IMPACT FACTOR – 5.61

LangLit

An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal

ISSN 2349-5189

Langlit Latur (MS) India AIPROAJ

XENOTRANSPLANTATION: EXAMINING THE PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES

EMMANUEL E. ETTE,
PhD
Department of Philosophy
University of Uyo
Nigeria
Africa
&
IDORENYIN UDOAKPAN IDEM
Department of Philosophy
University of Uyo
Nigeria
Africa

ABSTRACT

Xenotransplantation - the transplantation of living cells, tissues, or organs from one species to another, particularly from animals to humans - represents a groundbreaking yet ethically complex development in modern medicine. It offers the potential to address the global shortage of human organs and save countless lives. However, it also provokes deep ethical concerns regarding the moral status of animals, the integrity of personal identity, public health risks, and questions of justice and equitable access. This study employs a philosophical-analytical method rooted in normative ethics, bioethics, and social philosophy to examine these multidimensional challenges. It explores the tension between technological advancement and moral responsibility, evaluating whether xenotransplantation can be ethically justified and under what conditions. The findings suggest that while the practice holds significant medical promise, it must be pursued within a framework of rigorous ethical safeguards. These include the minimization of animal suffering, protection of human dignity, prevention of biosecurity risks, and assurance of fair and just access to medical innovations. The study recommends the development of inclusive and transparent bioethical policies, meaningful public engagement, and robust international regulatory structures. As scientific capabilities continue to grow, they must be guided not only by innovation, but by a strong commitment to ethical reflection, justice, and social responsibility. Xenotransplantation therefore, is not merely a scientific endeavor but a profound philosophical and moral challenge.

Introduction

Xenotransplantation, the transplantation of living cells, tissues, or organs from one species to another (particularly from animals to humans) is one of the most ambitious and controversial innovations in modern medicine. This medical technique holds tremendous

promise in addressing the global shortage of human organs available for transplantation, a crisis that leaves thousands of patients on waiting lists and leads to preventable deaths each year. With the development of genetic engineering, immunosuppressive drugs, and advances in biotechnology, scientists are now closer than ever to making animal-to-human transplants a viable and routine practice. However, as medicine extends its reach into uncharted biological territory, xenotransplantation also brings to the fore a series of profound philosophical questions. Such as: What are the ethical limits of medical intervention? Can we justify the use of animals as a means to human ends, even in the face of life-saving potential? What does it mean to be human if part of our biological makeup includes non-human components? Should our sense of moral responsibility expand to accommodate the interests of animals used in this process?

The practice challenges long-held distinctions between species, raises concerns about identity, personhood, and the sanctity of the human body, and forces society to reconsider the balance between medical progress and moral constraints. It also invites philosophical reflection on the nature of life, the definition of moral agents, the boundaries of ethical obligation, and the possible societal consequences of such innovations. In light of these concerns, the discussion around xenotransplantation cannot be confined to laboratories and medical journals alone. It demands the insights of philosophers, ethicists, theologians, policy-makers, and the public. This paper aims to examine the philosophical issues surrounding xenotransplantation, drawing on the works of influential thinkers to critically evaluate its ethical implications, explore metaphysical and identity-related concerns, and assess the broader societal impacts of this emerging practice.

The Concept of Xenotransplantation

Xenotransplantation is the process of transplanting living cells, tissues, or organs from one species into another. While it can theoretically involve a combination of wide range of species, the term is most commonly associated with transplanting animal organs, especially from pigs, into human recipients. This practice is being seriously considered in response to one of the most pressing challenges in modern medicine: the chronic and growing shortage of human organs available for transplantation. Every year, thousands of lives are lost as patients wait for organ donations that do not arrive timely creating an urgent need for alternative sources. The global organ shortage is staggering according to the world Health organization, only about 10% of the global need for organ transplants is met each year (Morrison and Fishman, 2293). However, modern science has dramatically reshaped the landscape of the possibility of this animal transplant into human. Advancement in genetic engineering, particularly the ability to “humanize” animal organs by altering their DNA to reduce rejection, have made xenotransplantation a more realistic and promising option. Pigs, for instance, have emerged as the preferred donor species due to their physiological similarities to humans, their rapid reproduction, and the relative ease of genetic modification. Pigs are ideal candidates because their organs are similar in size and function to human organs, and they can be bred rapidly in controlled environment (Platt et al. 683).

According to Cooper et al., researchers have been able to remove or deactivate pig genes that trigger human immune responses and insert human genes that promote compatibility (205). Yet, xenotransplantation is not merely a technical or biomedical issue. It presents deep philosophical and ethical dilemmas. At its core, it forces us to reconsider the

boundaries between species. Traditionally, many cultures and religious traditions have drawn sharp lines between humans and animals. These lines are based on beliefs about the uniqueness of human life, consciousness, and moral status. By inserting animal organs into human bodies, xenotransplantation challenges these distinctions, raising fundamental questions about identity: Can a person with an animal heart or kidney still be considered fully human? Does such a procedure compromise our humanity, or is it simply a continuation of the medical imperative to save lives at any cost? Moreover, the practice raises the issue of how we regard animals. Are animals mere tools to be used for human benefit, or do they possess intrinsic value that should limit their use in medical experiments? This question strikes at the heart of ongoing philosophical debates about animal rights, moral consideration, and the ethical limits of scientific progress.

Philosophical and Ethical Issues Involved

One of the most critical philosophical questions surrounding xenotransplantation is whether it is ethically permissible to use animals, especially genetically modified ones, for the benefit of humans. This issue speaks directly to the moral status of animals: Do they possess rights? Do their interests carry moral weight? Can they be treated as mere instruments for human use, or do they have intrinsic value that commands ethical respect? Singer is one of the most influential voices in contemporary animal ethics. In his work, *Animal Liberation*, Singer introduces the principle of equal consideration of interests, which demands that the suffering of any being capable of experiencing pain must be taken into account equally, regardless of species. Singer challenges speciesism - the idea that humans are inherently superior to other animals - as an unjustified bias, akin to racism or sexism. He writes,

> If a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. No matter what the nature of the being, the principle of equality requires that its suffering be counted equally with the like suffering, in so far as rough comparisons can be made of any other being (5).

From this utilitarian standpoint, the ethical acceptability of xenotransplantation hinges on a cost-benefit analysis: the benefits to humans (such as saving lives, reducing suffering) must significantly outweigh the harm and suffering imposed on the animals used. Moreover, Singer would argue that alternative means of saving lives, such as improving human organ donation systems, should be exhausted before resorting to exploiting animals.

On the other side of the ethical spectrum is Cohen, who offers a rights-based rebuttal to Singer's position. In his essay titled *The Case for the Use of Animals in Biomedical Research*, Cohen argues that animals do not possess rights in the same way humans do because they are not moral agents. That is, they do not participate in moral reasoning, understand moral duties, or engage in moral communities. As he puts it, "a right is a claim or potential claim that one party may exercise against another... only beings who are part of the moral community can have rights" (867). For Cohen, animals are not members of this moral community and therefore cannot be bearers of rights, although he acknowledges that humans still have obligations to treat animals humanely. From this viewpoint, xenotransplantation is ethically defensible if it serves a legitimate human interest, such as saving lives, especially when animal suffering is minimized through humane treatment and genetic engineering.

The ethical tension between Singer and Cohen's views reflects a broader philosophical divide: between utilitarianism, which focuses on the consequences of actions and the balancing of interests, and deontological or rights-based theories, which emphasize the moral standing and inviolability of certain beings. While Singer sees the suffering of animals as morally significant and requiring strong justification for any harm, Cohen maintains a human-centered moral framework that prioritizes human life and interests. These divergent views force us to grapple with essential questions: Should the line of moral consideration stop at the human species? If animals are genetically engineered for human benefit, does that increase or reduce our moral responsibility toward them? Is there a morally relevant distinction between creating animals for food and creating them for organs? In light of these debates, the ethics of xenotransplantation remain highly contested. While proponents argue that the potential to save human lives provides a strong ethical justification, critics warn that reducing animals to mere biological tools risks violating fundamental moral principles and blurring the boundaries of moral responsibility.

The philosophical questions raised by xenotransplantation go beyond ethics and animal rights - they reach into the realm of metaphysics, specifically concerning personal identity and what it means to be a "person". If a human being receives a genetically modified pig organ, such as a heart, kidney, or lung, does this alter their identity or challenge their status as human? These concerns are not merely speculative; they touch on deep cultural, existential, and philosophical anxieties about the boundaries between species, the integrity of the human body, and the foundations of humanity. Warren offers a framework for understanding personhood that is particularly relevant here. Warren contends that a human should not be defined strictly by biological or genetic criteria, but by psychological attributes, including consciousness, reasoning, self-motivated activity, the capacity to communicate, and self-awareness (438). From this perspective, it may be argued that the fact that an individual has received an organ from a non-human does not diminish their human attribute. As long as the individual retains these psychological capacities, their moral and personal identity remains intact. In this view, identity is not bound to the organic origin of the body parts but rather to the continuity of consciousness and moral agency.

Furthermore, proponents of xenotransplantation often argue that the procedure is no more ethically problematic than receiving a human organ transplant or using a pacemaker made from synthetic materials. Organs, whether synthetic, human, or animal-derived, are functional components that sustain biological life, but they do not alter the core attributes that define humans in a philosophical sense. However, this optimistic interpretation is not universally accepted. Some thinkers and bioethicists express concern that xenotransplantation could blur species boundaries and thereby destabilize deeply rooted concepts of human uniqueness and dignity. For example, Fox has raised concerns about the metaphysical and symbolic implications of integrating animal organs into human bodies. Fox suggests that such practices may violate deeply held cultural taboos and raise metaphysical concerns about the integrity of the human body and identity, especially when genetically modified animal parts are involved. The fear is not just of physical contamination, but of symbolic or existential dilution of becoming "less human" or being perceived as such by society (45).

These concerns reflect what might be called the "yuck factor" or bioethical unease - a visceral moral intuition that some technological interventions, even if medically effective, may violate deeply held beliefs about the natural order, the sanctity of the human body, or the

proper limits of science. While these intuitions are not always rationally grounded, they play a powerful role in public perception and policy debates. The tension between these viewpoints raises important questions: Is our sense of personal identity tied to the origin of our biological components, or to our self-conception and social relationships? Should the symbolic value of the human body place limits on medical interventions? Does preserving "human dignity" require strict biological integrity, or can it be maintained in the context of interspecies transplantation? One of the most pressing concerns surrounding xenotransplantation is the risk it poses to public health, especially the threat of zoonotic diseases (pathogens that can jump from animals to humans). According to the World Health Organization, "retroviruses embedded in pig genomes could potentially infect human recipients and cause unknown long-term consequences" (WHO 3). The transplantation of animal organs into human recipients creates a biological bridge through which unknown viruses or retroviruses could cross species barriers, potentially leading to novel infections with epidemic or even pandemic potential. This concern is not merely theoretical; the history of pandemics such as HIV and COVID-19, both of which involved zoonotic transmission, underscores the gravity of such risks.

Given the above, many ethicists argue for the application of the precautionary principle. One of the most influential advocates of this principle is Jonas, who, in *The Imperative of Responsibility,* argued that the unprecedented power of modern technology demands a new ethic - one grounded in prudence, foresight, and humility. Jonas maintains that when dealing with powerful and unpredictable technologies, especially those involving life forms and ecosystems, we must act not on the basis of what is probable, but on what is possible, even if highly improbable, when the consequences are catastrophic. He maintains thus:

> To be sure, the burden of proof falls on those who propose to introduce the change, not on those who oppose it. The onus is on the innovator to demonstrate that the proposed change will not lead to harm, especially when such actions have the potential for far-reaching and irreversible consequences (127).

In this view, safety must be absolutely ensured before undertaking interventions like xenotransplantation, regardless of how promising the benefits might be. The precautionary principle, therefore, demands that scientific certainty, especially concerning long-term and systemic risks, must precede any large-scale implementation of xenotransplantation. This contrasts sharply with more utilitarian or risk-tolerant approaches, which weigh potential benefits (such as saving human lives) against estimated probabilities of harm. For example, if xenotransplantation could potentially save thousands of lives each year, some might argue that the benefits outweigh the small probability of a viral outbreak. But the precautionary view holds that when the stakes involve irreversible and widespread harm, such calculations are ethically inadequate.

Furthermore, critics argue that informed consent, while necessary, is insufficient in this context. A patient may consent to the personal risks of xenotransplantation, but public health risks extend beyond the individual. If a zoonotic virus were to spread from the transplant recipient to the broader population, uninformed and non-consenting third parties would bear the consequences. Thus, xenotransplantation introduces an ethical tension

between individual medical benefit and collective public safety. This dilemma is further complicated by the long-term unpredictability of biological systems. Even with rigorous screening and genetic modification of donor animals, it is virtually impossible to eliminate all risk of viral mutation or unforeseen immune responses.

Beyond ethical questions about animals and risk, xenotransplantation raises urgent concerns about justice, particularly distributive justice (the fair allocation of medical resources in society). If the technology becomes viable, a pressing question emerges: Who will have access to xenotransplants? Will they be available equitably, or only to those with wealth, status, or geographic advantage? Rawls offers a framework for addressing such inequalities. Central to Rawls's theory is the difference principle, which asserts that social and economic inequalities are only justified if they benefit the least advantaged members of society (Rawls, 302). In the context of xenotransplantation, this principle would demand that access to life-saving technologies should not deepen existing health disparities. Instead, the development and distribution of xenotransplants should be structured in a way that especially improves the medical prospects of the poor and marginalized (those who are often last in line for traditional organ donations due to economic, racial, or geographic barriers).

If xenotransplantation becomes a premium service (available only in high-tech hospitals or countries with advanced biotechnology), it risks reinforcing the biomedical divide between the global rich and poor. Ethical policy must therefore confront issues of health equity, ensuring that this innovation does not create a two-tiered system where the wealthy live longer through access to cutting-edge interventions, while the disadvantaged are left behind. As Daniels, a Rawlsian healthcare ethicist, argues in *Just Health*, that protecting fair equality of opportunity requires addressing social determinants of health (Daniel 89). He also opine that, access to vital health resources (such as preventative care, treatment for illness, and essential public health services) should not be determined by socioeconomic status, as health is a foundational condition for individuals to pursue life plans and participate fully in society (45). Without health, the very opportunities Rawls envisions as part of a just society become inaccessible, especially to the most disadvantaged. Moreover, the commodification of life becomes a concern when biological materials, particularly animal organs, are assigned market value. There's a danger that xenotransplantation could follow the same path as other profit-driven medical technologies, where market incentives override ethical commitments to accessibility. It seems critics fear that if biotech companies gain patents over genetically modified pigs or transplant procedures, access could be governed by intellectual property rights and market dynamics rather than by human need. This scenario raises troubling questions about whether we are turning life itself into a commodity, where organs are manufactured, priced, and distributed according to profit potential rather than moral duty.

Further complicating matters is the potential for exploitation in the Global South. If genetically engineered pigs become essential organ sources, will poorer countries be pressured to serve as production grounds for wealthier nations? Such a dynamic would mirror existing global inequalities in pharmaceutical trials and organ trafficking, raising issues of biocolonialism, where the bodies and ecosystems of the poor are used for the benefit of the rich. Therefore, ethical frameworks for xenotransplantation must go beyond individual consent and benefit analysis to address structural justice. Access should be governed by public institutions, with policies designed to prioritize patients based on medical need rather

than financial capacity. Public investment, transparent regulation, and international collaboration will be key to ensuring that the benefits of xenotransplantation are shared equitably, not hoarded by the privileged few.

Evaluation

Xenotransplantation stands in between the extraordinary medical innovation and profound ethical complexity. It holds the promise of addressing one of the most critical issues in contemporary healthcare: the shortage of human organs for transplantation. For thousands of patients on waiting lists worldwide, the ability to receive a life-saving organ from a genetically modified animal represents a powerful beacon of hope. However, the promise of such progress cannot obscure the urgent need for rigorous ethical scrutiny. The road forward must be guided by a careful balance between scientific ambition and philosophical responsibility. One of the primary moral Challenge in this field is minimizing animal suffering. Following the ethical framework proposed by Singer, we must extend moral consideration to animals, especially those bred and genetically modified for medical purposes. As long as the interests of animals are given equal consideration, utilitarianism could support their use in research or transplantation under strict conditions (Singer 147). Singer's utilitarian approach demands that we weigh the pain and exploitation of animals against the potential human benefits, and act only when the benefits are morally compelling and the harms minimized.

In his chapter "Utilitarianism and Animals" in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*, Frey discusses the utilitarian emphasis on sentience as the basis for moral consideration. He notes that utilitarianism has historically been sympathetic to the pains of animals, stating: "By using a sentiency criterion of moral standing, Jeremy Bentham ensured that the pain and suffering of animals counted in the moral calculus" (Frey 172). Frey acknowledges that, within a utilitarian framework, the capacity for suffering grants animals moral considerability, aligning with Singer's argument that animal suffering must be weighed against human benefits in ethical decision-making. By incorporating Frey's perspectives, we see a reinforcement of Singer's utilitarian approach, emphasizing that the moral permissibility of using animals in research hinges on a careful assessment of suffering and benefits. This calls for stringent welfare standards, humane treatment, and transparency in research protocols, ensuring that animals are not simply treated as tools or commodities for human convenience.

Indeed, informed consent and public engagement are equally crucial. Any medical procedure that carries significant risk, especially one involving novel and ethically sensitive practices like xenotransplantation, must involve robust mechanisms for obtaining informed, voluntary consent from recipients. Beyond individual consent, society as a whole must be included in the conversation. Technologies with broad implications for public health, animal ethics, and biosecurity must be subject to open democratic discourse. Transparency, accessibility of information, and engagement with diverse cultural and religious perspectives can help cultivate public trust and legitimacy in decision-making. Biosecurity represents another cornerstone of ethical implementation. The risk of zoonotic diseases poses not just a danger to individual patients but to the wider population. Jonas, in his work *The Imperative of Responsibility*, emphasizes the moral weight of our responsibility to future generations in the face of uncertainty and risk. He warns against the arrogance of assuming that human

capability equates to ethical certainty: "Our capacity to do things is not the same as our capacity to know what we ought to do" (Jonas 121). This concern is similarly echoed by Habermas, who warns against the unchecked application of human technological power without democratic and ethical reflection. He argues that:

> Modern biotechnology offers unprecedented technical control over the conditions of human genetics, but they ethical guidelines necessary to responsibly manage this power are still emerging and require careful development (Habermas 28).

Both thinkers highlight a central ethical tension: that technological advancement often outpaces our moral frameworks, and with that comes a heightened obligation to act cautiously and responsibly, especially in ways that may affect future generations. This perspective strengthens the call for the precautionary principle - acting only when the risks have been clearly studied and mitigated. Institutions must implement rigorous scientific oversight and adopt the highest biosecurity standards to prevent unintended consequences from experimental procedures.

Equally vital is the question of justice. Drawing on Rawls's difference principle, any just society must ensure that the benefits of new medical technologies are distributed in ways that improve the lives of the least advantaged. Xenotransplantation, if developed without equitable access in mind, could cause global and domestic health disparities. Policies must be designed to prevent the commodification of life, resist the monopolization of biotechnology by corporations, and ensure that life-saving organs are not accessible only to the rich or to those living in countries with advanced healthcare systems. Fairness demands that the technology serve the broader public good and reflect our deepest ethical commitments to equality and human dignity. Another question is, can xenotransplantation be permitted on the grounds of 'general good'? This connotes the importance of the live of the patient to the society. For example, if an individual who's existence will add value to the society needs a little time to achieve that. Can xenotransplantation be permitted on the ground of 'general good' the act stands to achieve?

Xenotransplantation challenges us to walk the fine line between innovation and caution, between hope and humility. It requires that we reflect not just on what is scientifically possible, but on what is morally permissible. The ethical path forward must be paved with compassion for animals, transparency with the public, accountability for risks, and a deep sense of justice for all people. In the spirit of Jonas's warning, it is not enough to ask whether we can perform xenotransplants, we must also ask whether we ought to. Only by grappling honestly with these philosophical questions can we ensure that our pursuit of medical progress remains deeply and unshakably human. For instance In 2022, surgeons at the University of Maryland performed a historic transplant: a genetically modified pig heart was transplanted into a terminally ill human patient. The patient survived for two months before succumbing to complications, but the procedure demonstrated that a pig organ could function within the human body for a significant period (Ewalt). The question now is, if the procedure is for a short period of time, why waste the time? Why waste the resources? And why kill the animal if the exercise will be temporary.

Conclusion

Xenotransplantation lies at the intersection of cutting-edge biomedical innovation and profound philosophical inquiry. It challenges not only the capabilities of medical science but also the moral compass of society. At its core, it provokes essential questions about what it means to be human, the moral obligations we owe to non humans, and how we can responsibly harness technological progress without compromising our ethical standards. By merging human and animal biology in such a direct and intimate way, xenotransplantation forces us to reflect on the boundaries of human identity and dignity. Thinkers like Warren remind us that human nature is rooted more in consciousness and rationality than in biology, suggesting that receiving a non-human organ does not diminish one's humanity. Yet, the metaphysical discomfort and public resistance often associated with such procedures indicate that deeper existential and cultural anxieties are at play. These anxieties must be met not with dismissal, but with dialogue, education, and ethical sensitivity.

Moreover, the treatment of animals in this context remains one of the most pressing ethical concerns. While some, like Cohen, argue that animals can be used to advance human interests due to their lack of moral agency, others, like Singer caution against ignoring animal suffering and advocate for a more inclusive moral community. Xenotransplantation tests the extent to which the society is willing to recognize the interests of animals, especially when their lives are engineered and sacrificed for human benefit. Public health concerns and biosecurity risks also demand caution. The potential for zoonotic disease transmission poses a threat not only to individual recipients, but to society at large. Jonas's call for responsible innovation reminds us that just because we have the ability to pursue a technology does not mean we have the ethical license to proceed without restraint. The unknown surrounding long-term effects and cross-species disease transmission underscore the need for humility, rigorous oversight, and the prioritization of public safety.

Lastly, issues of justice and fairness must be front and center. The promise of xenotransplantation must not become another tool of inequality, accessible only to the wealthy or to nations with advanced infrastructure. As Rawlsian justice principles emphasize, medical advancements should work to benefit the most disadvantaged and ensure equitable access. Otherwise, we risk turning life-saving treatments into symbols of privilege, undermining the ethical fabric of healthcare. The ethical viability of xenotransplantation rests not solely on scientific breakthroughs, but on our collective moral reasoning. We must construct robust frameworks rooted in the principles of rights, justice, compassion, and responsibility. Xenotransplantation presents an opportunity not only to extend life, but to expand the moral scope of how we think about life (human and non-human alike). As we move forward, let our choices be informed not just by what we can achieve, but by what we ought to become.

WORKS CITED

1. Cohen, C. "The Case for the Use of Animals in Biomedical Research". *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 315(14), 1986: pp. 865 - 870.
2. Cooper, D. K. C., Ekser, B., and Tector, A. J. *A brief history of clinical xenotransplantation*. International Journal of Surgery, 23(Pt B), 2016: pp. 205 - 210.
3. Daniels, M. Just Health: meeting Health needs fairly. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
4. Fox, M.. *Deep Vegetarianism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
5. Frey, R. G. Utilitarianism and Animals. The Oxford handbook of animal ethics, edited by Tom L. Beauchamp and R. G. Frey, Oxford UP, 2011, pp. 172-197.
6. Frey, R. *Justifying animal experimentation: The starting point*. *Society*, *39*(6), 2002: pp 36–39. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-002-1003-7 on 2025 - 5 - 16
7. Habermas, Jurgen. The future of Human Nature. Translated by Gregory Elliott, polity press, 2003.
8. Jonas, H. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
9. Morrison, Sarah, and Jay Fishman. "Xenotransplantation and the Human Organ Shortage: The Future Is Closer than You Think." New England Journal of Medicine, vol. 386, no. 24, 2022, pp. 2293–2295. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2202664
10. Platt, Jeffrey L., et al. "The Promise of Xenotransplantation." Nature Reviews Immunology, vol. 21, no. 10, Oct. 2021, pp. 682–693. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-021-00549-0.
11. Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1971.
12. Singer, P. *Animal Liberation*. New York: New York Review of Books, 1975.
13. Singer, P. Utilitarianism and Animals. Oxford handbook of animal ethics, by Tom L. Beauchamp and R. G. Frey, oxygen University Press, 2011, pp. 140-165.
14. Warren, M. *On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion*. The Monist, 57(4), 1973: pp 438 - 445.
15. World Health Organization. Xenotransplantation: Guidance on Infectious Disease Prevention and Surveillance. WHO, 2001, https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/67163.