

element: one cannot change the relationships members of society enjoy or detest by modifying the individual bodies of these members. That said, sustained corporal change over time could certainly have an effect on relations in society.

3.1 Difference and the Concept of Man

The concept of Man could of course change, but to what extent? Perhaps the thing that society is calling out for here is a concept of humans that is more material in nature when compared to the current idea of what it is to be human. The belief that we could/should/must modify our own physical existence may mean that the immaterial – social, psychological, cultural, and spiritual – aspects of our lives have become less important to us. Would such a statement be too simplistic or is it part of our new reality? Those working in advanced Artificial Intelligence, Cognitive Robotics, Neuro-evolution, and transhumanistic technologies generally do not delve into the intricate questions of love, faith or respect for others in society, all of which are of direct concern in the human immaterial sphere. These specialists are currently not supposed to be intimately concerned with such matters. One could nevertheless be very mistaken in saying that these matters are not on scientists' agendas. How can they ever hope to do better than man if they cannot copy certain facets of humans? We can conclude for the time being that the concept of being human today means being more physically human than 100 years ago.

3.2 Relation and the Concept of Man

So the concept of Man has evolved. Does this have an effect on related concepts? The concepts of Nature and Artifact need to be explored here. The fact that we accept tampering with Mother Nature's "products" today is not new but the application of such techniques to our own physical and cognitive capacities has increased exponentially. However, we could only say that our relation to nature has been altered slightly. What is important to ask is why this change suddenly becomes necessary and what our new relation with nature means to us in the future.

As for the concept of artifact, the shift seems to be more radical. The tie between Man and being man-made has been strengthened in the consciousness of members of society, perhaps paradoxically. Take the common notion of the "self-made man." A "self-made man" referred to self-assurance, aspirations, intellectual stamina, and other characteristics that are part of the purely psychological composition of an individual, whereas now we are able to apply this notion to his physical composition as well. If one prefers lesser-alarming examples, one could examine the simple layman's understanding of the use of steroids in sports: first they were used practically, then their use was considered to be cheating, and now they are deadly substances.

This shift has happened over a relatively short period of time whilst the effects of their use have remained stable. Will our judgment on what can and what cannot be considered an artifact also be affected this rapidly?

3.3 *Identity and the Concept of Man*

If human modification becomes common, what will this mean for the identity of man in the ecosystem? The fact that man would have the opportunity to change the very concept of himself in this manner, and that this would have a real effect on man's surroundings proves that *homo sapiens* can control its "conceptual environment" and that the techniques discussed here would be a mere side effect of his existence, i.e., other techniques could be used to sustain the developments sought. This would mean that individuals really would have obtained an overwhelming level of power *vis-à-vis* their past and *vis-à-vis* their counterparts.

4 **Shouldn't We be Against Greater Human Diversity?**

In the hypothetical situation just described, the weaker are bound to suffer more. Is this the type of *homo sapiens* we wish to become?

The identity of others would be heavily affected in such a world. The identity of the "improved" self would be equated with a very heady position – practically Godhood. But today, we do have the opportunity to apply this ill-formed logic to our lives ourselves.

So, should biodiversity include the redesign of man? As I said, the key to strengthening the argument against modifying Man requires practical ideas on how and why we should not indulge in such modifications. Many are modifying man by eugenics, implants, etc., though perhaps not to the point of becoming cyborgs. (For an exception which may not yet prove the rule, see the chapter by Daniela Cerqui and Kevin Warwick in this volume).

The way in which they, the artificial or modified beings, would seem different from the average human today is in the values they would, conceivably, be able to share and apply; because of the hypothetical differences we can imagine between the (traditional) human values of original men and non-organic modified persons, one might not wish to see the latter caring for one's children or for the elderly. One may have difficulty trusting the moral judgments of a non-natural neighbor or artificial person.

The practical arguments supporting the view that bio-diversity should not include the redesign of Man would entail, among other things, avoiding simulation in all its forms. This claim about simulation could be presented as generic advice, with negotiations for special cases determined by some other set of criteria. The important aspect here is the urgency of the question as, in light of the suggestions made by Turkle cited above, simulations are changing our vision of ourselves and of our world today.