JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY AND CONTEMPORARY ISSUES
Volume 2, Number 1 (March 2026)
ISSN: 1595-9457 (online); 3093-060X (print)
Website: https://jppssuniuyo.com/jpci **Email:** jppssuniuyo@gmail.com
Received: February 18, 2026 **Accepted**: March 07, 2026 **Published**: March 31, 2026
Citation: Ibeh, Chikezie W. (2026). "Ethical Dimension to Genetically Modified Organisms (Gmos): A Deontological Analysis." *Journal of Philosophy and Contemporary Issues*, 2 (1): 116-123.

Article **Open Access**

ETHICAL DIMENSION TO GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOs): A DEONTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Chikezie Winston Ibeh
University of Abuja, Abuja
Email: winston.c.ibeh@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores the ethical dimensions of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) within the philosophical framework of Kant's deontological ethics. Thus, emphasizing the intersection of biotechnology, ethics, and public responsibility. It also identifies a crucial gap in existing scholarship, which is the insufficient incorporation of philosophical ethics in assessing GMOs, which are often evaluated only through scientific, economic, or policy-oriented lenses. This paper, draws upon the ethical traditions of Immanuel Kant's deontological duty, to advance a comprehensive framework of responsible biotechnology practice. This paper shades light on findings that indicate that, while GMOs possess significant potential to address global food insecurity, reduce agricultural dependency, and mitigate environmental stress, their ethical legitimacy depends on distributive justice, sustainability, and respect for the intrinsic worth of all life forms. This study therefore, demonstrates that moral philosophy provides essential corrective to technocratic approaches that prioritize efficiency over ethical accountability. Consequently, biotechnological innovation must be guided by prudence, humility, and foresight to ensure it enhances rather than undermines the moral and ecological fabric of human existence. The objective of this study is to underscore the necessity of a deontologically ethical education within; practical scientific research, formulation of transparent policies for governance in biotechnology, and interdisciplinary oversight mechanisms that align biotechnological progress with enduring principles of human dignity, ecological stewardship, and global justice. This study employs the analytic method of research by which concepts and arguments surrounding the subject matter of the study, are tested and broken down.

Keywords: Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO's), Deontological Ethics, Intrinsic Value of Life, Biotechnology Governance, Public Responsibility.

Introduction

Ethics, as a key branch of philosophy, concerns itself with the rational evaluation of moral principles governing human conduct; specifically, what is right, good, or just. When extended to the realms of science and technology, it interrogates the moral boundaries of human creativity and the attendant responsibility that comes with the power to manipulate nature. The rapid advancement of biotechnology in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has fundamentally altered humanity's relationship with the natural world, raising profound ethical questions about the legitimacy and moral limits of scientific intervention. Among the most notable outcomes of this technological revolution is the creation of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs); entities whose genetic composition have been deliberately altered to enhance certain traits such as pest resistance, nutritional value, and adaptability. While these innovations represent milestones in agricultural, biological and medical progress, they also introduce deep ethical concerns that transcend empirical science and enter the philosophical domain of moral justification; further entering an area that is within the realm of the type of ethics called, applied ethics; of which bioethics is the focus.

The ethical discourse surrounding GMOs, as argued by scholars such as Hans Jonas (1984) and Aldo Leopold (1949) centres on humanity's moral duty to respect the integrity of nature and the future of life. Kantian deontology would urge that biotechnological actions be judged not by outcomes but by their adherence to moral duty and universalizable principles. Conversely, utilitarian philosophers like Jeremy Bentham (1861) and John Stuart Mill (1863) would justify genetic modification if it maximizes collective welfare. Yet, as contemporary scholars in bioethics such as Paul Thompson (2007) and Peter Singer in (2010) have observed, the ethical analysis of GMOs has largely been dominated by consequentialist reasoning within policy and economics, with limited attention to the philosophical depth of moral obligation and intrinsic value.

This research gap underscores the absence of a coherent ethical framework that integrates moral philosophy with modern biotechnological governance, a void this study seeks to fill. The moral evaluation of GMOs thus, presents one of the most complex challenges at the intersection of science, ethics, and public policy. While proponents highlight their potential to alleviate hunger and foster sustainability, critics question whether humanity possesses the moral right to alter the genetic essence of life. Having said that, peer-reviewed studies, such as those by Nuffield Council on Bioethics (2016) and Paarlberg (2019), reveal an ongoing global tension between sientific optimism and ethical caution. The existing literature often treats the GMO debate through empirical or regulatory perspectives, neglecting the deeper metaphysical and moral dimensions concerning human responsibility and ecological stewardship. This deficiency in ethical integration, where technological progress often outpaces moral reflection, thus, constitutes the central research problem addressed in this study. Accordingly, this work undertakes a philosophical-ethical inquiry into GMOs by applying deontological ethical theories in order to assess the moral legitimacy of genetic modification practices. This paper also, critically evaluates whether the manipulation of life forms aligns with moral principles of justice, respect for life, and sustainability, and seeks to develop a deontological framework for biotechnological innovation. The study positions itself within the broader discipline of applied ethics, aiming to bridge the gap between philosophical theory and practical governance in biotechnology. Methodologically, it employs a philosophical-analytical approach, engaging with primary philosophical texts

and peer-reviewed scholarship to construct a normative argument for ethical responsibility in scientific practice.

This study, is significant for several reasons. Theoretically, it contributes to the discourse in applied ethics and bioethics by extending moral reasoning into agricultural and environmental biotechnology; domains often marginalized in ethical analysis. Practically, it provides normative guidance for policymakers, scientists, and ethicists confronting the moral dilemmas of genetic modification. Most importantly, it reaffirms ethics as the conscience of scientific progress, ensuring that human innovation remains guided by moral wisdom, justice, and respect for the intrinsic value of life. By integrating moral philosophy with biotechnological discourse, this study aspires to establish a deontological framework, one that harmonizes human creativity with moral restraint, scientific progress with ecological integrity, and innovation with justice and sustainability.

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are products of modern biotechnology created through the deliberate alteration of genetic material using techniques such as recombinant DNA technology and CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats); a gene-editing technology that allows scientists to make precise changes to an organism's DNA, such as deleting, adding, or altering sections. This system is derived from a natural defense mechanism in bacteria and uses a guide RNA to find a specific DNA sequence and a Cas9 protein to cut it, enabling researchers to modify genes to study diseases or create new therapies. Unlike traditional breeding, genetic modification allows for precise and targeted changes that enhance traits such as pest resistance, drought tolerance, and nutritional content. As a scientific innovation, GMOs hold significant promise for addressing global challenges like hunger, environmental degradation, and agricultural inefficiency. They also play a crucial role in medicine, industry, and environmental management. Despite these benefits, GMOs raise far-reaching ethical, ecological, and socio-political concerns. From a bioethical perspective, issues of autonomy, justice, beneficence, and non-maleficence shape debates about consumer consent, global inequality, potential harms, and equitable access to biotechnology. Deontological moral theories question whether altering genetic material treats life as a mere instrument, while other ethical theories/perspectives either generally justify GMOs based on their potential to improve welfare or highlight concerns about biodiversity loss, gene flow into wild species, ecological disruption, and long-term unpredictability.

However, socio-economic issues further complicate the discourse around GMOs, as patented GMO seeds concentrate power in the hands of a few multinational corporations, affecting farmer autonomy and global seed sovereignty. This; more often than not, leads to public mistrust which is often fueled by misinformation or cultural values, goes on to influence policy and market acceptance. International governance frameworks, including the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, attempt to regulate the safe use and movement of GMOs, although policies vary widely across regions. This is why, Jianhui Li (2024) critically examined ethical governance around genetically modified animals, and argued that global ethical-review frameworks remain fragmented, lacking uniform standards, and that there is tension between innovation goals and animal welfare. Thereby, calling for coordinated oversight and ethical governance reforms. Similarly, Jason Lai (2024) offers a normative review concluding that, while GMOs are controversial, they provide significant environmental, health and economic benefits. However, Lai urges careful ethical and regulatory consideration around the proliferation and use of GMOs. Philosophically, the GMO debate exposes deeper

questions about humanity's relationship with nature, responsibilities to future generations, and the moral limits of technological intervention. While GMOs provide significant benefits, they also challenge societies to balance innovation with ethical reflection, ecological stewardship, and social justice. The future of genetic modification therefore depends not only on scientific capability but on deliberate and responsible moral decision-making.

Deontological Foundations of Ethics Vis-à-Vis GMOs

Deontological ethics derived from the Greek word deon (meaning duty), is a normative ethical framework that evaluates the morality of actions based on adherence to moral rules, duties, or obligations rather than consequences. It is one of the central traditions in moral philosophy and stands in contrast to consequentialist theories, such as utilitarianism, which determine rightness by the outcomes of actions. Deontological ethics insists that certain actions are morally required or prohibited regardless of their consequences because morality is grounded in principles that command universal respect. The foundations of deontological ethics are therefore, rooted in rationalist moral philosophy, most prominently articulated by Immanuel Kant in the 18th century. However, earlier philosophical traditions, including; Stoicism and religious moral codes also emphasized duty, virtue, and moral law.

Immanuel Kant's deontological ethics provides a framework that grounds morality, not in outcomes but in duty and rational autonomy. Kant (1997) famously formulated the categorical imperatives, that hold that one should act only according to that maxim whereby one can at the same time will that it should become a universal law. For Kant, moral worth arises from acting out of duty, not inclination. Furthermore, his distinction between price and dignity underscores the moral sanctity of life. He held that, in the kingdom of ends, everything has either a price or a dignity and whatever has dignity, admits of no equivalence.

In the ethical evaluation of GMOs, Kantian reasoning insists that nature and living organisms should never be reduced to mere instruments of human or corporate interest. Immanuel Kant, evaluates moral action not by outcomes but by adherence to universal moral duty. In his Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals (1997), Kant articulates the categorical imperative, such that we should act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law. This imperative provides a rational test for moral universality. When applied to GMOs, it asks whether the manipulation of life forms could be justified as a universal moral practice without contradiction or degradation of dignity. Kant further distinguishes between things that have a price and those that possess dignity, insisting that whatever has a dignity admits of no equivalence. Genetic organisms, as the foundation of life, arguably falls into the latter category; bearing intrinsic moral worth that resists commodification. Philosophers such as Onora O'Neill (1996) expand Kant's framework to biotechnology, contending that, respect for autonomy requires that biotechnological practices not merely use organisms as means to human ends, but regard them as entities with their own moral significance. Similarly, Christine Korsgaard (2018) argues that human rationality imposes obligations toward all beings capable of being ends in themselves, noting that the value of humanity gives rise to duties toward nature as part of the world in which humanity realizes its moral vocation. From this standpoint, the ethical challenge of GMOs lies not in their utility but in whether their creation and use, respect the autonomy and intrinsic value of life. Kantian ethics thus, demands restraint and moral reflection before altering genetic material that may have consequences beyond human comprehension. Immanuel Kant's deontological ethics, thus, rejects moral reasoning grounded solely in consequences. Instead, it posits that actions have moral worth only when they arise from duty in accordance with his categorical imperative. When applied to GMOs,

Kantian ethics asks whether genetic manipulation respects the inherent dignity of living beings or merely treats them as means to economic and scientific ends.

Kant's (1997) categorical imperative demands that genetic manipulation be morally universalizable and respect the dignity of life. O'Neill (1996) argues that rational moral limits must guide biotechnology, while Korsgaard (2018) extends moral concern to nonhuman life, insisting that moral vocation includes obligations toward all living beings. Jonas' (1984) ethics of responsibility further requires that technological actions preserve the conditions necessary for future life. This approach warns against unchecked scientific intervention when long-term consequences remain uncertain. Also, deontological reasoning extends moral consideration to future generations, this is a principle reinforced by Hans Jonas' ethics of responsibility. Jonas (1984) asserts that modern technology demands a new imperative, which is that actors in modern technology should act so that the effects of their action are compatible with the permanence of genuine life on earth. This "heuristics of fear" which boarders on incessant experimentation, urges caution in applying genetic technologies whose long-term ecological impacts remain uncertain. From a Kantian-Jonasian perspective, the moral duty to preserve the integrity of life and natural systems overrides utilitarian appeals to immediate benefit. Ethical biotechnology must therefore respect moral limits grounded in the dignity and autonomy of living beings.

Previous Ethical Studies on GMOs

The ethical discourse surrounding genetically modified organisms (GMOs) has developed across multiple disciplines, such as; bioethics, agricultural ethics, and environmental philosophy. Early discussions focused primarily on risk and safety, while later analyses integrated broader moral questions about justice, autonomy, and sustainability.

Paul Thompson (1995) argues that agriculture is a moral relationship, not merely a technical enterprise, and emphasizes that soil and ecosystems deserve ethical consideration. This insight situates biotechnology within a framework of moral stewardship rather than instrumental control. Similarly, Ruth Chadwick and Matti Hayry (1994) both advocate for integrative bioethics, that combines deontological and utilitarian principles to evaluate scientific responsibility holistically. Vandana Shiva (1997), offers an ecofeminist critique, arguing that GMO technologies and genetic patents perpetuate economic and ecological inequities, particularly in the Global South. Martha Nussbaum (2006) provides a point of view from another lens, emphasizing that justice requires safeguarding the basic capabilities necessary for human dignity. In environmental ethics, Holmes Rolston III (1988) reminds us that; nature is a value generator; humans are but one expression of the planet's valuing processes. His non-anthropocentric ethic challenges the assumption that technological manipulation of life can be justified solely by human benefit. Collectively, these thinkers reveal the multidimensional moral landscape surrounding biotechnology, spanning; welfare, justice, sustainability, and the integrity of nature itself. This framework provides an ethical lens for evaluating how GMOs affect not only economic outcomes but also human dignity and ecological well-being.

Identified Gaps in the Literature

While significant scholarly attention has been devoted to the scientific and regulatory aspects of GMOs, the philosophical integration of ethics(especially deontological ethics) and biotechnology remains underdeveloped. Much of the existing ethical analysis tends to adopt either a consequentialist (utilitarian) or risk-based approach, often neglecting deontological and other ethical perspectives that question the moral foundations of genetic manipulation

itself. Also, existing ethical discourse often fail to fully engage the intergenerational and ecological dimensions of the GMO debate. Consequently, the question of moral responsibility toward future generations, central to Jonas' philosophy, is rarely given adequate weight in policy-oriented discussions. Similarly, the intrinsic value of nature and the moral status of non-human life are frequently overlooked in favour of anthropocentric reasoning centered on human benefit. This study therefore seeks to fill this gap by offering a comprehensive philosophical synthesis that draws upon deontological ethical theories to construct a coherent moral framework for evaluating GMOs. It aims to move beyond isolated debates about safety or utility and instead explore the deeper ethical structure that should guide human engagement with biotechnology in pursuit of justice, sustainability, and moral integrity.

A Philosophical Analysis of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) Through the Lens of Bioethics: The Ethical Nexus of Science and Life

Bioethics, as a subfield of applied ethics, emerges from the intersection of philosophy, biology, and moral reasoning. It investigates how moral principles guide scientific innovation, particularly where human intervention affects life itself. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), as products of advanced biotechnology, epitomize this moral frontier. Through deliberate alteration of the genetic structure of plants, animals, and microorganisms, scientists seek to enhance traits such as pest resistance, nutritional content, and productivity. Yet, these scientific accomplishments raise profound philosophical questions: Should humanity alter the genetic code of life simply because it can? and Does such modification uphold or undermine the moral integrity of nature?

These questions move beyond empirical science into the moral domain of bioethics, which insists that life forms possess inherent moral significance and should not merely be treated as instruments of human utility. As Van Rensselaer Potter (1971) rightly puts it, that the survival of humanity depends on merging biological knowledge with ethical wisdom , a principle particularly relevant in evaluating GMOs.

The Philosophical Foundations of Bioethical Inquiry

According to some philosophical scholars, bioethics rests upon four foundational principles: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. These provide a moral compass for assessing scientific conduct, as elaborated below:

i. **Autonomy:** Here, respect is demanded for the self-determination of individuals and communities affected by GMO policies, particularly farmers and consumers who must have informed consent regarding what they cultivate or consume.
ii. **Beneficence:** This requires that GMOs genuinely contribute to human welfare, for example by improving nutrition or food security.
iii. **Non-maleficence:** This prohibits causing harm to humans, animals, or ecosystems, warning against unintended consequences such as genetic contamination or ecological imbalance.
iv. **Justice:** Justice insists on equitable access to the benefits of biotechnology and fair distribution of its risks, especially for developing nations that often become testing grounds for GMO technologies without corresponding economic or social benefits.

Through the above principles, bioethics demands that genetic innovation be morally accountable, socially just, and ecologically sustainable.

Philosophical Synthesis Toward a Responsible Biotechnology

Synthesizing Kant's deontological ethics and biotechnological practices, invariably leads to more responsible, humanity oriented biotechnological practices. This, also involves an approach or approaches that are grounded in justice, sustainability, and humility before nature. This synthesis advocates that ethical biotechnology should be responsible for the following:

i. **Promotion of Human Welfare Without Commodifying Life:** The alleviation of hunger and disease must remain a moral imperative, but life itself must not be treated as a marketable artifact.
ii. **Respecting Ecological Integrity:** Any biotechnological intervention should maintain biodiversity, protect soil fertility, and prevent ecological imbalance.
iii. **Ensuring Distributive Justice:** Access to GMO benefits should be equitable, especially for developing nations like Nigeria; where smallholder farmers are many. Doing or achieving this will lead to avoiding the monopolization of genetic resources by corporate entities.
iv. **Safeguarding Intergenerational Responsibility:** As Hans Jonas (1973) asserts, the effects of our technological choices must be "compatible with the permanence of genuine human life on earth." This should be an important guiding light in the practice of biotechnology.
v. **Fostering Public Dialogue and Ethical Education:** Biotechnology must operate transparently and democratically, guided by ethical literacy and informed consent among "all" stakeholders.

Recommendations

Based on the ethical analysis of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for policymakers, researchers, international organizations and relevant stakeholders:

i. **Establish Ethical Oversight Bodies:** National and international biotechnology agencies, should mandatorily include ethicists, environmental scientists, and community representatives in biotechnology review boards to ensure that genetic research aligns with human rights and ecological ethics.
ii. **Strengthen Global Governance of Genetic Resources:** Global frameworks like, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (which regulates the transboundary movement, handling, and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) to protect biological diversity from potential risks and establishes an Advance Informed Agreement (AIA) procedure for international transfers, requiring countries to receive and approve notification before LMOs are imported), should be expanded to regulate genetic patents, prevent biopiracy, and promote open access to life-saving technologies for low-income regions.
iii. **Integrate Bioethics into Scientific Education:** Ethical reflection should be embedded within biotechnology curricula in schools, to cultivate moral awareness among future scientists. As Aristotle (1999) reminds us; "We become just by doing just acts."
iv. **Promote Sustainable Innovation:** Research funding should prioritize GMOs that enhance ecological resilience, such as drought-tolerant, pest-resistant, or nutrient-rich crops, without compromising biodiversity or cultural farming practices.
v. **Encourage Ethical Corporate Conduct:** Companies involved in GMO development must adopt transparent labeling, fair pricing, and responsible intellectual property policies that protect the autonomy of farmers as well as consumer choice.

Conclusion

Conclusively, the ethical dimension of GMOs demands more than regulatory compliance; as it requires a transformation with regard to how humanity conceives of its relationship to life and nature. Having said that, biotechnology can either deepen human solidarity and ecological harmony, or reinforce exploitation and imbalance. As Leopold (1949) reminds us, ethical responsibility toward land stems from recognizing ourselves as part of its community. As such, responsible biotechnology requires aligning innovation with deontologically ethical values that preserve life, dignity, and ecological balance. The future of GMOs, therefore, depends not merely on scientific advancement but on the moral wisdom with which we wield it. Ethical biotechnology is not the rejection of innovation, but the humanization of science, ensuring that progress serves life, rather than dominates it.

References

Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics (T. Irwin, Trans.)*. Hackett Publishing.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. T. Payne.

Bentham, J. (1861). *Utilitarianism.* Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Chadwick, R., & Häyry, M. (1994). *The ethics of biotechnology.* Blackwell.

Hursthouse, R. (1999). *On virtue ethics.* Oxford University Press.

Jonas, H. (1973). *Technology and responsibility: Reflections on the new tasks of ethics.* Social Research, 40(1), 31–54.

Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age.* University of Chicago Press.

Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Korsgaard, C. (2018). *Fellow creatures: Our obligations to the other animals.* Oxford University Press.

Lai, J. (2024). *The Ethicality of Genetically Modified Organisms: Is the Use and Proliferation of Genetically Modified Organisms Ethical?* Matrix Science Medica, 65–69.

Leopold, A. (1949). *A sand county almanac and sketches here and there*. Oxford University Press.

Li, J. (2024). *Ethical Review and Welfare Protection of GMO Animals: Current Status and Future Prospects.* GMO Biosafety Research, 15(6), 290–297.

MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Naess, A. (1973). *The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement.* Inquiry, 16(1–4), 95–100.

Norton, B. (1991). *Toward unity among environmentalists*. Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership.* Harvard University Press.

O'Neill, O. (1996). *Towards justice and virtue: A constructive account of practical reasoning*. Cambridge University Press.

Potter, V. R. (1971). *Bioethics: Bridge to the future*. Prentice-Hall.

Rolston III, H. (1988). *Environmental ethics: Duties to and values in the natural world.* Temple University Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Shiva, V. (1997). *Biopiracy: The plunder of nature and knowledge.* South End Press.

Singer, P. (2011). *Practical ethics (3rd ed.).* Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, P. B. (1995). *The spirit of the soil: Agriculture and environmental ethics.* Routledge.

Williams, B. (1973). *Utilitarianism: For and against*. Cambridge University Press.