Journal of Posthumanism
2025
Volume: 5, No: 3, pp. 166–180
ISSN: 2634-3576 (Print) | ISSN 2634-3584 (Online)
posthumanism.co.uk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i3.725

Philosophy and Theology Facing Transhumanism: A Hermeneutic Analysis

Johan Méndez Reyes[1], Ana Padrón Medina[2], Víctor Iza Villacis[3]

Abstract

Transhumanism holds that human beings possess the ability to create a new identity, redefine their place in the world, reconfigure their relationships with others, and rethink their notion of transcendence. Its foundation lies in the idea that individuals can shape their own destiny and develop new beliefs and narratives. Within this framework, this research aims to analyze philosophy and theology in relation to transhumanism from a hermeneutic perspective. To achieve this, a qualitative methodology is employed, specifically the hermeneutic method and design, which allows for the interpretation of texts within their context. The study concludes that transhumanism, despite its aspiration to build a perfect society, has failed to address humanity's true needs, such as poverty, violence, disease, and the depletion of natural resources, among others. Rather, there is a growing trend of narcissistic and arrogant individualism among political, scientific, and economic leaders. In this context, posthuman society has yet to provide effective solutions to these global challenges. Therefore, this study seeks to open new pathways for philosophical and theological dialogue, fostering a deeper debate on the meaning and destiny of human beings in the technoscientific era.

Keywords: *Transhumanism, Technoscience, Philosophy, Hermeneutic, Theology*.

Introduction

Transhumanism can be considered not only a scientific stance but also an ideological one, as it promotes human enhancement through advances in technoscience. This implies the creation of a type of identity that could lead to a new non-human species, capable of transcending the limits of nature. Thus, human beings would become the master of their own destiny, which would entail a new reality that goes beyond the limitations traditionally associated with existence. From this perspective, transhumanism is configured as a political, cultural, ontological, and epistemological project, constituting a kind of dominant paradigm. Its philosophy seeks to offer answers to the problems inherent in the human condition, such as finitude, suffering, and corporeality, which opens a debate in theological and religious spheres.

Transhumanism is based on the idea that it is not only possible to improve humanity's physical and intellectual capacities but also to perfect it. Technoscience is presented as the one called to offer an efficient and definitive response to the great problems that afflict humanity: diseases, aging, and even death.

[1] Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, Grupo de investigación ATARAXIA, Email: jmendezr@ups.edu.ec, (Corresponding Author), https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9349-223X, Phone: +593963628151.
[2] Universidad Tecnológica ECOTEC, Email: apadronm@ecotec.edu.ec, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4724-9543
[3] Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, Grupo de investigación ATARAXIA, Email: viza@ups.edu.ec, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9834-7683

CC BY NC ND

That is why it is believed that science and technology can emancipate humanity from the limitations of nature and evolution, without requiring divine explanations. Consequently, humans are considered creators of their own destiny, with the power to generate life and remedy the biological imperfections that characterize existence. Although these approaches offer an ideological response to their defenders today, the great problems of humanity—such as poverty, misery, inequality, hunger, wars, invasions, and the ecological crisis—continue to be unresolved. Within this panorama, transhumanism could lead to a form of social Darwinism in which only economic elites have access to the benefits of technoscience, marginalizing the majority to their fate or even their extinction.

In response to these challenges, fundamental questions arise about the meaning of life and the values that should guide human existence. The struggle for freedom, justice, peace, and dignity remains central to the proposal of humanism. Philosophy and theology have contributed significantly to this reflection, valuing humanist values. Faced with this, posthumanism appears as a dead-end labyrinth, laden with uncertainty and contradictions.

In this context, the present work aims to analyze transhumanism in the light of philosophy and theology. It proposes a hermeneutic analysis that encompasses both human experience and perception and integrates a critical reflection on the impact of technoscience on humanity. To this end, a qualitative approach is adopted, based on hermeneutics and exegesis, which allows for an in-depth study of transhumanist aspirations and their consequences for the human future.

Likewise, this research highlights how philosophy and theology enrich contemporary critical thought, by revealing the implications of a transhumanist project that seeks to exercise absolute control through science and technology. While advances in genetic engineering, nanotechnology, artificial intelligence, cryogenics, and mind uploading are undeniable, the fundamental issue lies in the ethical and human costs that these processes entail. This study seeks to offer a profound reflection on these dilemmas, providing a perspective that allows for an understanding of the limits and possibilities of transhumanism within the framework of human existence.

Transhumanism: Past, Present, and Future

In the 21st century, transhumanism seeks to enhance the human being through technology, utilizing both integration with machines and biological modification. The former includes human-machine fusion, brain control via electrodes, and mind uploading into computer systems. The latter encompasses DNA alteration, gene therapy, and the use of pharmaceuticals to regulate emotions (Lavina Faustmann, 2021).

Its origins are traced back to Haldane's research in the 1920s, where the use of technology for human benefit and genetic enhancement was proposed. Later, in 1946, Huxley argued that transhumanism is based on the human capacity to use scientific and technological advances to improve life in all aspects.

In addition to the previously mentioned developments, in the 1960s Ettinger proposed cryopreservation as a method for life extension. His idea focused on the belief that, through cryogenic freezing, humans could preserve their bodies in the hope of future revival (Garcés Castellote & Jiménez Rodríguez, 2016).

By the end of the 20th century, thinkers such as Nick Bostrom, Ray Kurzweil, David Pearce, Aubrey de Grey, Max More, Natasha Vita-More, and Julian Savulescu, among others, continued

to explore transhumanism. They believe that human enhancement is possible through the application of technoscience.

According to the transhumanist tradition, technology has been a transformative force in nature and humanity, thus justifying human enhancement as an extension of our evolutionary history. Savulescu (2012), for instance, compares the use of natural remedies with genetic engineering, arguing that both aim to improve quality of life. For him, life is valuable insofar as it allows the pursuit of pleasurable activities. Under this logic, healing and enhancement merge, as humanity has always used technology to fulfill its desires. The posthuman society would then be the next logical step in this trajectory, with technology continuing to expand our capacity for healing and improvement (Lavina Faustmann, 2021).

Transhumanism proposes that humanity is still in an early stage of its evolutionary development, with significant potential for transformation. This intellectual and cultural movement advocates for the radical improvement of the human condition through applied reason and technology. Its main goal is to transcend human limitations, such as aging and physical and cognitive capacities, through the development of advanced technologies. Moreover, transhumanism explores the ethical implications, benefits, and risks of these technologies, seeking a balance between progress and responsibility (Bostrom, 2005).

The transhumanist aspiration to transcend human limitations is supported by the convergence of various technosciences. This set includes nanoscience, biotechnology, information technologies, cognitive sciences, artificial intelligence, and robotics. These disciplines, grouped under the acronyms NBIC, CT, or HET, converge in their ability to intervene in the human condition. The aim is to overcome natural barriers through the application of these technologies, seeking a radical improvement of the human being. This approach raises both possibilities and ethical and social challenges (Marcos, 2018).

More (2010) defines transhumanism as a collection of philosophies that advocate evolution toward a posthuman condition. It shares with humanism a respect for reason and science, a commitment to progress, and the value of life. However, it differs in anticipating radical changes in human nature and potential through technology.

Transhumanist proposals for human enhancement can take multiple forms. These transformations could be permanent or temporary, invasive or non-invasive, individual or inheritable, and encompass various dimensions of existence—from the genetic, physical, and cognitive to the emotional and ethical (Bostrom, 2005). In this sense, transhumanism seeks to extend healthy life, eradicate diseases, alleviate unnecessary suffering, and maximize human capacities—mental, physical, and emotional (Garcés Castellote & Jiménez Rodríguez, 2016). While these goals aim at significantly improving quality of life, they also raise major ethical and social questions.

In a complementary perspective, Gaviria (2024) suggests that transhumanism does not necessarily conflict with education. Rather, he proposes that both dimensions could engage in mutual dialogue and enrichment, provided that human dignity is respected, and the core values of the educational process are strengthened. Although bioconservative sectors warn about the dangers of biotechnology to human autonomy and integrity, this author argues that such interventions can be ethically acceptable if they reinforce personal self-determination. Both the educational field and transhumanism pursue the overcoming of human limitations; the difference lies in the means: while education relies on symbolic and formative tools, transhumanism uses

technoscientific innovations. In this context, the author proposes a set of criteria to evaluate the ethical validity of such interventions, emphasizing the importance of setting clear boundaries, especially in the educational domain.

Pearce (2004), defines the central goals of transhumanism as the pursuit of superintelligence, superlongevity, and superb well-being for all humanity. He argues that the exponential acceleration of technological development, driven by artificial intelligence and the integration of NBIC technologies, could lead to technological singularity in the near future.

Kurzweil (2012), in turn, believes that the technological singularity will represent an irreversible tipping point in human history. This transformation could give rise to a new form of life: the posthumans. The singularity thus presents itself as a promise of progress but also as a challenge that demands careful ethical reflection.

In this emerging context, the evolutionary process would cease to be strictly natural and become directed by technological intervention. For example, germline genetic manipulation could allow for the alteration of DNA in human reproductive cells, making large-scale transformation possible through the application of technoscience (Mehlman, 2009). This would mean that humanity would have control over its own evolution, raising profound questions about nature and the future of the human being.

Although transhumanism has found support among numerous thinkers and scientists, it has also generated significant criticism. Among the main objections are the technical difficulties of applying these technologies to humans, the risks of a potential new eugenics, the threat of dehumanization, the exacerbation of social inequalities, and the ethical concerns related to extreme life extension. These criticisms invite a deeper philosophical reflection on the paths humanity is taking. Far from being mere speculation, transhumanism is now a growing reality that requires urgent ethical and anthropological discernment, as its implications directly affect the very meaning of being human.

Transhumanism, a diverse set of ideas, proposes the radical transformation of humanity through technology. Although it presents itself as a unified movement, it encompasses multiple perspectives, all centered on life extension, the pursuit of immortality, and human enhancement. This vision trusts science as the engine to achieve these goals, ranging from extreme longevity to overcoming human limitations (Adjahou, 2023).

According to Manzocco (2019), transhumanism is considered a system of parascientific beliefs that offers secular alternatives to religious aspirations. Unlike pseudoscience, it is based on current scientific knowledge—though not universally accepted—and projects it into the future. Thus, ideas such as cryonics and radical longevity lie at the frontier of science, awaiting possible validation.

Transhumanism: A Philosophical Perspective

Transhumanism presents itself as a postmodern philosophical vision that venerates technoscience, integrating various scientific theories. Its core themes include the pursuit of immortality, superintelligence, and space colonization. This current of thought, which defines itself as an evolution of the Enlightenment, seeks to achieve and facilitate the invention of the enhanced human through technoscience (Adjahou, 2023).

According to Alba and Calero (2023), transhumanism, from a philosophical perspective, is based on an ontological and teleological vision that seeks not only human improvement in terms of

perfection but also the self-construction of immortality. This assertion invites a deep philosophical analysis of how nature will be transformed for the creation of a new paradigm of life: posthumanism.

With the premise that science and technology are profoundly altering humanity, transhumanism proposes overcoming human limitations such as suffering, cognitive restrictions, aging, and death. Therefore, it seeks to enhance human physical and mental capacities through science and technology, aspiring to eliminate undesirable and surmountable aspects of the human condition, such as suffering, disease, aging, and mortality (Adjahou, 2023).

Pavlov (2019) argues that, although posthumanism and transhumanism both belong to the postmodern realm, they present significant differences. Both currents address the relationships between human beings and other forms of life. However, posthumanism focuses on the boundaries between the human and the non-human, while transhumanism centers its attention on the potential for human enhancement through technology (Alba and Calero, 2023).

In contrast, Dubrovsky (2013) suggests that the global crisis of civilization, stemming from the interdependence between phenomena such as climate change, resource scarcity, and growing inequality, constitutes today's main philosophical problem. From his perspective, transhumanism represents a concrete alternative for improving life on the planet (Alba and Calero, 2023).

From a bioethical standpoint, Mainetti (2014) defines transhumanism as a techno-futurist movement, infused with ideological and utopian elements. This movement advocates for a radical transformation of the human species, promoting enhancement as a new goal of medicine, one that transcends mere attention to disease and health (Alba and Calero, 2023).

Traditionally, the States have assumed responsibility for technologies aimed at human enhancement. However, transhumanists argue that this task should be driven by the progress of biotechnology. Thus, the aims of transhumanism are diverse, highlighting the use of science, reason, and technology to eradicate poverty and overcome disabilities. Nonetheless, in practice, these promises coexist with a society that reproduces inequalities and even threatens the very notion of humanity.

Bostrom (2016), one of the main proponents of transhumanism, admits that development lacking ethical guidance can produce negative consequences, such as increasing social inequalities. According to him, the responsible use of technology and rationality would allow humanity to overcome its evolutionary limitations, improve well-being, and exercise greater control over its existence (Terrones, 2018).

The author emphasizes the need for these technologies to be accessible to all, as limited access could exacerbate inequality. A broad distribution, on the contrary, would foster collective support for the transhumanist project, expanding its social base (Terrones, 2018).

Considering this scenario, it cannot be ethically justified to endanger humanity's existence under any scientistic argument. As Jonas (1995) warns, it is not morally permissible to compromise the essence or continuity of the human being in the name of progress. This line of thought underscores the urgency of ethics of responsibility, especially in view of the risks posed by technoscientific innovations (Terrones, 2018).

The unlimited potential of technoscience must be examined with a future-oriented awareness. It is necessary to avoid the abuse of our capabilities, remembering that uncertainty should prompt

an attitude of prudence and responsibility. Therefore, it is essential to envision scenarios that truly benefit humanity, applying reasonable doubt in the face of technoscience's power and promises (Terrones, 2018).

Although transhumanism emphasizes individual bodily enhancement, it also opens the possibility of addressing limitations imposed by congenital diseases, moving closer to the ideal of a more equitable society. Technologies such as virtual reality could improve the autonomy and social integration of people with disabilities.

In response to these aspirations, philosophy positions itself as a critical tool for analyzing technological advances and their impact on the human condition. Within this framework, the concept of the "cyborg"—a fusion of machine and organism—has been interpreted as a new way of conceiving the contemporary subject. However, far from being a path to liberation, this figure can be understood as a manifestation of technological determinism imposed by capitalist logic. From this critical perspective, the idea that technology can transform human beings into an immaterial entity is rejected, since the body remains an essential component of our existence. Its denial would only deepen the processes of alienation (Reyes, 2010).

Consequently, the transhumanist proposal to transcend the human body and upload consciousness to a digital medium does not constitute true emancipation. Rather, it reinforces already existing structures of domination within the capitalist-technological system. Reducing existence to a mere mental phenomenon ignores the fundamental role of the body in shaping thought and consciousness. Philosophy challenges this instrumental view of the human and reaffirms that corporeality is inseparable from personal identity (Reyes, 2010).

From this philosophical standpoint, transhumanism has been the subject of multiple criticisms. Thinkers such as Fukuyama (2002) and Sandel (2007) warn that its apparent rationality makes it more dangerous. From this perspective, biomedical interventions are ethically acceptable only when aimed at healing purposes, and not when intended to expand human capabilities beyond their natural limits (Pugliese, 2020).

One of the most significant fears lies in the potential unequal access to genetic enhancements, which could lead to profound divisions among individuals. Buchanan (2011) warns that genetic manipulation could alter the essence of the human being, compromising the principle of equality. In their work From Chance to Choice, Buchanan and his colleagues (2000) insist that genetic engineering should focus on correcting deficiencies rather than enhancing abilities, to preserve justice and fairness (Pugliese, 2020).

On the other hand, Nussbaum (2002) points out that the modification of talents and personal traits could lead to harmful standardization, affecting cultural diversity and weakening the principles of social justice. Along similar lines, Byung-Chul Han (2017) argues that contemporary society promotes an ideal of self-optimization that ends up alienating the individual. In this context, transhumanism emerges as an ideology that promotes extreme perfectionism, supported by technologies that can strip the human being of their humanity (Pugliese, 2020).

Considering these criticisms, it is concluded that transhumanism threatens human dignity by altering its essential nature, generating inequalities, and promoting a utilitarian vision of life. This stance not only undermines fundamental values such as justice and inclusion but also impacts the planet's ecological balance.

Therefore, it is essential to critically examine both the tenets and the hidden implications of transhumanism. It is not enough to reject the idea of reducing the human being to digital consciousness or a database; it is urgent to deepen a philosophical reflection that recognizes the unity of nature and culture in the human condition and that warns of the risks the technoscientific paradigm poses to life as we know it.

Indeed, from a philosophical standpoint, transhumanism is based on the firm belief that science and technology have the potential to radically transform the human condition. This approach seeks to transcend the inherent limitations of our existence by enhancing the physical and mental capacities of human beings and eradicating human imperfection. Through this vision, transhumanism aspires to redefine humanity, proposing a future in which biological boundaries are surpassed through technological intervention.

Technoscience and Progress: A Crossroads for Humanity

Transhumanism is grounded in the ambition to transcend human limitations through reason, science, and technology. It promotes the development of technologies to combat aging, enhance physical and cognitive abilities, and ensure survival through hibernation or brain transfer. Key terms such as 'overcoming,' 'development,' 'enhancement,' and 'immortality' reflect its pursuit of human perfection. However, this aspiration reveals a rejection of the finitude, imperfection, and vulnerability inherent in the human condition (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

This is why humans strive to transform their natural environment to meet their needs, a response deeply rooted in their anthropological essence. In this process, science and technology have served to harmonize individual interests with shared collective values. However, with the consolidation of modern rationality, a unique model of thought was imposed that privileged the scientific method as the exclusive path to truth, marginalizing other legitimate forms of knowledge and understanding of the world.

At the same time, the expansion of science and technology has produced ambivalent, even dangerous effects, not only for humanity but for the entire planet. This has generated a mix of skepticism and concern about the idea of boundless and uncontrolled progress, considering the perception that certain technoscientific advancements, rather than solving the fundamental problems faced by individuals and communities, have deteriorated essential aspects of existence such as quality of life, happiness, and human dignity (Bolaños, 2023).

In this context, it is essential to adopt a critical perspective that allows for questioning the very notion of progress, development, and scientific-technological advancement. It is important to recognize that the scientific method is not the only valid path for generating knowledge; there are other equally valid epistemological forms that have supported various cultures and civilizations throughout time.

This tension is also reflected in the geopolitical disputes over the control of the global economy, where potentially destructive technoscientific developments are involved, such as biological and biochemical weapons, the irresponsible use of nuclear energy, genetic manipulation, and the production of substances that severely damage ecosystems. These practices represent real threats to the survival of the human species and the planet (Bolaños, 2023).

In this context, if technoscientific progress continues advancing without ethical and rational regulation, its benefits could be eclipsed by the dangers it represents, becoming a latent threat to all forms of life, including humanity in its diversity (Bolaños, 2023).

Therefore, it is urgent to recover a solid moral foundation in the human being that allows us to rethink the epistemological, ontological, and ethical foundations of our relationship with science. This involves promoting scientific responsibility that, beyond innovation, commits to ethical principles centered on the protection of life. The scientific community must actively take on this challenge and direct its research toward the common good and toward development that is truly sustainable, enduring, and rooted in endogenous foundations (Bolaños, 2023).

From this perspective, the dominant technoscientific rationality in the West needs to open itself to other dimensions of human experience, recognizing the richness of cultural diversity and the social, ethical, and moral dimensions that shape our humanity. In this sense, the role of ethics is crucial for evaluating the impact of scientific and technological developments. A renewed rationality is required that not only broadens the epistemological horizon but also contributes to a more comprehensive conception of human life (Bolaños, 2023).

Faith in the power of reason to solve current challenges presents us today with an unprecedented dilemma. To overcome it, an articulation between multiple scientific disciplines, political and social will, and the active participation of communities is needed. The commitment of the scientific community is key, as it must generate accessible and applicable knowledge that truly improves the living conditions of society.

Thus, there is an urgent need to promote a new articulation between epistemology and technoscience, guided by ethical reflection on its environmental impact and on life in all its forms. This requires defining new values that direct the use of reason toward just ends, through an epistemology that does not hierarchize or underestimate the human sciences in comparison with the experimental sciences but rather fosters dialogue between knowledge as the foundation for a common human project that ensures collective well-being.

The potential creation of thinking machines through AI raises crucial questions about the essence of what it means to be human and the future of our dignity. The rapid evolution of systems like ChatGPT, capable of simulating conversations and analyzing complex information, has generated concern among experts, some of whom have even proposed a pause in AI development. This unease suggests the possibility that AI could radically transform our existence, giving rise to posthumanism. In its most extreme form, this vision proposes liberation from biological restrictions, considering the body an obstacle. Essentially, it questions whether the pursuit of technological perfection entails the denial of our finite and vulnerable nature (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Death: An End or a Beginning? A Theological Critique of Transhumanism

The aspiration to achieve immortality or an extremely prolonged life, proposed by transhumanism, leads us to question the very nature of our existence. Human life, as we know it, is built and experienced within the context of our relationships with others. It is not merely about individual existence, but rather the network of daily interactions with our family, friends, and colleagues (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

The dynamics of these relationships, their constant evolution, are what gives meaning to our lives. Therefore, the idea of a prolonged existence without these connections presents a profound existential void, like the one we experience during mourning (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Moreover, the notion that immortality would be accessible to everyone, or even desirable, is questionable. Works of fiction such as Ad Vitam and Interview with the Vampire explore the

possible consequences of eternal life, revealing the tedium, loneliness, and persistence of the darker aspects of human nature (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Ultimately, the transhumanist pursuit of immortality may not resolve the fundamental problems of the human condition, such as selfishness, the pursuit of power, and the lack of existential meaning (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

For Méndez Reyes (2024), one of humanity's great concerns is the reflection on death. It is difficult for us to accept our finitude, which leads us to constantly question our mortal destiny. In this context, transhumanism offers a captivating promise: immortality and the extension of life, which addresses our deep desire to avoid death.

Despite this anguish, the only certainty in human existence is death. The death of the body constitutes an equally fundamental dimension of our lives, as essential as existence itself. Our identity and essence are deeply linked to both life and death. However, the fear of death has driven great efforts in science and technology in search of alternatives that can extend life and enhance human capacities through natural or artificial resources (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

According to Meza-Rueda (2023), transhumanism seeks to transcend the limits of the human condition through technology, including artificial intelligence. Its goal is to prolong life and well-being, although it has yet to overcome traditional dualisms, such as the distinction between the natural and the artificial. It also proposes overcoming the separation between body and soul, or between mortal flesh and consciousness. To achieve this, it advocates the technologization of consciousness, transforming it into information manipulable by technology (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

Méndez Reyes (2024) argues that science and technology exert a great attraction on humanity, promising immortality and perfection. These promises are irresistible, as they appeal to our desire to overcome both death and imperfection. However, transhumanism, which promotes the use of technology to improve the human condition, also presents challenges for theological disciplines such as Christology, theological anthropology, and eschatology, which are rooted in Judeo-Christian scriptures (Meza-Rueda, 2023).

For Christianity, in contrast, death does not mark the end of existence but a transition to a more perfect and eternal life. In this framework, death is seen as a temporary separation of body and soul, with the soul being immortal. This belief is based on the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who overcame death (Meza-Rueda, 2023). In contrast, transhumanism views death as an obstacle to be overcome, proposing technology to extend life indefinitely or achieve immortality, based on the ongoing advancement of medical and scientific technology (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

In this context, the figure of Jesus Christ is central to Christianity, representing the "living hope" derived from the resurrection (1 Peter 1:3). The resurrection demonstrates that death is not the end but the necessary step toward immortality. This hope drives us to live from the strength given to us by faith in Christ, allowing us to face the difficulties of mortal life (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

Believing in Jesus Christ, therefore, is an act of liberation from suffering and oppression, while transhumanism seeks to liberate us from our body and soul (Meza-Rueda, 2023).

Transhumanism rejects the idea that we have been created in the image and likeness of God in body and soul. This movement believes that the human body is an entity that must be subjected to the information of hardware, which acts as the memory where consciousness, subjectivity,

and intelligence reside (Méndez Reyes, 2024). Thus, when the body dies, the information contained within it could be transferred to another entity, whether semi-human or artificial (Meza-Rueda, 2023).

According to Meza-Rueda (2023), several questions arise for reflection: Which of these two discourses will attract humanity more? Transhumanism or Christianity? Will we witness a reinterpretation of Christianity that responds to humanity's desire for eternity? Will faith, hope, and love, in their fullest expression in Christ, give meaning to the death that so many people fear today? These questions invite us to reflect on the future and destiny of humanity (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

From a Christian perspective, we are called to face physical death with love and charity, considering it a transition to eternal life, and to maintain hope and faith. This theological view does not deny the advances of science and technology but emphasizes that they must align with the moral and spiritual values of each person. Science and technology must be used for the common good, avoiding blind trust in their unlimited progress, as these advances operate between creation and destruction, putting at risk the evolutionary balance of life on the planet (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

This theological vision calls us to be more realistic and responsible. Scientific and technological advances can benefit humanity if they are used for the common good, but they can also be dangerous if used irresponsibly. Hence, the importance of ethics that guides the development of science and technology, based on principles and spiritual values, in order to build a better future for humanity (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

Indeed, when Christian theology asserts that humanity is imago Dei, it affirms that each person is destined to live in communion with God, with others, and with creation, just as God himself is understood in his intratrinitarian community (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) and extratrinitarian community (the Lover, the Beloved, and Love). This vision of humanity as a relational being fades in the context of transhumanism, where the focus is primarily on the individual's relationship with technology, relegating the importance of others to the background (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

In this paradigm, the main focus is for the individual to selfishly secure their own well-being, and, if others become relevant, it would only be to manipulate them into consuming technological tools under the logic of neoliberalism. From a religious perspective, this could be understood as a form of introspection, in which the human being, consciously or not, ends up subjugating themselves to a technology-deity (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

On the other hand, in Christianity, communion is celebrated through the sacraments, which, in their essence, are signs of faith, hope, and charity, structured around the resurrection. However, Easter, as a fundamental experience, is not an individual matter but an ecclesial task, lived in relation to others. In contrast, if we consider transhumanism as a kind of modern religion, the question arises: what would its "sacraments" be, and what meaning would they have? Undoubtedly, transhumanism has its own creeds and rituals, which translate the idea of "com-union" into a concept of "interconnection," where others are reduced to mere data (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Transhumanism: A Challenge for Theology?

In the Gospel of John (11:25-26), Jesus proclaims: "I am the resurrection and the life; whoever believes in me, even if they die, will live. And everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die eternally." For Christians, these words refer to Jesus Christ as the central figure of the eschatological event, in which his life, death, and resurrection mark the beginning of the Kingdom of God—a kingdom of life and of the Spirit. Within this framework, Christian hope is grounded in the resurrection and the radical transformation of life, which begins in Christ and will reach its fulfillment at the end of history. However, this understanding of future life stands in contrast to the transhumanist vision, which places its faith in science, its hope in technological progress, and its love in humanity itself. For transhumanism, the aspiration is to achieve “eternal life” within this temporal reality through technological advancement (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Indeed, as Zamora (2023) notes, transhumanism promotes a paradigm in which technology, particularly artificial intelligence, exerts unprecedented control over human nature, aiming for perfection and immortality in a posthuman era. This vision raises profound theological questions, analyzed by Oviedo (2022) from three key perspectives. First, the relationship between the divine image in the human being and technological enhancement sparks debates about whether such enhancement honors or distorts the intrinsic dignity of the human person. Some theological interpretations view enhancement as an approach toward divinization, while others warn against the risk of altering the essence of humanity (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

Second, theology addresses the human fragility derived from original sin, questioning whether transhumanism represents a legitimate effort to overcome these limitations or a manifestation of self-sufficiency that disregards divine redemption. The debate centers on whether technology can redeem or rather exacerbate the fallen human condition. Third, it explores whether technology can serve as a channel of divine grace, or whether it diverts attention from the traditional means of sanctification (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

In this context, an interdisciplinary dialogue among theology, philosophy, and technology is advocated to question the individualism inherent in transhumanism and to promote a technology centered on human well-being and social interdependence. Emphasis is placed on the application of Christian principles such as compassion and justice, in response to Pope Francis’ call for an inclusive and solidaristic society. Theology thus seeks to respond to the challenges posed by transhumanism by building a society founded on hope, peace, and dialogue (Méndez Reyes, 2024).

Furthermore, for Meza-Rueda (2024), this transhumanist approach—centered on prolonging physical life through cybernetic bodies—diverges significantly from the Christian vision, which does not conceive future life as a mere extension of the present one, but rather as a radical transformation rooted in the mystery of Jesus’ Paschal event as "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (1 Corinthians 15:20). In contrast to transhumanism, which seeks to overcome natural materiality through technology, the Christian life is understood as a path of spiritual renewal. This path is not based on simply extending life but on a fundamental transformation that can only be attained through spiritual sowing, grounded in love, compassion, forgiveness, and justice. As Jesus warned, "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world, yet forfeit his soul?" (Mark 8:36).

The Christian conception of future life as transformation—rather than prolongation—highlights the limitations of transhumanist aspirations. The promise of immortality through cybernetic bodies is inevitably subject to technological obsolescence, revealing that any attempt to extend human life through purely material means remains exposed to the inherent corruption of

technology. In contrast, Christianity proposes a "sowing in the Spirit," founded not on worldly values, but on a self-giving love, exemplified in the incarnation of God, who embraced human vulnerability to redeem it from its deepest roots (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Posthumans, in striving for perfection, may lose what it truly means to be human, since imperfection, vulnerability, and finitude are constitutive of our nature. In these aspects lies the very meaning of life: the capacity to coexist, to love despite suffering, to build shared projects with other imperfect beings, to ask for forgiveness, and to share both achievements and frustrations. Humanity is expressed precisely in our finitude and in our capacity to be vulnerable and compassionate (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

Praxeology, Axiology, and Technoscience: Challenges for the Future of Humanity

From a sociopolitical perspective, Echeverría (2008) argues that technoscience has developed a specific type of praxeology in modern society. Therefore, it is necessary to establish guidelines for reflection on the power that humans gain over nature and the connection between technoscience and these factors.

On the other hand, Barreto Calle (2023) asserts that scientists, technologists, and technoscientists have the ethical responsibility to explain why it is legitimate to aspire to the lifestyles proposed by transhumanism. Furthermore, they must justify why they believe that the benefits of these advancements outweigh the potential collateral damage caused by experimental practices on living beings and the natural environment.

According to Echeverría (2009), technoscience represents an innovative mode of knowledge characterized by its interdisciplinary nature, its focus on practical application, and its global reach. He argues that technoscience has triggered a revolution in praxeology, altering the way individuals interact with the world. Praxeology, as a discipline, studies human action by examining its foundations, circumstances, and processes.

Technoscience has enhanced human control over nature by developing technologies that have enabled an unprecedented level of manipulation of living beings. This rapid increase in power has created significant challenges for humanity. In fact, technoscientific advancements have fostered an increasing interdependence in human behavior, reflected even in new forms of organization and governance.

At the same time, technoscience has also transformed labor relations. By automating tasks previously performed by humans, it has created new challenges regarding employment and social security.

Technoscience emerges as a powerful force capable of radically transforming society. Hence, it is crucial to establish ethical and social principles to accompany the absolutist ambitions of technoscientific development, emphasizing its necessity to contribute to the common good and environmental protection.

It is essential for humans to become aware of the need to establish a balanced relationship between science, technology, ethics, and ecology. This will allow us to achieve sustainable progress and development without endangering the essence of humanity or its relationship with the environment. To achieve this, it is necessary to develop a political, economic, and social project that benefits everyone (Barreto Calle, 2023).

Scientific and technological progress has brought great benefits to humanity, but it has also posed new challenges. We must design new axiological and ethical foundations to guide the development of science and technology, ensuring the common good and the protection of life and nature.

Conclusion

This work has enabled an in-depth analysis and a critical evaluation of transhumanism from both philosophical and theological perspectives, while also recognizing the significant contributions of technoscience. It does not propose a rejection of technological advances but rather calls for an ethical stance that fosters responsible discernment of their potential and risks. In this regard, the urgent need for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary dialogue is emphasized—one that promotes a comprehensive understanding of the technoscientific phenomenon and simultaneously revitalizes reflection on its anthropological, spiritual, and social implications.

From this perspective, the research offers a philosophical contribution by articulating a critical position that challenges the foundations of the transhumanist project. Rooted in an instrumental rationality characteristic of modernity, transhumanism tends to reduce the human condition to functional parameters, aligning it with market-driven logic and the interests of powerful ideological structures. In contrast, this study proposes opening new avenues for dialogue among philosophy, theology, and other disciplines, with the goal of deepening the debate on the meaning and destiny of the human being amid ongoing technoscientific transformations.

The concept of the human being promoted by transhumanism is grounded in a materialistic determinism that rarely questions its own assumptions. By privileging technical outcomes without considering their social viability or other forms of cultural wisdom, there is a risk of encouraging narratives that obscure the ethical and political dimensions of human enhancement. In this context, it is crucial to recall that technology is not neutral: it is shaped by power structures and economic interests. Therefore, a thorough analysis is urgently needed regarding its social consequences, criteria of access, and the ethical dilemmas it raises—areas in which both philosophy and theology retain a valuable critical and constructive capacity.

The challenges faced by a society that seeks to transcend natural limits, and transcendent references demand a lucid and committed response. What is needed is a critical assessment from inter- and transdisciplinary perspectives that supports the construction of a more just and humane future. Philosophical inquiry, in dialogue with theology and the human sciences, can offer key insights for a fuller understanding of technoscientific development, promoting a vision of progress oriented toward the common good, equity, and sustainability.

The reflection on the relationship between transhumanism and Christianity has highlighted the need to recover the fundamental role of the theology of grace in this contemporary dialogue. It emerges as an essential hermeneutical key, given its deep connection with the theology of salvation. Indeed, whether we place emphasis on grace or on technology—as an expression of human freedom—within the horizon of salvation, will significantly shape our stance toward the transhumanist project (Adjahou, 2023).

Ultimately, in the face of the rapid advance of technoscience, it is essential to adopt a balanced posture: neither technological idolatry nor total rejection, but rather an attitude that values those developments that genuinely contribute to improving the quality of human life. This includes such fundamental aspects as health, social coexistence, and spiritual openness, always guided by the wisdom needed to keep sight of what is essentially human. Understood as the discernment

of the good amid complexity, wisdom allows us to maintain a harmonious relationship between God, humanity, and the cosmos, in full awareness of our interdependence and of the limits that shape our existence (Meza-Rueda, 2024).

References

Adjahou, T. R. (2023). Transhumanismo y cristianismo: Reflexión teológica sobre su eventual compatibilidad. Universidad Pontificia Comillas.

Alba, J. y Calero, M. (2023). Transhumanismo: una Perspectiva desde las diferencias biológicas basadas en la desigualdad de riqueza. Revista de Filosofía. Universidad del Zulia.

Barreto Calle, C. (2023). Fundamentación axiológica de la tecnociencia. En Zuna Serrano, K. (Coord.). Transhumanismo y realidades paralelas. Interpelaciones desde la filosofía y la teología. Editorial Abya-Yala. http://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/24589

Biblia Católica. https://www.bibliacatolica.com.br/es/

Bolaños, R. (2023). Vivas La paradoja del progreso tecno-científico contemporáneo. Un acercamiento desde Evandro Agazzi. En Zuna Serrano, K. (Coord.). Transhumanismo y realidades paralelas. Interpelaciones desde la filosofía y la teología. Editorial Abya-Yala. http://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/24589

Bostrom, N. (2005). Valores transhumanistas. Universidad de Oxford.

Bostrom, N. (2011). Una historia del pensamiento transhumanista. Argumentos de Razón Técnica, Nº 14. Universidad de Oxford.

Bostrom, N. (2016). Superinteligencia: caminos, peligros, estrategias. España: Editorial Teell.

Buchanan, A. (2011). Beyond humanity? Oxford University Press.

Buchanan, A., Brock, D., Daniels, N., & Wikler, D. (2000). From chance to choice: Genetics and justice. Cambridge University Press.

Dubrovsky, D. (2013). "Global Future 2045. Convergent Technologies (NBICS) and Transhumanism Evolution", Moscow, MBA Publications.

Echeverría, J. (2008). Filosofía de la práctica tecnocientífica y valores. https://bit.ly/3Y7vRjy

Echeverría, J. (2009). Ética y sociedades tecnológicas [Ethics and technological societies]. Isegoría, 41, 207-229. https://doi.org/10.3989/isegoria.2009.i41.671

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

Garcés Castellote, E. & Jiménez Rodríguez, M. (2016). Transhumanismo: cómo el mejoramiento humano cambiará el cuidado: un análisis desde la teoría general del déficit de autocuidado. Ene, 10 (3). http://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1988-348X2016000300005&lng=es&tlng=es

Gaviria, J. L. (2024). ¿Transhumanismo 'contra' educación? Teoría de la Educación, 36(2), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.14201/teri.31762

Han, B.-C. (2017). La expulsión de lo distinto. Herder Editorial.

Jonas, H. (1995). El principio de responsabilidad. Ensayo de una ética para la civilización tecnológica. Barcelona: Herder.

Kurzweil, R. (2012). La Singularidad está Cerca. Berlín: Lola Books.

Lavina Faustmann, L. (2021). Transhumanismo, el último suspiro de Dios: análisis del proyecto transhumanista desde la filosofía posthumanista posmoderna. Cuadernos salmantinos de filosofía, 48, 283-31

Mainetti, J. (2014). Bioética Del Posthumanismo y El Mejoramiento Humano. Revista Red bioética / UNESCO.

Manzocco, R. (2019). Transhumanism: Engineering the human condition. Springer.

Marcos, A. (2018). Bases filosóficas para una crítica al transhumanismo. ArtefaCToS. Revista de estudios de la ciencia y la tecnología, 1 7(2), 107-125. https://doi.org/10.14201/art201872107125

Mehlman, M. (2009). Will direct evolution destroy humanity, and if so, what can we do about it? Saint Louis University Journal of Health Law & Policy

Méndez Reyes, J. (2024). Religion and Theology Facing the Challenges of Transhumanism. International Journal of Religion, 5(11), 7054 – 7061. https://doi.org/10.61707/6pp4yg66

Meza-Rueda, J. (2023). "¿Vas a morir?" Crítica teológica a la idea de inmortalidad del transhumanismo. En Zuna Serrano, K. (Coord.). Transhumanismo y realidades paralelas. Interpelaciones desde la filosofía y la teología. Editorial Abya-Yala. http://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/24589

Meza-Rueda, J. L. (2024). Meditación teológica acerca de la promesa transhumanista del mejoramiento humano. Carthaginensia, 40(78), 525-544.

More, M. (2010). Transhumanist FAQ

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Genética y justicia: Tratar la enfermedad, respetar la diferencia (R. Orsi, Trad.). Isegoría, 27, 5-17.

Oviedo, L. (2022). La teología ante el transhumanismo. Pensamiento. Revista De Investigación E Información Filosófica, 78(298 S. Esp), 515–522. https://doi.org/10.14422/pen.v78.i298.y2022.012.

Pavlov, A. (2019). Posthumanismo: superación y legado del posmodernismo, Voprosy Filosofii, Nº. 5. https://doi.org/10.31857/S004287440005053-3

Pearce, D. (2004). The hedonistic imperative.

Pugliese, Z. (2020). Transhumanismo: Una promesa de mejoramiento humano carente de fundamento ético. Nuevo Pensamiento: Revista de Filosofía del Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas de la Facultad de Filosofía de la Universidad del Salvador, área San Miguel, 10(16), 429-446.

Reyes, P. E. (2010). La filosofía transhumanista: La condición humana y el mundo cyborg. Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Sandel, M. (2007). Contra la perfección: La ética en la era de la ingeniería genética. Marbot.

Savulescu, J. (2012). ¿Decisiones peligrosas? Hacia una bioética desafiante. Grupo Anaya.

Terrones, A. (2018). Transhumanismo y ética de la responsabilidad Resonancias. Revista de Filosofía No. 4.

Zamora, C. (2023). Teología, mundos posibles y realidades paralelas. En Zuna Serrano, K. (Coord.). Transhumanismo y realidades paralelas. Interpelaciones desde la filosofía y la teología. Editorial Abya-Yala. http://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/24589