced information management tools, memory enhancing drugs, and wearable computers. The second scenario involves the upload of the human mind or consciousness into more durable machines that can live forever. (Bostrom, 2003, p.9-19).

Although the transhumanist’s dream for a brave new world appears persuasive and promising, a critical look at the dream raises some ethical questions, such as, is transhumanism morally right? Do we have the moral right to alter human nature? Is it morally right to tamper with the existing human condition? Judging the moral normativity of this dream had received lots of attention from philosophers that had advanced different arguments for or against the moral plausibility of transhumanism. One of the objections raised against transhumanism is the Playing God Argument. But the tenability of this argument as an objection against the transhumanist dream for the creation of the brave new world is worthy of consideration.

Playing God Argument as an Attack on the Brave New World

The playing God argument is one of the distinctive arguments raised against human enhancement and genetic engineering in general. (Peters, 2007, p.173). It is an argument levelled against medical and non-medical interventions in the works of nature, either humans, animals, or the physical environment. In bioethics, this argument is directed at opposing attempts to alter human life. Although the argument has both religious and secular undertone, the central line of thought expressed through this objection is that humans should not interfere with things considered to be beyond human domain. (Weckert, 2016, p.87). It is also known as the non-interference argument (Evans, 2002, p.125).

The objection is often used to invoke a precautionary principle or to mount a charge of human hubris that humans are not allowed to claim for themselves that which is said to be the sole

providence of the divine. (Grey, 2012, p.468). According to Weckert, the playing God argument, rather than being about the evil or harms that can eschew from human intervention in the work of nature, is particular about the fact that these interventions are beyond what humans have business doing. (Weckert, 2016, p.87). This objection is fundamentally against humans overstepping their moral or divine boundaries. It sends warnings about human arrogance, which might result from having overconfidence that they can control forces beyond them.

Religious Perspective of the Playing God Argument

The playing God argument is popularly known and interpreted from the religious perspective. From the religious view, it is interpreted as meddling with activities that solely belong to the supreme being, deity, or God. (Grey, 2012, p.469). The Playing God Argument invokes divine sauthority. It is operative on the ideology that only God possesses the right and authority to create or alter life in fundamental ways. The argument appeals to the fact that human life and the natural order are within divine jurisdiction and should not be tampered with for the fear of disrupting delicate balances. Any attempt to tamper with human life, either by bringing humans into existence or out of existence is morally wrong.

According to proponents of this objection, God is the only all-knowing, all-powerful, and good being who has the capacity to foresee all possible consequences of all actions and also can handle human life and the world properly. They believe that there is a necessary gap between God and humans, and by so doing there are things restricted from humans due to the fallibility and finiteness of the human mind. Transhumanism, for them, is morally wrong because the transhumanists' vision places man in the position of playing or acting God, a role considered to be higher than humanity or outside the orbit of human capacity. (Weckert, 2016, p.87). Humans, according to them, have limited mental capacity and also lack the foresight to manage the accompanying responsibilities of transhumanism; hence, humans ought not to alter the human condition. (Hamilton, 2013, p.178). It rejects overconfidence in human ability, which can lead to unintended consequences.

How plausible is this view? The playing God argument from the religious perspective does not present a clear and precise normative yardstick for evaluating moral action. It only invokes divine authority and also appeals to emotion. Whereas, the concept of divinity is a highly

contestable one, the concept of God is a relative one. Among religious circles, there are different ideologies about the nature and commandments of God that make it difficult to pinpoint the nature and things within the jurisdiction of the supreme being. For instance, as argued by Coady, Christianity supported the idea that God gave humans absolute dominion over the earth, which includes the right to create and recreate things at will. (Coady, 2013, p.9). Even the sacred scripture of Christians stated in Psalm 82:6 (King James Version) that humans are gods. Deducible from this, it can be argued that humans are just acting out of duty when they alter human condition. Other religions might have a contrary position to this. Also, the fact that most instruction claimed to be God's instructions are those handed over by men who are representative of God, it might be difficult to differentiate instructions from God and that of men.

In line with this, Grey observed that the Playing God argument, instead of clarifying and providing a normative guide, darkens judgements about moral actions. (Grey, 2012, p.469). To him, within the religious circle, there is no unified conception about the prerogatives of God. Different religious organisations have different understanding of the God's prerogatives, using these prerogatives as a yardstick for determining the normativity of moral action would be quite unhelpful and unproductive.

The playing God argument also appears to be ambiguous and vague. Drawing the ethical line between what can be seen as playing God and those that do not equate as playing God is difficult. There is no religious document that gives a guideline on this. If what counts as playing God is any human activity that is directed to changing the order of nature or how nature is structured, then this criterion would be too ambiguous because many human engagements with nature such as medicine, agriculture, irrigation, road construction, performing a surgical operation to remove diseases such as appendixes or a caesarean operation, and modifying crops to control pests or feed millions of people, among others, would amount to playing God. The playing God argument does not provide comprehensive guidance as to what playing God really entails and what human activities count as playing God. It is only suggestive that humans act at restructuring what is in nature amounts to playing God but not detailed about those human interventions that would amount to hubris.

The playing God argument, in its attempts to preach a form of humility and acceptance towards what God creates, also preaches a form of blind dogmatic acceptance of reality that could be

made better if we had attempted. It appeals to emotion and sends out a form of withdrawal attitude to life that is majorly caused by the fear of the unknown. Truly, humans have limited mental capacity; nevertheless, life cannot be better if we do not take the risk of making it so. There might definitely be mistakes or unintended consequences in human attempts to intervene in the work of nature; this, however, should not stop humans from striving to life better. By withdrawing from intervening in nature, humans would be accepting many natural processes that can cause avoidable suffering.

Since the playing God argument from the religious perspective is not helpful in the evaluation of moral action, let us consider if the secular version of the playing God argument might be a bit better and provide the guidance the religious version fails to provide. The secular version will be examined shortly.

Secular Perspective on the Playing God Argument

From the secular perspective, God is interchanged with nature. The playing God argument is interpreted to mean intervening in a deified nature's domain. But what this nature actually is and who assigned the domain to it, is left in the dark. It is not so clear why things under the deified nature's domain qualifies to be there and not within human domain. According to the proponent of this interpretation, transhumanism is morally wrong because it would violate some intrinsic sanctity of nature. (Weckert, 2016, p.88). This version of the playing God argument was famously defended by Michael Sandel in his attempt to object genetic engineering (Giubilini, A. & Sanyal S., 2016, p.6). Sandel considered human enhancement or genetic engineering as morally wrong because it is an attempt to remove humans' openness to the unexpected. To him, the pursuits of human enhancement is characterized by the human's pursuit to usurp the role of a creator or one solely responsible for the existence and capacities of humans. Sandel argues that this is a role that is not only beyond humanity but also removes the equality and solidarity that is peculiar to humanity. (Sandel, 2007, p.47). It erodes the humility and acceptance of life as a gift.

The objection also sends a precautionary message that allowing humans to alter the human condition might bring into existence new species that would blur existing species boundaries. (Annas, et. al, 2002, p.151–78). This new specie might threaten the existence of human specie and invariably leads to the disappearance of the human species.

Playing God objection sends precautionary message which can help curb humans excesses in the attempt to alter or redirect the course of nature, however this argument raises questions about the limit of human agency, human relationship with nature, what nature is and the extent of human intervention in nature that are worthy of consideration in determining the normativity of the argument as a viable objection transhumanism and other forms of genetic intervention. In the next section, I attempt to assess the playing God argument with the view of showing that this argument fails to provide a strong evidence or justification against the moral worthiness of transhumanism.

Why the Playing God Argument Fails

The playing God argument has been argued earlier to be unhelpful from the religious aspect. In this section, it will further be argued that even from the secular perspective, the playing God argument also fails to establish a logical objection against the plausibility of transhumanism. Considering the Playing God argument, questions that come to the mind are; what is the extent of human agency? should humans intervene in nature? And by the word nature, what do they mean? The playing God argument appears to operate on a sweeping subjective interpretation or assumption of what nature is. It is premised on the idea that there is a generalized meaning of nature which clearly set boundary between what humans are permitted and not permitted to alter. Proponents of this argument fails to provide a clear interpretation of what nature is and what qualifies to be categorized as nature. They assume that by the word nature, there is a concise and general understanding of nature or what qualifies as natural, while defining nature is a contentious task. Clarifying the meaning nature is expedient in determining what the extent of human agency should be or deciding the limit and extent at which human can intervene in nature.

Nature is a common word that almost everyone is familiar with, but often difficult to define. The more one tries to define it, the harder it becomes. The word “Nature” has no consensus definition (Frederic, 2025). The reason is because of the scope of things that can be included in the word. Weckert defining nature categorised attempts at defining it into two, which are Nature including humans and nature without humans (Weckert, 2016, p.89-91).

The first attempt at defining the word “nature” is to construe it as the physical world or natural phenomena both living and no living things that exist in places without civilization or human

intervention. (Weckert, 2016, p.89). According to The Britannica Dictionary (2025), nature is the physical world and everything in it that is not made by humans. It entails ecosystems, plants, animals, landscape, weather and natural phenomena such as rivers, mountains, rivers, forest, wilderness, desert, and oceans existing outside the city, town and country where no one resides. Put in other words, nature are phenomena that exist independent of human intervention and civilization.

From this definition, things within the nature's jurisdiction are what exist outside where humans are and what are not made by humans. Adopting the secular version of the playing God argument to this definition of nature would connote that if nature entails the physical environment and everything in it outside human's jurisdiction, then it might be difficult to accuse humans of playing God. Since humans hardly have day- to day interaction with these entities.

This conception of nature, though gives a glimpse of what we might see or believed to be nature, yet is not as simple and straightforward as it appears. This definition is too inclusive and reductionistic. It reduces nature to entities far beyond the reach of humans and thereby neglected some natural entities like plantations, mountains, sea, animals among other that can be seen as natural phenomenon but also withing where human habit. It does not provide a comprehensive account of what might be considered as nature. It excludes things like animal, flowers, plant, tourist centres, beaches, rivers, natural gardens and parks that though has touches of human intervention, are still natural things and cannot be considered as artificial things since they are not solely human creation.

If nature is defined as the physical world and things without human touch, few things such as the deep ocean floors, particularly the Hedal zones, the Antarctic ice sheets, Amazon rainforest interiors, Himalayas Mountain peaks, Arctic and Siberian wilderness would count as nature. Even though human presence might not be seen in these areas, nevertheless humans still indirectly impact these areas.

Granting that these are what nature entails, then the playing God argument might fail to hold a strong objection against any form of enhancement or genetic engineering as human intervention is not directed towards any of the things that qualifies to be called nature. Since nature does not include humans and products of humans then the playing God argument would not necessarily

form an objection against enhancement as genetic intervention has to do with what does not qualify as nature *a bi initio*. What undergoes alteration in transhumanism or genetic intervention is not part of nature, hence, we do not play God or intervene in nature, when we engage in transhumanism.

Another way of defining nature is to conceive it as comprising of both the physical world and human beings. (Weckert, 2016, p.90). That is nature entails all natural phenomena inclusive of humans. This definition appears to be exclusive and free from the objection faced by the first definition. But does not provide a ground for the plausibility of the playing God argument. If humans are part of nature, then it is arguable that it is not only out of place for humans to intervene in a system or domain that he is part of, humans cannot also do without interacting with the system they belong to. (Weckert, 2016, p.91). In the course of this interaction, humans would have to alter the system in attempt to make life better for themselves. Just like other members of the system interacts with the system and build life and existence from the resources of the system, humans too only participate in the system and also sustain their existence in the system by altering the nature-system to make life worth living. It is not hubris or playing God when humans intervene in nature. In the same way, animals do engage in the natural environment, humans, as part of the nature only exercise their right when they explore, alters and remodify nature to suit their needs.

The playing God objection also runs on a sweepy assumption that there are clear distinctions of what is and is not within human domain. The objection raises questions such as; how do we decide what is in human domain? And what are not in human domain? What are the criteria of judging this? To be in a person's domain entails being under one's control, influence, expertise or responsibility. Determining what does or does not belong to human domain is a difficult task to come by. This is because, many things in the environment that are nature dependent or originated from nature have been shaped and beautified by humans. Things that fall under both domains are intertwined. The human domain does not exist separately from the natural world. Neither is the natural world independent of human intervention, the human domain is an extension of the natural world. The natural world was shaped out his comeliness and voidness by human and aspects that can be categorized as belonging to human domain are derived from the natural world.

There is a thin line between things within the jurisdiction of human and that of nature. Rain for instance is seldomly manipulated in some areas in Africa like western region of Nigeria. (Ossai A. & Madu J. 2024, p.29). While nature exist independently, they have been significantly altered and modified by human actions. Both domains are intertwined and interconnected, so it is difficult for humans not to intervene or alter nature.

The fact that there is no distinct demarcation between natural and unnatural further makes it difficult to object man's intervention in nature. The distinction between natural and unnatural is a highly contentious debate in philosophy. (Deckers, 2021, p.297). It is not clear whether humans only have right to intervene in unnatural things and not in natural things or whether they can alter both artificial and natural things. Owing to the fact that there are difficulties in determining what is natural and not natural, how do we then determine those things that human has the right to alter? Requesting that humans abstain from altering or interfering with what we exactly do not have idea or know what is, appears unimaginable.

Even if it is possible to demarcate between natural and unnatural, the non-interference principle presented by this objected would still be unrealistic. This is because humans cannot do without interfering with nature.

Humans interact with their environment on a daily basis and this interaction interferes with the structure of things in nature. Although this intervention might not completely displace nature, nevertheless it does cause some changes in nature. So many human activities have reshaped how nature is. There is something very natural about humans interfering with nature. When humans interfere with nature, they are just doing what they evolved to do. What makes the earth habitable for humans is man's intervention with nature.

Due to the fact that humans live in the nature or physical environment, it is impossible for humans not to interfere with nature. Humans interfere with nature is so many ways. Human basic activities and his consumption of natural resources inevitably impact the environment thereby creating a level of interference. Humans rely on natural resources like air, water, plants for survival and interaction with these elements constitute interferences. Human activities such as farming, rearing of animals, urbanization, industrial production and transportation also alters nature (Granted that nature is taken to mean physical environment either inclusive of humans or not). In many ways scientists alter crops and animals to improve produce, resist diseases and

assist in adapting to the changing environment. Intervention in nature at times help circumvent mishap. To argue that nature be left to have its course every time is to be ready to accept to live a life that is not comfortable to humans. Humans intervene in the physical environment to make life better and easier.

It is also practically impossible for humans to avoid interfering in the evolution of human species. As social beings, human life is deeply interconnected through cooperation, competition and mutual influence. Humans are not essentially products of nature; they are shaped and made to become the best version of themselves possible by other humans.

Through science and technology, humans have provided treatment to diseases, epidemic breakout, and anomalies that are capable of shortening human lifespan and also making life unbearable to humans. In term of human health, nature cannot be allowed to always have its way. For instance, should we allow people die of sickness or disease when we could have avoided them just because we do not want to intervene in nature. It is also morally wrong to procreate children with avoidable disabilities when we have opportunities to do so, all in the name of respecting nature's boundary by not intervening in what is outside human domain.

Human actions- both biological and cultural have always interfere in the shaping of the human evolution, survival and development. Human reproduction is not a passive one, potential parent through their lifestyle, exposure, DNA, determines which children would come to existence. (Ridley, 2003, p. 10-30). There is no passive reproduction, we are not fully product of nature. Even after procreation, newborns are shaped and cultured in the way considered good by parents and society. No children are left to grow in a crude way they were given birth to.

Social structures such as family, education, and societal norms also influence how people grow, learn and interact. No one grows to interact solely by how nature configures such a person. Our attitude, life style, values among others are all products of societal influence on us. Language, traditions and education also shape human identity and development. Enhancing humanity is not a new thing. It is what we have always done naturally without any reservation. Adopting a specific life style, diet, living condition among others all affect human adaptation and evolution. No human being is currently in his/her crude state. It is wild to leave the human species to nature to solely direct or to a blind acceptance. Healthcare, vaccines and biotechnology do not only extend human lifespan but also alter the human biology to make it

resistant to diseases and epidemics. Even when we choose not to alter the human condition, that would still be a form of passive influence as evolution and survival pressures would continue to shape the human species.

Nature cannot be left to handle itself since it is not capable of self-direction. The fate of the human species has never for once be left to caprices of nature, humans have always sought to improve the human condition even from time immemorial. If altering human nature through traditional means such as medicine, education, culture, tradition have not been seen as morally wrong, then doing so through the use of biotechnology should not be an exemption.

When diseases are treated, are we not altering nature or not? Should people be left to die because we do not want to alter nature or act like God? When weak organs are replaced with health one, is that not altering the human nature? It is unclear what the proponents of this argument mean by the phrase "acting God." They fail to spell out the boundary between nature and nurture and the extent to which man can intervene in nature. If treating diseases, replacing weak body organs are not considered as altering human nature, why is enhancement seen as altering the human nature. Nature itself is crude and raw; it takes refinement for us to enjoy every bit of it. Hence, it is baseless to consider an action morally wrong because it is equal to playing God.

What the objection should raise

The key concern that the playing God argument ought to raise is about what the relationship between human and nature should be, rather than defending the idea that humans should not interfere with nature. As argued above, the focus rather should be about what sort of relationship should be between human and nature and the extent of human intervention with nature. Interfering in nature is intrinsically not wrong but negative interfering is that which is bad. The way and manner of human interference with nature is more important than whether humans should interfere with nature or not. Since total non-intervention is impractical because humans are naturally interdependent. The major concern should be that humans must pursue ethical and minimal intervention within the boundaries of their knowledge. In our intervention with nature, balancing perfection with ethical responsibility is required. Intervention in the human condition must also be that which is ethical, sustainable and responsible.

Conclusion

The Playing God argument against the transhumanist desire to create a brave new world has been extensively interrogated. The argument states that humans should not interfere with things considered to be beyond human domain or should not usurp the powers or roles assigned to the divine being or deified nature. While this argument sends a cautionary message in regards to what the relationship between humans and nature should be, it fails to establish a strong and logical objection against human intervention in nature. It is an objection that operates on sweepy and subjective explanation of what nature is about. The Playing God argument appeals largely to personal sentiments and emotion while neglecting the inevitability of human interference in nature (physical environment and human life). The argument becomes more problematic and unfounded when the thought or idea of God's existence has not yet been established, hence controversial.

REFERENCES

- Annas, G. J., Andrews, L. B., and Isasi, R. M. (2002). 'Protecting the Endangered Human: Toward an International Treaty Prohibiting Cloning and Inheritable Alterations', *American Journal of Law and Medicine*, 28.
- Bostrom, N. (2003). The Transhumanism FAQ: An Introduction. World Transhumanism Association. Retrieved from: <https://www.nickbostrom.com>
- Bostrom, N. (2005a). "A History of Transhumanist Thought". *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, p. 1-3
- Bostrom, N. (2005b). Transhumanist Values. *Review of Contemporary Philosophy*, Vol. 4.
- Bostrom, N. (2013c). Why I Want to be a Posthuman When I Grow Up In The M. More & N. Vita-More (eds.) *Transhumanist Reader: Classical and Contemporary Essays on the Science, Technology, and Philosophy of the Human Future*. UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Coady, C.A. (2009). Playing God. In J. Savulescu & N. Bostrom (eds.) *Human Enhancement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darwin, C. (2003). *The Origin of Species*, New York: Barnes & Noble Classics. Fine Creative Media, p. 1-7.
- Deckers, J. (2021). On (Un)naturalness. *Environmental Values*. 30(3), 297-318.
- Divine Command Theory by Michael W. Austin, The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ISSN 2161-0002, <https://iep.utm.edu/divine-command-theory/#H9>.
- Evans, J. H. (2002). *Playing God? Human Genetic Engineering and the Rationalization of Public Bioethical Debate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frederic, D. (2025). What is Nature. Encyclopedie de l'environnement. <Http://www.encyclopedia-environment.org/?p=12392>
- Giubilini, A. & Sanyal S. (2016). Challenging Human Enhancement in S. Clarke, & J. Savulescu (eds.) *The Ethics of Human Enhancement: Understanding the Debate* (pp. 6) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grey, W. (2012). Playing God. In R. Chadwick (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. UK: Elsevier Inc.
- Hamilton, Clive (2013). *Earthmasters: The Dawn of the Age of Climate Engineering*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Mccollum, A. (2013). *The Transhumanism Pandemic: Sub-Humanity's Messiah; Humanity's Annihilation*. Australia: Pisceanesque Publishing, p. xvi.
- More, M. (2013). The Philosophy of Transhumanism. In The M. More & N. Vita-More (eds.) *Transhumanist Reader: Classical and Contemporary Essays on the Science, Technology, and Philosophy of the Human Future*. UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Nature Definition & Meaning. The Britannica Dictionary. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/dictionary/nature>.
- Ossai, A. & Mafu, J. (2024). Exploring Rain-Making and Rain-Prevention as Instruments of Peace-Building in Ezimo Community, Nsukka Cultural Area of Igboland. Awka: *Unizik Journal of Culture and Civilization*, Vol. 3.
- Peters, T. (2002). *Playing God? Genetic Determinism and Human Freedom*. New York: Routledge Publishers
- Peters, Ted (2007). ‘Are We Playing God with Nanoenhancement?’, in Fritz Allhoff, Patrick Lin, James Moor, and John Weckert (eds), *Nanotechnology: The Ethical and Social Implications of Nanotechnology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, pp. 173–83
- Ridley, M. (2003). *Nature via Nurture: Genes, Experience, and What Makes Us Human*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1- 365.
- Sandel, M. (2007). *The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in The Age of Genetic Engineering*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 45
- Tirosh-Samuelson, H. (2010). Engaging Transhumanism. In G. R. Hansell & W. Grassie. *H+ Transhumanism and its Critics*. USA: Metanexus Institute
- Weckert, J. (2016) Playing God: What is the Problem? in S. Clarke, & J. Savulescu (eds.) *The Ethics of Human Enhancement: Understanding the Debate* (pp. 87) Oxford: Oxford University Press.