

Human enhancement

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Human Enhancement and Affiliations Although surrogate parents and their normally sign an agreement of bearing the children, Anderson strongly opposes this idea by considering whether the welfare of the unborn child is considered. It is obvious that the child might have emotional issues in life upon discovery that it is not the mother who bore him or her directly hence in other words defends the child who has no capability to complain of the mode of birth. Anderson also discourages the fact that people may decide to bear surrogate children for selfish commercial gains (Anderson, 1997).

When parents decide to have a child through surrogacy, they are the ones who benefit since they feel that they are satisfied with the decision they make. If the decision is because of a genetic defect in the parents, then she argues that surrogacy is not a solution because the child would still develop the complication since it is in the genes of the parents. It is also difficult to totally decide the kind of child to bear hence we should learn to incorporate all kinds of children and help them accept their situations.

The society at large should also discourage commercial surrogacy for reasons posed by parents that there is improper allocation of jobs for disabled. Since some parents consider surrogacy for fear of delivering disabled children, the governments should create slots for employment of such people in the society. This can help such mothers to know that any child borne has a role to play despite his or physical appearance (Anderson, 1997).

In his article, Buchanan argues that most human body alterations through biotechnological means have negative effects on the clients that try them. He says that these alterations may either terminate the human nature or make it almost difficult to differentiate between a good and a bad looking

<https://assignbuster.com/human-enhancement/>

person since such judgements are normally done according to natural appearance. These conclusions are just interrelated in a way with the second supporting the first one which is against human enhancements. Although most biotechnological enhancements techniques have been made available, there is still no clarity as to whether these techniques are best solutions for the public. These scientists only talk about how the procedures are possible, they evade to give further advice on such procedures, maybe for commercial purposes. Therefore the public should take it an obligatory role to weigh the shortcomings by considering whether they will still be attractive in their enhanced looks in the future. It might even be true that the negative effects would start manifesting since it is unknown of what changes would occur to the enhanced part of the body with time (Buchanan, 2008).

A principled objection to enhancement gives the total interrelationship between human nature and judging good and bad character. The principled objection to enhancement puts across the fact that even if the enhancement procedures were meant to remove a bad part, even the good parts will be altered in way. Therefore to avoid such inconveniences, people should try as much as possible to maintain their natural appearance. Context specific examples include the process of fertilizing embryos in labs instead of the normal sexual reproduction that fertilizes embryos in the female body. A child as a result of fertilization in the lab may have some complications as compared to the one fertilized inside the mother.

In his publication, Parens discourages use of Viagra by women because it only helps men enjoy sex while the female victims get no desire for sex. The blood associated with intake of the pills only arouses men but give the women no considerable enjoyment for sex. With the negative effects that <https://assignbuster.com/human-enhancement/>

might be felt in the female's body, it makes it not worth it to tolerate them if they don't serve their primary purpose of sexual enjoyment (Parens, 2005).

References

Anderson, J. (1997). What cognitive science tells us about ethics and the teaching of ethics? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(3), 279-291.

Buchanan, A. (2008). Enhancement and the ethics of development. *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 18(1), 1-34.

Parens, E. (2005). Authenticity and Ambivalence: Toward Understanding the Enhancement Debate: *The Hastings Centre Report*, 35(3), 34-41.