Abuja Journal of Humanities

Vulnerability as Meaning: Reflections on the Loss of Human Fragility in Transhumanist Futures

Peter Anakobe Adinoyi

Department of Religious Studies, Federal University Lokoja, Kogi State

Gbenga Cornelius Fasiku, PhD

Department of Philosophy, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba

Abstract

This paper critically examines the philosophical significance of human vulnerability and the existential risks posed by its erasure in the context of transhumanist futures. Drawing on phenomenological thinkers such as Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Emmanuel Levinas, alongside African philosophical frameworks rooted in *Ubuntu* ethics, the study argues that fragility is not merely a limitation to be overcome but a fundamental condition of human meaning, creativity, and ethical life. Phenomenological insights emphasise embodiment, finitude, and ethical responsibility as intrinsic to lived experience, while *Ubuntu* underscores the relational and communal dimensions of vulnerability. Together, these traditions affirm that human flourishing emerges through, rather than in spite of, fragility. The paper interrogates the core assumptions of transhumanism, particularly the pursuit of technological mastery over disease, ageing, and death. It critiques the reduction of human value to optimisation and the potential consequences of disembodied enhancement, including existential detachment, relational alienation, and moral erosion. Furthermore, it raises concerns about the socio-ethical implications of enhancement technologies in postcolonial contexts, where structural inequalities may lead to new forms of exclusion and ontological injustice. By integrating African and Western philosophical perspectives, the paper contends that any future-oriented technological vision must be ethically accountable to the conditions that sustain empathy, solidarity, and shared humanity. Rather than aiming to eliminate vulnerability, a more humane trajectory would seek to honour and support it, ensuring that technological advancement deepens—rather than diminishes—the meaning of human life. In this way, the paper contributes

Keywords: Vulnerability, Transhumanism, Ubuntu Philosophy, Phenomenology

Introduction

Human vulnerability has long been regarded as an essential aspect of the human condition, shaping how individuals experience the world and construct meaning. From the inevitability of death to the fragility of the body, vulnerability forms the basis of existential engagement, fostering relationships, creativity, and ethical responsibility. Both Maurice Merleau-Ponty and

Peter A. Adinoyi and Gbenga C. Fasiku

Martin Heidegger emphasise that human fragility is not merely a limitation but a fundamental condition of *being-in-the-world*. Merleau-Ponty, for instance, situates embodiment at the core of human experience, arguing that the lived body, with its inherent limitations, is essential for meaningful interaction with the world. Similarly, Heidegger posits that finitude, particularly the awareness of mortality, gives life its urgency and depth, grounding the pursuit of authenticity. However, these philosophical reflections are not confined to the Western tradition. In African thought systems, particularly within the framework of *Ubuntu* philosophy, vulnerability is not only recognised but valorised as the basis of communal existence. Ubuntu—summarised in the maxim, *"I am because we are"*—articulates an ontology in which individuals exist not in isolation but through interdependence and mutual care. In this context, vulnerability is the connective tissue of human society, enabling empathy, ethical responsiveness, and solidarity. As such, African communitarian thought offers critical resources for rethinking the place of fragility in human life, particularly in a rapidly technologised world.

This world is increasingly shaped by the ambitions of transhumanism—a philosophical and technological movement that seeks to transcend the biological and cognitive limitations of the human body through artificial enhancement, genetic engineering, and digital transformation. Transhumanist discourse is characterised by the promise of mastery over ageing, disease, and even death, with the goal of constructing a post-human future unbounded by the limits of human fragility. While these aspirations are framed as liberatory, they raise fundamental questions about the cost of such transcendence. What happens to meaning, empathy, or creativity in a world devoid of vulnerability? Does the attempt to eliminate fragility threaten the very essence of what it means to be human? This paper critically engages with these questions by examining the philosophical significance of human vulnerability and its potential erasure in transhumanist futures. Through a phenomenological and existential lens, the paper argues that vulnerability is not simply a hindrance to be overcome but an ontological condition that grounds human authenticity, ethical engagement, and relational meaning. Drawing on Western existentialism and African humanism, the paper contends that the elimination of vulnerability through technological enhancement risks existential detachment, relational fragmentation, and a diminished capacity for shared meaning. Ultimately, this work calls for a reflective and ethically grounded engagement with technological advancement—one that acknowledges the promises of transhumanism without forsaking the fragility that makes human existence meaningful. By foregrounding vulnerability as a site of philosophical and cultural significance, the paper seeks to contribute to a more balanced vision of human flourishing in the age of enhancement.

Human Vulnerability in Phenomenological Experience

Vulnerability, as an intrinsic aspect of human existence, holds a central place in phenomenological accounts of lived experience. It shapes how individuals engage with the world, themselves, and others, anchoring their sense of meaning, identity, and authenticity. In phenomenology, vulnerability is not simply a weakness or limitation; rather, it is a fundamental condition that defines human existence. Thinkers such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Martin Heidegger, and Emmanuel Levinas have each explored this centrality through concepts such as embodiment, finitude, and the face-to-face encounter with the Other. Together, they articulate a vision of humanity where fragility is not opposed to flourishing but is constitutive of it. Merleau-Ponty situates the body as the foundation of all human experience, describing it as a *corps vécu*—a "lived body" that is not merely an object in the world but the dynamic medium through which the world is encountered. The body's fragility—its limitations, susceptibilities, and exposure—fundamentally shapes how individuals perceive and engage with their environment. The very act of moving, speaking, or relating is negotiated through bodily finitude. For Merleau-Ponty, the richness of perception and the immediacy of existence derive precisely from the body's situatedness and its openness to risk and injury. Without this embodied vulnerability, human interaction with the world would lack its sensual depth, moral urgency, and existential resonance.

Heidegger complements this insight with his emphasis on *Sein-zum-Tode*, or "being-toward-death." In *Being and Time*, Heidegger posits that the awareness of mortality is not merely a

future-oriented anxiety but a structuring feature of existence itself. Finitude—our constant proximity to non-being—imbues life with significance. It forces individuals to confront the contingency of their being and invites them to live authentically, that is, in conscious relation to their own temporality and limitations. Thus, vulnerability to death is not a marginal experience but the ground upon which meaningful existence is constituted. Levinas shifts the focus to the ethical dimension of vulnerability, particularly in relation to the Other. For him, the face of the Other is not merely a visual cue but a call to responsibility, an epiphany of vulnerability that disrupts the self's autonomy. In this view, it is precisely the Other's fragility—visible in the face, the gaze, the cry—that initiates moral responsibility. As he puts it, "the face opens the primordial discourse whose first word is obligation." Therefore, vulnerability is not just ontological or experiential—it is ethical.

This triadic phenomenological insight—embodied finitude, existential mortality, and ethical responsiveness—demonstrates that human vulnerability is not incidental but essential to human life. However, the philosophical conversation around fragility need not be restricted to Western thought. African philosophy, particularly in the form of *Ubuntu*, contributes profoundly to our understanding of vulnerability as a generative force. Ubuntu, commonly rendered as "*I am because we are*", emphasises relational identity and interdependence. Human beings are not autonomous substances but nodes in a web of shared existence. In this view, vulnerability is not simply tolerated—it is valorised as the condition that makes mutual care and community possible. African thinkers such as Ifeanyi Menkiti and Kwame Gyekye have debated the balance between communalism and individualism in African thought, yet both agree on the foundational role of human interdependence. Menkiti, for instance, asserts that personhood is acquired through ethical relationships within a community. This moral ontology places vulnerability at the centre of human development. Rather than being a flaw to overcome, it is a gift that facilitates empathy, justice, and relational maturity. Hence, both African and Western traditions converge in recognising that fragility is not a deficit but a mode of access to deeper forms of existence. In light of these perspectives, the push by transhumanist thinkers to eliminate or diminish vulnerability appears not only philosophically reductive but existentially hazardous. The aspiration to perfect or transcend the human body may inadvertently sever the very roots from which meaning, ethics, and community emerge. The phenomenological and African humanistic traditions serve as a powerful counter-narrative, reminding us that it is through limitation, exposure, and need that we come to know ourselves, others, and the world in meaningful ways.

Transhumanist Technologies and the Eradication of Vulnerability

Transhumanism, as a philosophical and technological movement, seeks to transcend the biological and cognitive limitations of the human condition. It envisions a future in which cutting-edge innovations such as genetic engineering, artificial intelligence, cybernetic augmentation, and neuro-enhancement technologies eliminate what are conventionally understood as human vulnerabilities—disease, disability, ageing, and even death. While the transhumanist imagination promises unprecedented freedom and flourishing, it simultaneously raises deep ethical, philosophical, and existential concerns, particularly regarding the ontological cost of eradicating fragility. If vulnerability is intrinsic to meaning, authenticity, and relational life, then its systematic removal may represent not merely progress but a profound loss of humanity. At the core of transhumanism is the assumption that limitation is a problem to be solved. Influential advocates such as Ray Kurzweil (2005) and Nick Bostrom (2014) articulate a vision in which biological finitude is obsolete. Through technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 for gene editing, artificial neural implants for cognitive enhancement, and synthetic biology for life extension, humanity can theoretically engineer a post-human species liberated from its ancestral fragility. The prospect of digital immortality—wherein consciousness might be uploaded to non-biological substrates—represents the apogee of this dream. Yet, in seeking to overcome our embodied finitude, transhumanism may be displacing the very conditions that make life intelligible, affective, and ethically grounded.

Philosophically, this vision risks reducing the human experience to a utilitarian calculus of optimisation and efficiency. If, as Heidegger insists, our orientation toward death gives weight and urgency to our choices, and if, as Merleau-Ponty argues, our embodied vulnerability is

the very condition of perceptual richness, then a post-human state of invulnerability may paradoxically erode meaning. Instead of enhancing life, the elimination of fragility may sterilise it—flattening the highs and lows into a monotonous continuum of managed existence. Bernard Stiegler (1998) warns of such a future, wherein technics displaces lived temporality and creativity is stifled by artificial determinism. From an African humanistic standpoint, the implications are equally grave. Transhumanism imports a Western metaphysical dualism that privileges disembodied rationality over the relational, corporeal personhood central to African thought. In *Ubuntu* and related traditions, vulnerability is the basis for ethical relations; to be human is to be *with* and *for* others, bound by a shared finitude. Technological enhancement that severs individuals from this mutual dependence risks fostering a new form of ontological alienation—what Achille Mbembe might term "*the technicisation of being*".

Moreover, a postcolonial critique reveals that the transhumanist project may reinscribe global inequalities. The technological capacities required for enhancement are overwhelmingly concentrated in the Global North, while Africa and much of the Global South continue to grapple with basic healthcare and infrastructural deficits. The emergence of a biologically enhanced elite—immune to disease, impervious to ageing, and cognitively superior—would not only stratify humanity but could deepen geopolitical hierarchies. This *biotechnological imperialism*, as some scholars describe it, risks marginalising those who cannot afford or access enhancement technologies, turning vulnerability itself into a marker of obsolescence. In light of these critiques, the eradication of fragility cannot be understood as a neutral or universally beneficial goal. While it is important to acknowledge the potential of technology to relieve suffering, it is equally crucial to interrogate the epistemic and ethical assumptions underlying enhancement discourses. For whom is suffering being reduced? At what cost is finitude being eliminated? And what philosophical traditions are being excluded or subordinated in this process? The African philosophical commitment to relationality, care, and embodied ethics offers a necessary corrective. Instead of imagining a future beyond vulnerability, it invites us to imagine a future *through* it—a world in which technological advancement coexists with a deep respect for the fragility that makes us human. This vision would not reject innovation, but would direct it toward strengthening communal bonds, enhancing ethical responsiveness, and preserving the conditions for meaning.

Empathy and Relationality in a Post-Human World

Empathy and relationality are fundamental dimensions of human social life, enabling individuals to connect meaningfully, build trust, and cultivate ethical responsibility. These capacities are rooted in the shared experiences of embodiment, suffering, and mortality—conditions that transcend cultural and historical boundaries. In phenomenological terms, empathy emerges not only from cognitive recognition but from a *felt resonance* with another's vulnerability. Levinas, in particular, emphasises that the face of the Other discloses a silent imperative, calling one to moral responsiveness. It is in the fragility of the Other that the self encounters the limits of its autonomy and is summoned into ethical obligation. Transhumanist technologies, which aim to augment human faculties and mitigate suffering, promise to redefine the texture of interpersonal interactions. From neural enhancements that regulate emotion to artificial intelligence that simulates empathy, these developments introduce new forms of relationality—forms that may be optimised, programmable, and increasingly disembodied. While such innovations hold the potential to bridge gaps in communication and deepen emotional intelligence, they also risk undermining the foundational conditions that make empathy genuine: unpredictability, mutual exposure, and shared fragility.

A critical concern is that enhanced individuals—freed from the existential weight of illness, pain, or mortality—may gradually lose the capacity for authentic connection with the unenhanced. The recognition of another's suffering presupposes a memory or anticipation of suffering within the self. Without this continuity of experience, empathy may give way to simulation, and moral engagement to paternalism or indifference. Hubert Dreyfus warns against such disembodied ethical performance, noting that authentic human responsiveness is irreducible to computational models. The danger lies not only in technological alienation but in the erosion of those affective intuitions that arise from a common vulnerability. From the

perspective of African communitarian ethics, the implications are especially disconcerting. Ubuntu philosophy asserts that personhood is acquired and affirmed in relationships of care, respect, and solidarity. The proverb "*A person is a person through other persons*" encapsulates a vision of humanity that is inherently interdependent. In this moral universe, to encounter another's vulnerability is not simply to feel sympathy but to recognise a shared humanity that binds the community together. Empathy is not an optional moral virtue; it is constitutive of ethical subjectivity.

In a post-human society stratified by access to enhancement technologies, this relational fabric may be severely strained. If only some individuals can afford cognitive, emotional, or physical augmentation, the basis for mutual recognition could fragment. Enhanced beings may view themselves as superior, while the unenhanced may experience social exclusion or existential inferiority. Such asymmetries threaten not only social cohesion but the ontological equilibrium that underpins Ubuntu. The community ceases to be a space of shared becoming and becomes a site of technological inequality. Moreover, the technological mediation of emotion—through algorithms, artificial companions, or neurochemical interventions—raises questions about the authenticity of relational life. Can love, care, or grief be meaningful if regulated or pre-emptively controlled? If intimacy is stripped of uncertainty, can it still be transformative? African philosophies of affect suggest that emotional life is not to be optimised but lived—with all its tensions, ruptures, and reconciliations. Vulnerability in this sense is not a design flaw but a space of ethical cultivation.

Nonetheless, transhumanist technologies also present opportunities. Virtual reality, for instance, can simulate experiences of marginalised lives, fostering understanding across cultural and cognitive divides. AI tools may assist individuals with disabilities to communicate and participate more fully in communal life. However, the design and application of such technologies must be guided by a commitment to preserving, not replacing, the existential structures of empathy and relationality. The future of social life in a post-human world hinges on whether technological enhancement will be guided by values of solidarity, justice, and vulnerability, or dominated by efficiency, control, and detachment. Empathy must not be engineered out of existence, but ethically protected as the condition of our shared humanity.

Theoretical Framework

This paper is grounded in a dual philosophical framework that draws from both Western phenomenological existentialism and African communitarian ethics. The convergence of these traditions provides a robust conceptual lens through which to examine the meaning and implications of human vulnerability in the age of transhumanist enhancement. By integrating the ontological insights of Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Emmanuel Levinas with the moral ontology of *Ubuntu* and African communal thought, the framework advances a pluralistic, human-centred critique of technological post-humanism. Phenomenology, as developed by thinkers such as Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, begins with lived experience as the primary site of philosophical inquiry. In this tradition, human beings are not abstract minds or passive bodies but embodied agents enmeshed in a world of significance. Merleau-Ponty's notion of the *lived body* (*corps vécu*) underscores the importance of bodily vulnerability in mediating perception and action. Our capacity to feel pain, to be affected by others, and to confront the limits of our physical being is not an impediment to knowledge or agency—it is the very condition of meaningful experience. Heidegger's existential analytic in *Being and Time* advances this argument by positioning finitude, particularly mortality, as central to authentic human existence. The concept of *being-toward-death* emphasises that an awareness of one's eventual non-being creates existential urgency and responsibility. It is through the recognition of temporal limits that the individual is compelled to make choices, take ownership of existence, and live with purpose. This orientation toward death is not morbid but generative; it structures the horizon of meaning within which life unfolds. Levinas introduces a further dimension by articulating the ethical implications of vulnerability in the face of the Other. For him, the face is not just a surface—it is an ethical summons, a revelation of fragility that commands a response. Vulnerability thus becomes the foundation of moral subjectivity, disrupting the sovereign self and calling it into relation. Together, these thinkers provide an

account of human subjectivity that is intrinsically relational, embodied, and finite — elements that are fundamentally challenged by transhumanist aspirations for invulnerability and perfection.

Complementing the phenomenological tradition is the African communitarian ethical framework, particularly as expressed in the concept of *Ubuntu*. Rooted in sub-Saharan philosophical traditions, *Ubuntu* affirms that personhood is not a given but a moral achievement realised through social participation and mutual care. The maxim *"I am because we are"* encapsulates an understanding of the self as embedded in a relational matrix. In this worldview, vulnerability is not to be eradicated but embraced as the condition of human solidarity and moral growth. Philosophers such as Ifeanyi Menkiti and Kwame Gyekye have articulated the contours of African personhood, debating the balance between communal embeddedness and individual autonomy. Menkiti argues that personhood is conferred by community recognition and moral conduct, whereas Gyekye offers a more moderate view that allows for individual rights within a communal framework. Nonetheless, both affirm the ethical centrality of interdependence and the moral imperative to care for others. In the context of transhumanism, this framework raises important questions: What becomes of the relational self when enhancement technologies promote radical individualism? Can technologically augmented beings still participate meaningfully in communal life if they are no longer vulnerable in the ways others are? Ubuntu ethics suggests that the eradication of vulnerability threatens the very fabric of communal existence by dislocating individuals from the shared conditions of need, care, and ethical responsibility. Together, these frameworks critique the transhumanist ethos of mastery and control. While phenomenology emphasises the ontological depth of human fragility, African communitarianism underscores its ethical and social significance. The synthesis of these traditions allows this paper to mount a multidimensional argument: that vulnerability is indispensable to the experience, meaning, and morality of being human. Technological innovation, therefore, must not aim to erase this fragility, but to engage with it ethically and creatively.

The Ethical and Existential Risks of Overcoming Vulnerability

The aspiration to overcome vulnerability lies at the heart of transhumanist ideology. By eliminating suffering, ageing, and death, advocates argue, humanity can usher in a post-biological future characterised by longevity, intelligence, and autonomy. Yet, this vision obscures a deeper set of philosophical, ethical, and existential risks. If vulnerability is foundational to human experience — as existential, relational, and ethical traditions suggest — its eradication may have unintended consequences that jeopardise the very structures that give human life its value. These risks are not merely speculative; they are grounded in ontological concerns about meaning, identity, empathy, and communal belonging. One of the foremost existential concerns is the potential attenuation of meaning in human life. Heidegger's concept of *being-toward-death* reveals that the recognition of finitude is not an impediment to flourishing but a precondition for authenticity. Mortality forces individuals to confront their temporality, to choose, to value, and to act within the horizon of an ending. In the absence of such limitation, life risks becoming an endless sequence of interchangeable experiences, lacking the urgency that gives existence depth. As Hannah Arendt noted, the human condition is marked not only by natality but by mortality — both contribute to narrative coherence and existential significance. Without death, we may not become gods, but rather *ghosts* — disconnected from the temporal rhythms that structure our being. Furthermore, vulnerability is not only central to individual identity but also to the formation of ethical and social bonds. Emmanuel Levinas insists that the vulnerability of the Other is what calls us into ethical relation. In removing vulnerability from human life, we risk disrupting these moral imperatives. The enhanced post-human may no longer recognise the suffering of the unenhanced, not from malice, but from a radical disjunction in lived experience. As empathy diminishes, so too does the social glue that binds communities. In this regard, transhumanist optimism may conceal a dangerous form of ethical abstraction — one that fails to account for the embodied, emotional, and reciprocal foundations of moral life.

From an African philosophical perspective, these risks are amplified. The African moral tradition — particularly as articulated in *Ubuntu* — centres on interdependence, shared

vulnerability, and mutual care. Vulnerability is not seen as a condition to be overcome but as the very soil in which ethical relationships take root. In eradicating this fragility, transhumanist ideals risk alienating individuals from the relational practices that constitute their personhood. The enhanced individual may, in effect, become *post-human* in more than biological terms—estranged from community, unmoored from the rhythms of human life, and incapable of participating in the reciprocity that *Ubuntu* demands. There are also ethical risks related to justice and inequality. Access to enhancement technologies is likely to be shaped by existing global and local disparities. In Africa and other parts of the Global South, where basic healthcare remains inaccessible to many, the advent of elite enhancement technologies could exacerbate existing structural inequalities. This would not merely create a technocratic elite—it would entrench a form of ontological injustice, where those unable or unwilling to enhance are deemed less human or less valuable. Such a future risks replicating the logic of colonial hierarchies in a new biotechnological key, what Achille Mbembe might call "*necropolitical futurism*": a regime in which access to life and enhancement is governed by capital and power.

Moreover, the drive to optimise and enhance human capacities could result in an erasure of diversity. The history of eugenics reminds us that the manipulation of biology in pursuit of perfection often entails normative judgments about what kinds of lives are worth living. If enhancement technologies allow for the elimination of traits deemed undesirable, we may inadvertently homogenise the human experience, reducing the richness of psychological, physiological, and cultural variation. This could lead to a diminished capacity for creativity, empathy, and adaptation—qualities that arise precisely from our imperfect, vulnerable natures. Finally, the pursuit of invulnerability risks undermining human creativity and resilience. As Bernard Stiegler warns, human inventiveness is born from *technics*—the necessity of solving problems and navigating limitations. It is often through suffering and constraint that individuals develop new forms of thought, expression, and solidarity. If all challenges are pre-emptively resolved through enhancement, the conditions for creativity may be lost. Transhumanism, then, may promise emancipation but deliver stagnation: a sterile utopia, devoid of surprise, risk, or growth. In sum, the ethical and existential risks of overcoming vulnerability are manifold. They involve not only the loss of individual meaning and moral depth but the fragmentation of community, the exacerbation of inequality, and the flattening of human diversity. African philosophical and moral perspectives provide a critical vantage point from which to question the desirability and justice of a post-vulnerable future. Rather than aspiring to eliminate fragility, we must learn to engage with it as the wellspring of our humanity.

Conclusion

The desire to overcome human vulnerability through transhumanist technologies reflects a profound shift in how contemporary societies conceive of flourishing, progress, and perfection. Yet, as this paper has demonstrated, vulnerability is not a peripheral defect to be technologically excised but an existential cornerstone that sustains meaning, creativity, empathy, and ethical responsibility. Drawing on the phenomenological insights of Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Levinas, as well as African communitarian thought—particularly *Ubuntu*—this study has shown that fragility is foundational to human subjectivity, not its negation. Transhumanist aspirations, while rooted in the noble aim of alleviating suffering, threaten to produce a paradoxical result: a future in which individuals, severed from their finitude and relational embeddedness, become less human even as they become more powerful. The eradication of vulnerability risks creating lives that are longer but not deeper; experiences that are efficient but not meaningful; and relationships that are functional but not ethical. It is precisely our exposure to pain, loss, and mortality that draws us into authentic connection with others and awakens us to the urgency of moral and existential questions.

African philosophical frameworks offer a necessary corrective to the disembodied, hyper-individualistic ethos of post-human discourse. In *Ubuntu*, vulnerability is the soil from which community grows; the human being emerges not in spite of others but through them. Technological futures that ignore this relational ontology risk fostering new forms of alienation and inequality, particularly in contexts already marked by historical exclusions and economic disparities. Rather than rejecting transhumanist technologies wholesale, this paper

advocates for a balanced, ethically grounded approach—one that critically interrogates not only what we can do, but what we ought to become. Technology must be directed by values that prioritise human dignity, relational care, and the preservation of the very fragility that makes empathy and meaning possible. Innovation should not aim to replace vulnerability but to support the human capacity to live well within its limits. In the face of seductive promises of perfection and control, philosophy must continue to remind us of what is lost when fragility is discarded. For it is in our vulnerability that we encounter not only the limits of life, but its depth, its beauty, and its ethical demands. The future of humanity does not lie beyond vulnerability, but within it—understood anew, cherished deliberately, and lived together.

References

Bostrom, N. (2005). *A history of transhumanist thought*. Journal of Evolution and Technology, 14(1), 1–25.

Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.

Dreyfus, H. L. (1991). *Being-in-the-world: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I*. MIT Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our posthuman future: Consequences of the biotechnology revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

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.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Harper & Row. (Original work published 1927)

Hughes, J. (2004). *Citizen cyborg: Why democratic societies must respond to the redesigned human of the future*. Westview Press.

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1961)

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.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. A. Landes, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1945)

More, M., & Vita-More, N. (Eds.). (2013). *The transhumanist reader: Classical and contemporary essays on the science, technology, and philosophy of the human future*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*. Clarendon Press.

Sandel, M. J. (2007). *The case against perfection: Ethics in the age of genetic engineering*. Harvard University Press.

Savulescu, J., & Bostrom, N. (Eds.). (2009). *Human enhancement*. Oxford University Press.

Shildrick, M. (2015). The critical turn in posthumanism. In I. Callus, S. Herbrechter, & M. Shildrick (Eds.), *Posthuman critical theory* (pp. 85–98). Bloomsbury.

Stiegler, B. (1998). *Technics and time, 1: The fault of Epimetheus* (R. Beardsworth & G. Collins, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1994)

Wolbring, G. (2012). Ethical theories and discourses through an ability expectation and ableism lens: The case of enhancement and global regulation. *Asian Bioethics Review, 4*(4), 293–309.