

## Are Spiritual-Humans Special Enough to Engage in Transhumanism?

Johan A van Rooyen

Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, South Africa

**\*Corresponding author:**

Johan A. van Rooyen, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, South Africa, E-mail: roojresearch@gmail.com

Submitted: 08 Nov 2019; Accepted: 23 Nov 2019; Published: 23 Jan 2020

### Abstract

*The transcended mind and brain in its transhumanist environment for spiritual-humans-Hope, in an age of technological enhancement. Today human technologies are largely limited to prescription drugs and surgery. However, research is underway on new exotic technologies such as nanotechnology, information technology, cell regeneration, and implantable devices that interact directly with the brain. Any one of these fields may lead to a far more powerful way to expand human powers, augment human capacities, and arguably at least, enhance human lives.*

### Introduction

In this script the author takes a pragmatic view that although human frailties and limitations cannot be called good, they are nonetheless vindicated by religious and spiritual-humans.<sup>1</sup> In this script, he writes for all religious-humans with the question amalgamated in the above-mentioned title who assumes our condition and thereby already transcends it for us, if only, we as religious-humans, will remain creaturely.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, is it the authors opinion that religious and spiritual-humans, and in the context of this scrip trans humanists, are seeking transcendence albeit that they are wary of transhumanism, not because they oppose going beyond the present but because they oppose going beyond being human. And therein lies his hermeneutical question of why? The author indicates, that this 'why', should be asked by religious and spiritual-scholars and believers in their quest to find the meaning of an evolutionary progress, as they are living in a very diverse as well as an anticipated Hope-reality, of what the age of technological enhancement can prepare humans for in-and-during their religious and spiritual time and Space of their lives lived. For this, the Hope-reality of what the age of technological enhancements can prepare humans for as he contemplates the works of the following.

Scholars: Firstly, he introduces us to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin as a Christian visionary with an extraordinary vision of the human future especially from a philosophical point-of-view of transhumanism. Secondly, he introduces Nicolai Fedorovich Fedorov who was little-known in the West, but had many notables admirers of his work in his lifetime, with his notoriety increased since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Thirdly, he consults a controversial thinker regarding environmental issues namely, Zoltan Istvan, who in his profound article Environmentalist is wrong, nature isn't sacred and we should replace it, makes some rather profound-but-interesting claims. And fourthly and lastly, in the context of reproductive rights of the Trans human Future, he investigates Yvonne Lake's relevant article for this script, The reproductive rights in the trans human future. With

this in mind the author starts the prelude of this script with a quick glance from a Paleoanthropological point-of-view.

### A Paleoanthropological View to Transhumanism (With thanks to D.P Veldsman)

A new hominin fossil called Homo Naledi was recently discovered in the Dinaldi Chamber (South Africa) that has been welcomed into the species of human relatives on 10 Sept 2015. At least 15 individuals with most skeletal elements repeated multiple times, are represented and this is the largest assemblage of a single species of hominins yet discovered in Africa. Notwithstanding this remarkable paleoanthropological finding, the reactions were extremely diverse. Reactions harbouring great excitement that spans from the positive: 'humankind meets our newest relative' to the negative: 'without a date, we are told not much perhaps a fairy tale'!

However and notwithstanding this extremely important find and still-to-come ramifications for the future, this script will not deal with Homo Naledi's specific context in whatever form of theological, anthropological, sociological, paleoanthropological or philosophical discourses, as it strives to arrive at an answer to a question in his own epistemological mind, that of: what epistemologically mind-brain barriers did Homo Naledi had to transcend in the then-living-context that he presumes would have been Naledi's epistemological mind and brain before physical death?

Furthermore, what does transhumanism, or as it also refers to, post-humanism offers any religious tradition in being hopeful in regarding themselves as special? Special enough to entertain the extremely difficult and paradoxical entities that are transhumanism by and for transhumanists. This is the reason why this script embarks on a different route, a route that follows the path of transcendence of the current human towards a transhumance. A 'towards' that should be regarded as a stepping stone on to the big open gravel road (gravel road, as the scientific notion of transhumanism is still in its

infancy), of transhumanism that has relevance on religious-humans metaphysical supposition as a physical reality.

What he is pointing to is the question of what, if any, can religious-humans explore from transhumanism in the context of transcendence towards a transhumanist's quest for being hopeful within a religious criterion in being part of a religious-experienced lived life as Homo sapiens? Not much could be the first inclination. But somehow, somewhere the author follows a route of religious transcendence into transhumanism that could flow into something new, something hopeful.

### The Philosophy of Transhumanism

Max More writes in his script the philosophy of transhumanism that: 'the growth of transhumanism is a little daring' [1]. With this I agree, as I think that for us, to be able to view the growth of transhumanism as a philosophical movement in and beyond different perspectives which has already been formed over the last couple of years, we will have to arrive at different interpretation-perspectives.<sup>3</sup> With these different interpretation-perspectives we must then identify certain basic themes, values, and interests that entwined transhumanism with its unique and distinct coherence identity. These coherences can be viewed in the vast array of agreements that is overflowing within and towards a multiple source of different definitions of transhumanism. The following examples, to name a few and for the purpose of this script, are put forward as transhumanism

### Definitions

- ❖ One, philosophies of life (such as extropian perspectives) that seek the continuation and acceleration of the evolution of intelligent life beyond its current human form and human limitations by means of science and technology, that is guided by life-promoting principles and values,
- ❖ two, the intellectual and cultural movement, that is transhumanism, affirms the possibility and desirability of fundamentally improving the human condition through applied reason, especially by developing and making widely available technologies to eliminate aging and to greatly enhance human intellectual, physical, and psychological capacities, and,
- ❖ Three, the study of the ramifications, promises, and potential dangers of technologies that will enable us to overcome fundamental limitations, and the related study of the ethical matters involved in developing and using such technologies.

More stipulates: 'Thus transhumanism is a life philosophy, an intellectual and cultural movement, and an area of study' [1]. It therefore refers to a life-philosophy that engulfed other definitions since the 1990s as definitions that place transhumanism in the company of complex worldviews such as secular humanism and Confucianism that have practical implications for our lives without being themselves, on any supernatural or physically transcendent belief. Herein lies my, (the author of this script), core content of what transhumanism can enrich religious-humans with. If one looks form a supposed Christian-humans view on transhumanism through my own, a Christian theologians epistemological point of view, one can describe transhumanism better when we ascribe it in two semantics namely one, that of: 'trans-humanism' and two, 'trans human-ism'. Let me explain even further. 'Trans-humanism' or even better 'trans human-ism' emphasizes the philosophical roots as found in the Enlightenment humanism as the emphasis is placed on progress (its possibility and desirability and not its inevitability),

when taking personal charge in creating better futures rather than praying and hoping for it to be brought about by supernatural forces.

Here, is it my opinion that one can engage in a modest and extreme vulnerable human contemporary context of exploring a transcended longing to explore rational reasons, with technology as a scientific method, to entertain the very noble thought of human creativity that are not focused on faith alone.

As more explains: 'Trans-humans emphasizes the way transhumanism goes well beyond humanism in both means and ends [1].' As humanism tends to rely solely and exclusively on educational and cultural refinement to improve human nature, transhumanism is eager to apply technology to overcome human's limitations imposed by our biological and genetic heritage. Therefore, transhumanists regard human nature not as an end in itself, also not as perfect but, in the words of More '... rather, it is just one point along an evolutionary pathway, and we can learn to reshape our own nature in ways we deem desirable and valuable' [1].

I then, am of the opinion that this then implies that we, as philosophical-theologians, should be bold in our evaluation of what the route should be through the steppingstone of transcendence toward transhumanism. By being bold, in a thoughtful and careful manner while applying ourselves we, as theologians, can also use technology albeit in a philosophical positive-way to not just accurately describe ourselves as humans anymore, but rather, ascribing ourselves as trans-humans!

This means that we then exceed our limitations that define the less desirable aspects of our current human condition, which could have the positive (my view) response to become perhaps immortal (which one must agree with, will have its own challenges and which will later be explained through a religious-human metaphor). Once more, more: 'They would have vastly greater physical capabilities and freedom of form, often refers to as morphological freedom' [1]. Even better for religious-humans, trans-humans will then also have a vast improved affective-cognitive capabilities that will transcends our emotions into a positive cosmological-philosophical-refined position,<sup>4</sup> as we then (my own point of view) will be able to enjoy much more joy in our life's lived and less depression that are usually (not always) accompanied with anger. Or better still, whatever such an individual prefers.

However, without any further elaboration, the danger that there is, is the danger of, what will a human individual do, altruistic-do (as I am sure that this will be the best 'do'), with such power, the power of such a choice? This supposed strong stance and I would suggest a very problematic one at that, (as I would not want it to be less problematic), brings me straight to our ability to understand the vastly (UN)-comprehensible source that is our mind and brain.

Regardless of this being said, an important aspect of transhumanism must first suffice and that is that although these hopeful approaches can be distinguished, as they cannot be separated, one would like to try and ascribe the mind-brain, as a God or Spirit-talk entity of religious-humans who can work with a prerequisite, which is a presupposition of philosophical suppositions. And herein lays the hermeneutical question of 'Why'? This script's 'why' is therefore maintained to conclude, which hopefully reflects the importance of religious-humans quest in their broader contemporary philosophical-

---

theological discourses on transhumanism, in an answer that reflects a positive yes, we can be so and so, regarding religious-humans that lives in Hope, as transhumanists that are special. That is what brings us to the (UN)-comprehensible source in the disciplines of the sciences of the mind and brain.

### Sciences of the Mind

Since the 1990s sciences of the mind has mushroomed and are categorised in the three major fields of neuroscience, cognitive science and the Artificial intelligence. According to Cornel du Toit, the theories of consciousness are not limited to specific disciplines [2]. However, he stipulates that philosophies of the mind are providing a meaningful background to the debate, especially the new interest of quantum mechanics and its guidance it gives a modelling-criteria in its quest to explain consciousness.<sup>6</sup> Cognitive science comprehends a cluster of disciplines dealing with mental functioning motor and reasoning<sup>7</sup>. While one branch of cognitive science deals with computer modelling of mental processes the other study the inclusion of behavioral neuroscience, which probes the neurobiological substrates of behaviour. Other cognitive psychologies deal with aspects like human learning and memory. Du Toit distinguishes between brain-talk, mind-talk, God-talk and spirit-talk [2]. He interjects that those brain-talks which concerns itself with lesion data, are anatomy, neurobiology and neurochemistry, and mind-talk, he (276) says, it is about intention, action, perception, consciousness and responsibility and together they are regarded as neuroscience entwined with cognitive science. Spirit-talk is construed as spirit-talk or as God-talk, something that regards identity as rooted in our relationship with God.

### Religious-Humans as a God and Spirit-Talk

To avoid reductionism the mind-brain sciences<sup>8</sup> consider the whole person (human) in its environment and different contexts. The theory of mind concept of mind-talk, brain-talk, God-talk and spirit-talk, including such faculties as empathy, attribution of mental state, and even empathetic deception, is a controversial criterion as it distinguishes the adult human among the hominids. Humans acquire this capacity after about four years of age, whereas it has not been proven (nor has it been disproven) that gorillas or chimpanzees ever develop a theory of mind. If indeed so, would it be possible to regard or envisage religious-humans that succumb to the propensity of religion<sup>9</sup> as being special? Being special, as I use the word succumb in a positive modus with the distinct reference to human culture. The same can be said or asked of Homo Naledi.

When we refer to the minds propensity for spirituality (especially referring to footnote 8), we must acknowledge that human culture has always been characterized by awareness of the transcendent. Meaning, that we can only regard, to my mind, religious phenomena as inexplicable, mysterious and a manifestation of itself that could present itself in dreams and visions through perhaps ghosts, angels, demons, death and near-death experiences. As du Toit points out: 'Religion is unimaginable without an experience of divine revelation or some sort of encounter with transcendent reality' [2]. Therefore, it would be logical for religious-humans to be viewed as transcendent, and not a Divine entity, but rather a transhumanist-DNA entity (as some Artificial Intelligence scientists suggests, in all eagerness, as a possibility).

If this is so it will have an enormous bearing on the question asked of are, we lost or special? Since the birth of our own Homo sapiens

species every cultural group, even if they were very isolated, has believed in some sort of spiritual reality. To me this implies that we are spiritually-wired through a genetic inherit trait. We had to believe in universal concepts like Gods or Divine Entities. That is what let us, as Homo sapient species survive. Not only survival as species in our quest for a God, soul, and an afterlife but also as beings that experience certain religious experiences, while living our life to the best of our abilities in time and Space that were allocated to us. Also, that we as a species are not just victims of our brains chemistry as being religious, that is earmarked or propagated by certain scientists as a hallucination of interpreted spirituality. My point is, humans and specifically the human brain has seemingly developed in such a way that it displays a propensity for being religious or still better, being spiritual.

Notwithstanding this, as du Toit explains: 'this propensity does not necessarily prelude the existence of God' [2]. For people (most of them, but not all) interact with God through prayer, worship and ritual and then such a God is experienced by them as the ultimate experiences of reality<sup>10</sup>. Unfortunately, albeit a positive one, there is still the small matter of where this experience of reality is coming from? Can we categorically say that it originates from our evolutionary development into the biologic roots of spirituality? If the answer is yes, we will have to embark on the not so small matter of evolutionary-and-biologic roots of religion.

### Evolutionary Development and the Biologic Roots of Religion

It is commonly viewed and although not empirical as yet accepted by anthropological and sociological scholars, all over the world, that human's has had a strong religious aptitude through their evolutionary development. The emergent of space and Time has changed the human environment. It changed in such an assured positiveness that our species was challenged through anticipated expectance for the meaning of life. Questions such as, where do we come from, towards questions such as, where we go after death, up to, why are we here? As du Toit describes it in wrestling modus: 'Humans were evolutionary equipped to grapple with questions that inevitably accompany higher states of consciousnesses [2]. As autopoietic (self-organizing) beings we are obliged to create and develop new structures, systems, rules, values as well as interpretation-experiences that want to deal with new environments.

Being this as it may, the potential to find meaning in humans experiencing of God was not viable before the origin of the neocortex, 'which permitted the faculties of consciousness, language and morals' (du Toit [2]. From a religious-human point of view as a precursor of being human with its inclination in being religious, it automatically (in my view) points to the fact that one can say that the evolution of humans and the creation of cultural environment paved the way for religion and enable humans to perceive and to worship a God. As du Toit again explains: 'Changing world views and different ways of finding meaning influence the way religion is practised and the divine is experienced' [2].

Spirituality, therefore, can establish a harmonized interdisciplinary reciprocal action towards a better biologic experience that entwined both genes as well as cultigens (cultural DNA, encoded in language, cultural artefacts and traditions) towards a better human species. As an example: 'The basic tenets of Christian belief are not incomputable with the story of life as it unfolds in evolutionary biology' [2] .<sup>12</sup> Therefore, what does these terms brain and mind-talk explains to

---

the religiously inclined believer? Or even better, what ontological relationship models lies in its explanation?

### **Brain and mind-talk as relationship models in explanation**

There are many models to explain the mind-brain relationship. They vary from a reduction of mind to pure physicalism, to substantivizing, towards the mind into something separate from the physical. The most popular view is that both, brain and mind, forms a unity, although the mind is not just physical. Before we embarked on these relationships a few introductory remarks on brain and mind must be explained.

#### **The Brain**

The brain is determined by the neurochemistry of the body. Changes at molecular level lead to global personality changes. Individual neurons, governed by their chemical makeup, contain one of many different neurotransmitters that are used for an image of the brain at rest to establish a baseline, followed by another, called activation study, during the performance of some activity. Brain-imaging techniques are used to determine the various brain structures involved in different religious experiences. Du Toit: 'The normal mode of brain functioning everyday experiences is that of time and matter, and the output of the brain is self-operative' [2]. Neuro impulses normally follow certain pathways to produce the perceptions associated with our five senses and the muscle movements associated with the motor systems of the brain. However, neuro impulses can also travel a different route through the same '... labyrinth of neural circuits' [2]. In this rare mode senses, time and Movement lose their perceptual boundaries as this is called a state of Absolute Unitary Being (AUB) and represents a mystical, religious experience (not always as some negative modus, e.g. depression could also suffice), as it brings me straight to some introductory remarks on the mind.

#### **The Mind**

The mind can be viewed from, among others, a psychological, phenomenological, philosophical, neurological and religious angle. Each approach has its own terminology and interests and in the context of this script we want to understand the nature of mind and its brain-body link.<sup>13</sup> mental properties are epistemologically irreducible to physical ones. They emerge from physical properties and are dependent on them but cannot be reduced to them.<sup>14</sup> Du Toit elaborates when he explains: 'The tradition of empiricism with its focus on physically observable reality views the metaphysical or trans-physical as transcendentalism' [2]. It could happen that the mind-body integration may eventually favour a one-dimensional physicalism and materialism at the cost of spirituality. It therefore seems likely and, in all fairness, to which evolutionary biology, cognitive science and neuroscience will ascribe to. However, and only too gladly (I think) must we ask, how are we to think of the self that is body and mind that modifies and enhances?

Let's assume that there is not some changeless core of the soul that is immune to the transformations of the body and the brain, some immaterial self that is untouched and unchanged by these neurological interventions, how are we to think of the religious-human as a continuous identity through change, especially change that is elected and effected and then serves as the basis for yet even more technology-manage-changes? One can almost certainly, on the one hand, regard it as almost suicidal whereby the self, wills its end by using technology to become someone else.

Notwithstanding this, on the other hand, the paradoxes of personal transformation and enhancement are nothing new to, for example, the Christian theology. The possibility of technology as the means of such transformation is both novel and perplexing. The question is: should Deity-believers, theistically, agree to this? If we say 'yes' or 'no' we as religious-humans should at least stipulate what religious-humans future role should be in these sides taken. This, to me, direct me specifically to the short engagement of the religious-humans, especially the Christian-humans, role in transhumanism.

### **The Christian-Humans Role in Transhumanism**

Ronald Cole-Turner warns us: 'saying no' seems wrong in light of all the ways in which Christians (religious-humans) use medical technology, not only believe it is Gods will but also praying that it will be affective [3]. And saying yes: '... seems odd because it seems to undercut or at least to reroute what Christian's say they believe about the power of God to make us, if not perfectly holy, then at least morally better human beings' [3]. We can even say that God does this in part through technology, just as we have always said that God does this in part through the church, our parents, or the influence of friends. Are we then saying that Christian-humans, (and again religious-humans), must update their repertoire, so to speak, when they entertained religious concepts like, grace, sin, salvation and our longing for a Divine? I myself can simply not see that technology can touch these concepts in trying to make it their own.

Does this however mean, that we must be afraid to use technology in becoming transhumanists, or even better, using technology to enhance ourselves as religious-humans? My answer is no! However, to be honest, this 'no' has more to do with the intuitive realization on-my-part, that grace, for example, and technology: '...cannot work together precisely because technology is so much within our control and therefore always a threat and never an aid to grace' [3]. What holds also true, in this contexts, is the reality that transhumanism presents new challenges, not only for theology, but for the ordinary religious-humans as well.

Furthermore, my 'no', also has to do with the fact that there are vast arrays of vistas about different views that exists to transhumanism as well as on the use of technology for human enhancement. Notwithstanding this, similarities are plenty and arrive in the most of general concepts one can think of. As an example, Cole-Turner points to: 'that the contribution, for or against transhumanism and the use of technology for human enhancement, generally recognize that on the surface, at least, there are notable similarities between Christianity (as an example), and transhumanism' [4]. Christians Hope for an eternal life that they can enjoy with the fullest possible knowledge (epistemological), joy (psychological), (affective-cognition) and moral purity (as theistically). And transhumanists are looking forward to prolonging the human life-span, perhaps indefinitely (as I already elsewhere indicated, would hold some different challenges), while also enriching human knowledge.

### **Cole-Turner further points to three important views that challenge Christian-humans to the integrity of their faith and tradition [4]:**

- ❖ One: in light of new technologies, how are Christian-humans supposed to view salvation? Some would respond to try and avoid enhancement technology altogether, holding on to just divine grace as the only valid pathway to true human fulfilment as well as transformation,

- ❖ Two: others may think that technology seems to provide something remarkably like what the Christian faith promises and therefore replaces the need for faith and,
- ❖ Three: still others might find a way to unfold the limited enhancements of technology into the fuller transformation of faith.

In all fairness here, I agree with Cole-Turner that the contributors of these views will agree with transhumanism on one very important assumption, that these views shared an acceptance of the theory of evolution as the best explanation of diversity and change in living organisms [4]. Thus, all views has to share the brute-reality (I say brute as evolution can, not always, be regarded as a brutal process), that the starting point to any view on transhumanism should originate from biological organisms, including human beings evolutionary-ability to evolve and change (that includes a changeable constitution) perhaps even through technological interventions. One has to remember that human nature, as it exists today, was not created in its present form, and I agree with Cole-Turner that: ‘Of course, we could find other theologians who would argue for the creationist point of view and who would object to transhumanism on the basis that human nature should be seen as fixed and final and that it is either impossible to inherently immoral to try and change it’ [4]. I reject this view! Firstly, because I think it is defiantly not good theology that is questionable to dismiss the well-verified findings of science on evolution, but more so secondly, because the focus of our attention in this script is on theology/religion and technology and not on theology and evolution. But, be this as it may, I think that critique and theological disagreements on transhumanism should also be noted.

### Critique on Transhumanism

Those who oppose any form of theology flirting with transhumanism would certainly agree to the most famous of disagreements namely what technology of human enhancement will have on anyone who is concerned with social and economic (in) justices. For one, an injustice that will emerge, as this is defiantly not the only one, but one that concerned-theologians should take seriously is that of the wealthy (money wise) will defiantly have the upper-hand as their money will vastly empower them to firstly, make first-hand-use of such an enhancement that secondly could lead to more power to become richer. This is most relevant where technology can be used in engineering a new post-human species, as Celia Deane-Drummond refers to in her objection to transhumanists desire to ‘flee the body’ [4].

Another valid theological criticism by Ted Peters is that transhumanists seem ‘n little naïve about the human predicament and therefore overly optimistic about what it takes to engineer solutions: ‘What theologians call sin, humanity’s unexplained but inescapable tendency to pervert and destroy even its best achievements, is missing from the transhumanism thought, and also absent in any realistic attitude about how well and, at the same time, how badly things will go as we make progress towards improving our lives and our species’ [4]. These theological disagreements must be examined more [4].

### Theological and Religious Disagreements

It seems that the most prominent disagreements have bearing on the question, how far human beings should, and in this context religious humans take the task of their own improvement into their hands,

using not just the moral and spiritual disciplines of religious life but also such things as technology. As Zoltan Istvan in Environmentalists are wrong: nature isn’t sacred and we should replace it (2019), takes its further when he states categorically: ‘that what we do to the planet is not as important as what we’re achieving as a species entering the transhumanist age’. From this statement, two questions emerged namely one: to what extent are we to except the world as a given, limiting our expectations and our interventions, and two: to what degree should we accept our human frailties and limits without meddling and complaining? As Cole-Turner asks: ‘Or conversely, to what extent are we to embrace our strengths, including our power and our duty to improve ourselves and our world’? It begs another question, when should we see decease, a lack of resources, and unmet longing as challenges that can and should be addressed by all our means, including technology? As Cole-Turner points out: ‘This disagreement is not likely to go away, perhaps because it runs deeper than theology and only manifests itself in a particular theological way’ [4]. This brings me to an own suggestion and endeavour why we as religious-humans should take up the task of becoming more ‘post-human’ through a transhumanistic way. With this ‘taking-up-of-task’, I will make use of four scholars, e.g. two famous theologians about transhumanism namely that of Frenchman Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) and the Russian Nicolai Fedorovich Fedorov (1828-1903), the third scholar, the very controversial former journalist for the National Geographic Channel, Zoltan Istvan,<sup>15</sup> who passionately covered many environmental stories, as well Yvonne Lake<sup>16</sup> through her sublime article The reproductive rights in the transhuman future [4].

Let me start, in admitting, that in contemplating my own endeavour I normally would have rely heavily on the work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin alone. Why? Because for me, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin could be regarded as my persecuting-visionary-genius that should be necessary and perhaps enough for future thought about trans-human spirituality and religion. Although I admit to this, I want to entwine Teilhard de Chardin’s work with the three above mentioned scholars.

As it stands now in this script, Teilhard de Chardin will have the lead as he was, first of all a palaeontologist and thereafter a theologian. So, the assumption comes naturally that, as a scientist that is very familiar with an evolutionary theory, he was perhaps better equipped than anybody else when talking about religious-humans view’s on transhumanism. His views on Christianity, spirituality and evolution, creative transformation, universal unification in a collectivistic context was and is, to my mind, ahead of his and our time. Although his conclusions that he deduces from his scientific studies are beautifully clear and far from being appalled by the immense vista of time and Space, he opened an evolutionary theory and cosmology that embarks on the ‘necessary-quest’ for religious-humans to make room, so to speak, for transhumanism.

Notwithstanding this, Teilhard de Chardin has his scholarly sceptics (especially in Protestant circles in South Africa), which will not be discussed for the obvious previously stated reasons. However, in discussing Teilhard de Chardin, Fedorov, Istvan and Lake, my own endeavour will highlight the transparency that is also an entity in my own effort onto transhumanism. Let me explain.

### Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin in his work on palaeontology takes technology seriously. Especially in reflecting the human future

---

where he diligently advocates the enhancement of humanity through theological means. When Teilhard de Chardin consider enhancement, he does it through the theological discipline of eschatology, where he deduces three distinct features namely, one: that social unification will continue to occur among diverse races and people.<sup>17</sup> Two: that the future will continue in its mechanization as a process that does not seem to go away, but rather speeds up.<sup>18</sup> And three: that the final trend of humanity into the future is a heightening of vision that not only refers to the greater advancement of technologies that reveals more phenomena but also to the general enhancement of our knowledge of the universe due primarily in its increase of faculties.

Teilhard de Chardin asserts that the Noosphere to be the most important strand in the progression of the universe and humanity. He understands the Noosphere as the collective mind of humanity as thought emerges and becomes increasingly unified. It is a way of looking at the phenomenon of communal thought but form the planetary level <sup>20</sup> [5].

Teilhard de Chardin emphasise personalization that is occurring to the Noosphere itself, a process that Teilhard de Chardin calls Noogenesis. Every individual within the collective human race is increasing its own personalization, while this very collectivism is converging toward an own person. This is where Teilhard's distinction between personality and individuality plays a key role. Personalization differentiates amid a total union, whereas the individualization separates itself at the expense of the whole and leads to greater plurality. Individuality sacrifices the ultra-personal element of humanity at large [5].

Teilhard asserts that when the Noosphere becomes more centred, it leads to the creation of a person and that the 'telos' of this conversion in the Noosphere points to a particular person, whom Teilhard de Chardin refers to as the Ultra-human or the Trans-human. Everything from the cosmos is funnelling its energy toward a single point, a point he labelled the Omega Point, at the end of history. This Omega Point is reached through the 'push' of evolutionary forces and the 'pull', which rests on the attraction of the Omega Point and today it is supposed to happen through people's mutual love for one another. I say suppose, as I am not sure this is happening at this moment in time. This brings me to the second scholar namely, Nicolai Fedorovich Fedorov.

### **Nicolai Fedorovich Fedorov**

In Fedorov, although little-known in the West, there are many notables admires of his work in his lifetime, and his notoriety has only been increasing since the collapse of the Soviet Union. For instance, as Burdett explains: 'Dostoyevsky, in reference to Fedorov, wrote to N.P [5].

Peterson: 'First: a question, who is the thinker whose ideas you have transmitted? If you can, please let me know his real name. I have become so interested in him... Secondly: I must say that in the essence I completely agree with his ideas. I read them as if they were my own'. Also, Leo Tolstoy, has been a great admirer of Fedorov's devotion to Christian practice.

Fedorov's major work, *The Philosophy of the Common Task* (1891), was written in response to the general discord that Fedorov found between people and nature. This to me punctuates a certainty. A certainty where we have to acknowledge that people have done

all possible evil to nature's, depletion, destruction, predatory exploitation, and to each other, inventing most abominable arms and implements of mutual extermination! Specifically, which must have a very close association with the fairness of our species, so to speak, of transhumanism, the fact of: '...unbrotherly attitude that people has for one another, manifested in wars or in working for profit at the expense of their fellow man, or in the general selfishness and individualism rampant during his time' [5]. For me, in our quest to perhaps put integrity driven transhumanism on the table, this one problem alone will be the greatest challenge of all [5]. *The Philosophy of the Common Task* is a treatise that responds to this unbrotherly attitude, especially between the learned and the unlearned and most of all, in contemporary context, between those who have (money and power) and those who have not (poorest of the poor).

As with Fedorov, I would also like to concur that the problems that exist between humans has to do with their own primitive nature, how they have become distinct from that of animals (therefore, our biologic discrepancies). This distinction is most apparent in their bipedal posture. In this upright position humans actually have moved away from the forces of nature on the ground, asserting the first real act of will. Fedorov claims: 'Creatures who face the earth, which is covered by vegetation and covered by other creatures, have only one aim, namely, to devour vegetation or these other creatures... On the other hand, the vertical position of man is above all an expression of man's revolution from this need to devour' [5]. And it is in this first act of will, that these human beings distinguish themselves, becoming subjects. Also, in the context of this script, religious-humans!

From this distinction the human separate herself from the animal kingdom and slowly but surely, they evolve into a person. And it is here where I found great favour with Fedorov as he then initiates that death becomes the primarily focus of avoidance in the humans consciousness. As abstract and perhaps disconcerting for most human, as it may seem, death is now seen as the destruction of personal identity and freedom from the forces of nature. As I indicated in the beginning that *Homo Naledi* will not be discussed in this script, but in looking at Fedorov's way of thinking, one must ask something about the serendipity (the occurrence and development of events by chance in a happy or beneficial way), of *Homo Naledi*.

This is also true where the philosophy of transcendence must play a part in the primitive human's, opposition against the forces of nature, to become above the rest and most of all, best of all, not to die. Although in itself, this may sound an infinite impossibility, if one base this, let's call it a fairy-tale-possibility so to speak, on the actual happenings of Christ resurrection, physical as well as spiritual, the notion of transhumanism can stem from Christianity. Christianity is the religion of resurrection, and death is the overcoming of the resurrection that lies at the heart of the Christian narrative. Fedorov's entire doctrine hinges upon the utilization of science and technology for the universal and the material resurrection of all humanity. Although his philosophy is premised upon the rejection of death as a central aspect of the human condition, he defined humanity precisely in distinction from other animals that must subdue the forces of blind nature for its own survival and identity. For Fedorov the essence of the Christian message, (and therefore for religious-humans), and the commission of humanity are to practise this defiance toward nature through material resurrection and by controlling all-natural forces.

---

Fedorov's view on resurrection therefore entertain, not only the spiritual and moral resurrection of Christ, but also the physical resurrection of Christ. And therein lays his conclusion that utilization of science and technology ought to be used for the universal and material resurrection of all humanity. He had defined humanity precisely in distinction from other animals through the rejection of death. The human species is a transcending animal that must subdue the forces of blind nature for its own survival and identity. For Fedorov the essence of the Christian message and the commission of humanity are to practice this defiance towards nature through material resurrection and by controlling all-natural forces. This brings me to the current controversial figure of Zoltan Istvan.

### Zoltan Istvan

Istvan kicks of this profound article Environmentalist is wrong, nature isn't sacred and we should replace it when he states: 'On a warming planet bearing scars of significant environmental destruction, you'd think one of the 21st Century's most notable emerging social groups-transhumanists, would be concerned. Many are not [6]. Transhumanists first and foremost want to live indefinitely, and they are outraged at the fact that their bodies age and are destined to die. They blame their biological nature, and dream of a day when DNA is replaced with silicon and data'.

Istvan, sees the enmity of transhumanists biology transcends their bodies, '... where Mother Earth is regarded as a hostile space where every little creature, be it a tree, insect, mammal, or virus, is out to survive' [6]. Everything is part of the food chain, and subject to natural law, where the consumption by violent murder in the preponderance of cases: 'life is vicious and makes him think of pet dogs and cats that sometimes eats their own after they have died' [6].

Istvan (2019:1) [6] believes that many transhumanists want to change all of it. 'They want to rid their worlds of biology, they favour concrete, steel, and code'. Where once biological evolution was necessary to create primates and then modern human, consciousness and directed evolution has replaced it. 'Planet Earth doesn't need iniquitous natural selection. It needs premediated moral algorithms conceived by logic that do the most good for the largest number of people' [6]. And he suggests that Artificial Intelligence (AI) will properly, be the best equip, better than humans anyhow, in less than two decades time to deal with this.

Ironically, fighting the makings of utopia is a coup a half century in the making. Starting with the good-intentioned people at Greenpeace in the 1970s but overtaken recently with enviro-socialists who often seem to want to control every aspect of our lives, environmentalism has taken over political and philosophical discourse and direction at the most powerful levels of society. Green believers want to make you think humans are destroying our only home, Planet Earth, and that this terrible action of ours is the most important issue of our time. They have sounded a call to 'save the earth' by trying to stomp out capitalism and dramatically downsizing our carbon footprint.

Notwithstanding this, Istvan, claims that the most important issue of our time, '... is the evolution of technology, and environmentalists are mistaken in thinking that the Earth is our only place to live' [6]. He deduces that before this century is gone, our home for intelligent life will likely be the microprocessor and will merge with machines and explore both the virtual and physical universe as sentient robots.

He, Istvan, stresses that the obvious destiny of our species and the coming AI age, popularized by past and present thinkers like Stephen Hawking, Ray Kurzweil, and Homo Deus author Yuval Noah Harari are explored by the hundred million-dollar companies in California led by billionaires like Elon Musk who are already working on technology to directly connect our brains in real time to the internet [6]. It is therefore, that these thinkers deduce that Homo sapiens would soon not need the planet at all.

And, this-being-said, he balanced that even if Homo sapiens somehow don't merge with machines, because as he puts it, 'scared governments' outlaw it, for example, we will still use the microprocessor and its data crunching capabilities to change our genetic make-up so dramatically, that it could not be called: natural' [6]. And then, (according to me), he makes a remarkable affirmation on the already 'above-mentioned', that leads to an astounding observation when he collaborates that we as sapiens will enter the Star Wars age where we literally change our DNA and biological appearance to become alien and creature, in an environment we need.21

Istvan also sounded paradoxically uncertain (or perhaps it is just my derivation), when he derives that whatever we become he want to first: make it clear that humans are destroying the environment. He does think that Mother Earth is overpopulated in many cities, and that there is a high likelihood that humans are helping to cause climate change. However, (and here my paradoxical-thinking on this point, emerge) he, said: 'second, we should not needlessly destroy the planet, especially wildlife, or live in man-made polluted wastelands, the last thing we need to do is put the brakes on consumption, procreation, and progress [6].

With this point he argued that what we're doing to the planet is not as important as what we are achieving as a species in the nearing of transition to the transhumanist age,22 as we will save and improve far more lives in the future via bioengineering, geoengineering, and coming technology than damaged ecosystems across the planet will harm: 'Salvation is in science and progress, not sustainability or preserving the Earth, and to argue or do otherwise is to be sadistic and act immorally against humanity's well-being' [6]. And that is why he believe that transhumanism, is the most humanitarian movement out there.

Of what has been stated above, I think, this is the reason why Istvan endorse Capitalism, when he says that the standard of living can only be increased by economic progress by all countries on Mother Earth. However, he immediately stresses, that it (economic progress): 'could change quickly as governments increasingly enforce strict pro-environmental regulation which slows down industry and commerce' [6].

'When you force companies to operate inefficiently for lofty ideals, it hurts their bottom lines, and that in turn hurts workers and everyday people. It's a well-known fact that when economies slow down, people increasingly lose property, turn to violence, and put having families on hold' [6]. Then he 'goes-for-the-throat' when he accuses the media, (remember where he is coming from), in saying: '... but the media usually Doesn't paint environmental policies this way. In fact, the media is responsible for a lot of the misinformation propping up the environmental movement, which is often at odds with transhumanism' [6].

---

Despite the imperfections of capitalism, Istvan continues to support it because: 'it remains the best hope for the poor to improve their standard of life, because at least the individually poor can work hard, be smart, and eventually become rich themselves' [6].

He then, according to me, asks the most important question in the context of his article and this script: 'But why create the same nature that is so quintessentially cruel, especially as we become trans-humans, with perfectly functioning ageless bionic organs and implants in our brains connecting us to the cloud. Let's us create new environments that fit our modern needs. These will be virtual, synthetic, and machines worlds. These new worlds will be far more moral and humanitarian than that of nature. They will be like our homes, cars, and apartments, where everything in it is inanimate or no longer living, and that's why we find sanctuary and comfort in it' [6]. I think that the importance of this question, for this script, lies therein that if religious-humans do think about a way through transhumanism, then we, will eventually have to ask the same question(s) in dealing with the fact, al-be-it a philosophical one, that in creating a transhuman we will have to think in terms of a new or post-environment that suits posthumanism.

Then, on a Philosophical-theological impasse, Istvan tells us that he, don't believe in evil, per se, but if there was such a thing, he calculated, '... it would be nature, a monster of arbitrary living entities consuming and devouring each other simply to survive. No omnipotent Homo sapiens would ever have the hate in them to create a system where everything wants and needs to sting, eat, and outdo everything else just to live.

#### AND

Yet, that's essentially what the environment is to all living entities. Environmentalists want you to believe nature is sacred and a perfect balance of living things thriving off one another'. Nonsense, he exclaimed: 'it's a world war of all life fighting agony and loss, of fight or flight, of death today or death tomorrow for you and your offspring' [6].<sup>26</sup> Before I embark on my own endeavour with Teilhard de Chardin, Fedorov, Istvan, I am also entertaining, Yvonne Lake through her sublime article *The reproductive rights in the transhuman future* [6]. I think it is only fair to say something of the *Reproductive Rights in the Transhuman Future* in this script.

#### Yvonne Lake

I was recently fortunate to tread on an article by Yvonne Lake *The reproductive rights in the transhuman future*, where she was asked to film a presentation by David Pearce [7].<sup>27</sup> The presentation, entitled 'Towards the Abolition of Suffering', outlined a future in which humans eliminate all sources of pain, including even carnivorous behaviour in the animal kingdom. Lake: 'Transhumanism advocates the use of technology to develop humanity beyond its current physical and cognitive limitations, via such means as smart prosthetics and implants. In doing so, transhumanists seek to direct evolution towards a post-human state. This end goal is often framed in utopian terms: as alleviating suffering, prolonging life and allowing human beings greater control over their destinies. Most transhumanists are steadfast individualists, believing in the right to adapt their own bodies as they wish, not for medical purposes, but for life enhancement' [7]. The specific subject of Pearce's talk was abolitionism and for transhumanists, abolitionism refers to the use of biotechnology for the maximization of pleasure and minimization of suffering in all sentient life. It is a philosophy inspired by utilitarian

ethics: if happiness equals value, then the elimination of suffering or maximization of value should be the main objective of humanity.

What stood out for Lake in the presentation was that proposed solutions to suffering often involve the control of reproductive systems in both humans and animals: 'Pearce outlined several areas of suffering, physical and psychological pain, animal slaughter in factory farming and the food chain in the natural world. The most common excruciating pain half the population are ever likely to face is that of childbirth, was not mentioned' [7].

The proposals to alleviate both physical and psychological pain involved the genetic engineering of embryos, so that the future generations could have higher pain and emotional distress thresholds. There was some mention of how pre-implantation genetic diagnosis is currently most common in India and China. 'Whilst Pearce acknowledged that this has led to a massively skewed ratio of men to women, due to the mass abortion of female foetuses, this point was given no further consideration during the talk' [7].

'Pearce suggested genetic engineering solutions to change the aggressive characteristics of carnivores in the animal kingdom and proposed the administration of contraceptives. He even argued that it wouldn't be such a bad thing if carnivorous animals, such as lions, were to become extinct, backing up this argument by displaying the image of a lion attacking its prey alongside mugshots of several notorious serial killers. Religious allusions were also abounded in the presentation. 'The opening slide displayed a quote from the Buddha and, later, a photo of a lion lying down with a lamb. One of the final slides showed a stairway to heaven, accompanied by another uplifting quote, this time, rather surprisingly, from the nineteenth-century French epicure Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin:<sup>28</sup> The limits of pleasures are as yet neither known nor fixed, and we have no idea what degree of bodily bliss we are capable of attaining' [7].

With this Lake suggested that it would be easy to dismiss Pearce as a crank, but, since he is a prominent figure within transhumanism, it is important to shed light on his ideas. Transhumanists wield enormous power in Silicon Valley, <sup>29</sup> counting entrepreneurs such as Elon Musk<sup>30</sup> and Peter Thiel<sup>31</sup> among their believers and have established think tanks such as the Singularity University and the Future of Humanity Institute. The ideas proposed by the pioneers of the movement are not simply abstract theoretical musings but are being embedded into emerging technologies at organizations such as Google, Apple, Tesla and SpaceX. Furthermore, the technological advances advocated by transhumanists, particularly artificial intelligence and genetic engineering, have great potential for misuse.

The development of new reproductive technologies raised a number of ethical dilemmas, and Lake expresses her concerns when she states the following: 'The control of female reproductive systems is a perennial battleground, debates around prostitution, abortion and surrogacy are currently raging [7]. Relevant medical interventions, which have produced varying degrees of harm and success, have included the introduction of forceps in the eighteenth century, a sometimes-fatal combination of morphine and scopolamine, and enemas combined with dichloride of mercury douches. Obstetric violence recently became the subject of national protests in Croatia, after MP Ivana Nincevic-Lesandric's revelations of the physical abuse she underwent during a miscarriage were met with cries of recognition on the part of her fellow countrywomen, who shared their



own similar horror stories. The possibilities that new technologies bring, as suggested by Pearce, thus raise concerns about the extent to which women will be granted autonomy over their own bodies, and about who will get to decide which rights will have granted them. Lake goes on in stating that ‘... whilst commercial surrogacy is banned across the EU, it is legal in countries such as Russia, India, Ukraine and a number of US states. Some other countries, including Greece, the Netherlands, Portugal and the UK, allow altruistic surrogacy, but the legislation is often unclear. Some are supportive of commercial surrogacy, due to the opportunity for parenthood it provides for same-sex and other couples unable to conceive naturally’ [7]. Conversely, in my own experience, some argue that treating women’s bodies as a resource to be bought is exploitation, and that it is the poorest women who are most likely to participate, for want of other employment possibilities.

Lake then deduces that: ‘for many, prostitution is very different from surrogacy, since the latter practice benefits from the image of woman as life-giver, committing the ultimate act of self-sacrifice’ [7]. However, in both cases, women’s bodies are, to some extent, being treated as a commercial product. The risks a woman undergoes during pregnancy should not be underestimated, nor should the psychological impact of carrying a baby to term and birthing it. Whilst some may argue that this is a matter of individual choice, there have been cases in which desperate women, who have broken the law by acting as illegal surrogates, have been forced to raise the resulting children themselves.

‘After the discovery of an illegal surrogacy service in Cambodia, thirty-three pregnant women were released from jail on this condition. In another high-profile case, a surrogate in Thailand carried a baby boy for an Australian couple. The couple were initially accused of abandoning the child when the surrogate refused to have the abortion they requested after detecting Downs Syndrome, but they were later cleared of the charges. The case throws up some of the complex issues surrounding both surrogacy and the genetic testing of foetuses’ [7].

‘Womb transplants are at the current frontier of reproductive technology. The first successful birth to a woman who received a womb from a dead donor took place in Brazil in 2017. Prior to this, there had already been thirty-nine womb transplants using live donors, which resulted in eleven babies’ [7]. These developments raise further questions, such as whether womb transplants may work for transwomen. Transhumanism’s mantra of better, not well would support such procedures, not on account of medical need, but for the sake of the pursuit of happiness.

Notwithstanding this, am I of the opinion that when the wellbeing of more than one life, in this case, those of donor, recipient and children, are at stake, things become more complex. Given the legislation and cultural practices that continue to dictate the reproductive rights of females across the globe, it seems prudent to consider the potential impact of new reproductive technologies on women’s rights: ‘Further issues, such as whether such procedures should be funded by the state, arise if the law considers the conception and gestation of a child as not only as a personal choice, but a right’ [7].

While the genetic engineering of future offspring could be beneficial, it also poses a number of ethical questions: ‘Genetic diversity plays an important role in the survival of a species, and it is virtually

impossible to determine what impact tampering with natural genetic variations may have on this. Directing the evolution of living beings in this way could leave them open to the spread of epidemics and may prevent the natural development of new and beneficial traits’ [7].

Then Lake reveal, (according to me), a strange revelation with a dangerous potentiality when she states: ‘Although transhumanism attracts people with a diverse range of interests and political leanings, libertarians are disproportionately represented, as are atheists’ [7]. Many transhumanists argue that their philosophy is based upon Enlightenment principles and grounded in reason and reject accusations that they are playing god’.

The Transhumanist Bill of Rights states that: ‘All sentient entities are hereby entitled to pursue any and all rights within this document to the degree that they deem desirable, including not at all. Thus, any new reproductive technologies should remain a matter of choice. However, the personal choices of some have the potential to affect the rest of humanity and other life on the planet if, for example, those choices curtail genetic diversity. In addition, a new cultural hierarchy could arise due to the adoption of new reproductive methods, through no fault of the transhumanist principles themselves’ [7].

Therefore, do I agree with Lake when she speculates that: ‘It is essential that any new reproductive technologies be fully explored not only for their physical impacts, but also with a view to possible conflicts of rights’ [7]? Some transhumanists are entrepreneurs at pharmaceutical and medical technology companies’.

To me, and in all honesty, due to my own suffering with mayo-depression since birth, and therefore genetically imprisoned with the non (or poor)-functionalities of brain mechanisms (I am using a high doses of anti-depressants), e.g. chemical imbalances I can only, from an selfish point-of-view, concur with what Lake states next: ‘Within abolitionism, medical intervention is often proposed as a solution to suffering, and framed in pseudo-religious terms, in an attempt to normalize the concept of human beings at one with technology’ [7]. For example, in the preamble to Pearce’s presentation he referred to human beings as organic robots. If we see bodies as little more than parts, to be artificially generated, assembled and disassembled, we need not associate them with human rights, nor should any biological process be viewed as exclusive to any particular group’.

Lake warns us that some transhumanists view is a wish to obtain satisfaction from natural bodily functions, such as carrying a baby to term and experiencing the various associated biological and emotional sensations, as anti-progress. Lake admits: ‘... to be fair to Pearce, it was perhaps beyond the scope of his presentation to explore the consequences of new reproductive technologies, but, in our enthusiasm at the possibilities new technologies may bring, we should not overlook the potential cultural upheavals that may accompany them’ [7].

I know that some scholars of transhumanism claim that it would be liberating to free women from responsibility for gestation and childbirth, but this assumes that the physical state of pregnancy is the only burden women face, rather than societal attitudes towards pregnant women and mothers. ‘It would clearly raise many potential ethical dilemmas and conflicts of rights if, for example, to gestate naturally were eventually seen as inferior’ [7].

And then, according to me, and what I have elsewhere in this script eluded to with regard to corruption with political undertones Lake impose that: ‘...since women remain under-represented in STEM,33 new reproductive technologies and the theories surrounding them will largely be developed by those who will never carry a baby to term themselves’ [7]. It is therefore especially important that the interests of women are represented, and their rights protected. As progressives, it is important to fully explore and embrace inevitable technological progress, with all the life-enhancing possibilities such new developments bring. However, we should also consider all the potential implications of these changes, and not allow them to be foisted upon us by the astroturfing of corporations or as a result of corrupt political interests [8].

This brings me to my own endeavour with Teilhard de Chardin, Fedorov, Istvan, and Lake, and in a synopsis onto my own views on this profoundly important aspect, of transhumanism in the future lives lived, by and for religious humans.

### **An own synopsis: Teilhard de Chardin, Fedorov, Istvan and Lake, entwined**

In the beginning of this script I asked the primarily question of, are religious-humans special enough to engage in transhumanism? My answer was and is a ‘yes’. A yes that can be qualified by my own, firstly intuitiveness, that is just as an important human characteristic, as we must not be afraid to walk this gravel road of transhumanism, and secondly, that if you are a religious-human, as an example, as a Christian that can positively move forward in this enhancement albeit with human’s ability to utilize technology to its fullest. My supporting this ‘yes’ can therefore lend themselves heavily on the following reasons:

- ❖ One: that transhumanism needs to be investigated by religious scholars as the integrity of religion/spirituality (theology) is on-the-line. Meaning, that any religion will not be able to partake in a theology-science discourse with regard to the enhancement of humanity through transhumanism, if an apathetic road is chosen,
- ❖ Two: is it imperative for religions and spiritualities, to arrive at different interpretation-perspectives, as these perspectives are obliged to identify certain basic themes, values, and interests that give transhumanism its unique and distinct coherence identity within theology/religion and it will therefore overlap into the religious-human itself,
- ❖ Three: that humans transcend their need to explore reason as rational with technology as a scientific method-partner to entertain the very noble thought of human creativity that are not solely focused on faith alone,
- ❖ Four: that in the science of the mind-brain we as religious-humans had to believe in universal concepts likes Gods or Divine Entities, as
- ❖ It was theses believe-entities that made us, as Homo sapiens species to survive,
- ❖ Five: that religion, and by implication and (as only an example, from the authors-side, Christian theology), can therefore establish a metaphysical harmonised-interdisciplinary-reciprocal-action (together with biologic science) towards a better biologic experience that entwined both genes as well as culturagens (cultural DNA, encoded in language, cultural artefacts and traditions) in a surge to become a better human species,

- ❖ Six: that we take cognisance of environmentalists (not all of them), who wants to make religious-humans to believe that nature is sacred and a perfect balance of living things thriving off one another. I for instance, had this intuitive inclination for a long time. (However, I am still uncertain and has not made up my mind, undefinedly)!
- ❖ And lastly, seven: that the altruistic-ethical-implications for the ‘no’ or ‘yes’ religious-humans regarding transhumanism, must at all cost be taken seriously. If our current religious-humans, that are supposedly responsible beings, does not take this last entry seriously, we must not be surprised of the disappearance of our species.

### **END**

In the beginning I pointed to the question of what, if any, can we explore from transhumanism in the context of transcendence towards a transhumanist’s quest for being hopeful within a religious-criteria in being part of a religious-experienced lived world as Homo sapiens? Not much, I hesitantly indicated. However, I think that in this script, in following a religious-transcendence-route into transhumanism, my question has flown into something new, something hopeful...

As indicated, this hopefulness can be perceived through all four scholars, Teilhard de Chardin, Fedorov, Istvan and Lake, especially as all four accommodate the transhumanist metaphor which Teilhard de Chardin converge into a noosphere and Fedorov into Christ resurrection, with Istvan warning us (religious-humans) of certain error-riddled motives from certain environmentalists, and Lake pleads with us to be ethical-responsible, when we entertain the finite future of being transhumanist or post-human. This left the reader of this script the valuable question: why not use the positives and the positiveness of transhumanism as metaphor for religious-humans that are spiritually and physically living-in-Hope for the future, as an extremely good time and Space example, in becoming a transhuman and therefore post-human?

### **References**

1. More Max (2013) the philosophy of transhumanism, in: More, M. & Vita-More, N. (Eds). The trans humanist reader! Classical and contemporary essays on science, technology, and philosophy of the human future! Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell 2013: 3-17.
2. Du Toit, Cornel W (2007) Viewed from the shoulders of God, themes in science and religion, Pretoria: University of South Africa.
3. Cole-Turner, Ronald (2011) Introduction to transhuman challenge, in Cole-Turner, R (ed). Transhumanism and transcendence Christian hope in an age of technological enhancement. Washington: Georgetown University Press 2011: 1- 18.
4. Cole-Turner, Ronald (2011) Transhumanism and Christianity, in Col-Turner, R (ed). Transhumanism and transcendence Christian hope in an age of technological enhancement. Washington: Georgetown University Press 2011: 193 -203.
5. Burdett, Michael S (2011) Transcendence and the human enhancement, in Cole-Turner, R (ed). Transhumanism and transcendence Christian hope in an age of technological enhancement. Washington: Georgetown University 2011: 19-35.
6. Zoltan, Istvan (2019) Nature are wrong: Nature isn’t sacred and we should replace it. <https://mavenroundtable.io/transhumanistwager/transhumanism/environmentalists->

- 
- are-wrong-nature-isn-t-sacred-and-we-should-replace-it-TZ7Msb4mOk-B3n4kNqsyqg/. 2019: 1-9.
7. Lake, Yvonne (2019) Reproductive rights in the transhuman Future <https://areomagazine.com/author/yvonnelaideart/>. Another Internet source is: <http://www.eucida.eu/network/yvonne-lake>.
  8. Grumett, David (2011) Transformation and the end of enhancement, in Cole-Turner, R (ed). Transhumanism and transcendence Christian hope in an age of technological enhancement. Washington: Georgetown University 2011: 19-36.

**Copyright:** ©2020 Johan A van Rooyen. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.