



Dymitr Kostrica

Wyższa Szkoła Menedżerska w Warszawie
Warsaw, Poland
E-mail: dkostrica@me.com

Medical approach of transhumanism

Abstract

Tremendous human development in technology could result in “posthuman” modes of being. After offering some definitions and conceptual clarification, review the utilization in medicine of new technology. This quasi – religion, of continuous human body improvement refer to some posthuman modes of being would be very valuable. The general acceptance of medical usage of transhuman approach become more acceptable, if we use technological development to treat humane body diseases. Moreover, there is ample evidence that human aspiration to prolong life without diseases provide to greater acceptance of transhuman - “posthuman” concepts.

Keywords: transhumanism; medicine, medical approach of transhumanism. Extreme human enhancement could result in “posthuman” modes of being. After offering some definitions and conceptual clarification, I argue for two theses. First, some posthuman modes of being would be very worthwhile. Second, it could be very good for human beings to become posthuman.

INTRODUCTION

Many transhumanists admire the hypothetical achievements of evolving technology, the desirability of developing new technology, and the probability to enhance current human capabilities (2). We have to remember about a multidisciplinary applied ethics of transhumanism. Concurring to the “Transhumanist Declaration,” declared at 1998 at a founding document of the World Transhumanist Association, transhumanists spot that technology has the power to impact human life in a fundamental way that would “redesign” it (2). Instead of turning away from technology or spoiling in “technophobia”, transhumanists believe that new technologies in the fields of genetics, robotics, information, and nanotechnology—have to be welcomed as hypothetically improve human life, nevertheless they are risky (2,11,12). Transhumanist advocate the investment of time and research into technology to improve cognition, anti-aging techniques, reproductive technology, and life suspension techniques such as cryogenics—all of which are mentioned in the Declaration. Although we have to realize their risks and potentials. Eventually, what individuals could gain, according to transhumanists, is the “use of technology to extend their mental and physical

(including reproductive) capacities and to improve their control over their own lives” (2, Appendix). If we summarize, the Declaration statements that transhumanists “seek personal growth beyond our current biological limitations” (2).

In Bostrom essay we could find a history of transhumanism. Taking literary epics, ceremony, and religion as a guide, moreover he notes that different cultures around the world have long bewailed death and pursued immortality. He considers Renaissance of humanism and the Enlightenment as primary precursors of today’s transhumanist point of view, because, like transhumanism, both of these historical frames emphasized the intellect and relied upon empiricism and human judgment to investigate the world and its possibilities, have nothing to do with dogma (2). Following Francis Bacon, Bostrom contends that science should be used to “achieve mastery over nature in order to improve the living conditions of human beings” (2). To summarize, “rational humanism” is where transhumanism locates its legacy, adding only that the human is among those objects of nature to be occupied (2).

The comprehension of Immanuel Kant’s motto “*Sapere aude!* Have courage to use your own intelligence!” which was used by Bostrom (2; 13). Bostrom’s concept, the redesigning of the human being would be directed to amendment in terms of abilities, and in harmony with John Stuart Mill, happiness (2). Transhumanism’s required, redesign human being and often implied to as the posthuman. Corresponding to the “Transhumanist FAQ”(Humanity FAQ), a collectively authored document by Bostrom participated in: “Posthumans could be completely artificial intelligences, or they could be enhanced uploads . . . or they could be the result of making many smaller but cumulatively profound augmentations to a biological human” (23). To be posthuman, by the transhumanists motto, is to populate a state, generally considered not only a departure from what are mostly considered human qualities, or transcendent of, humanity as we know it (2).

Concept of hybridization, as human-machine, as a reality could be used in orthopedics, computer science, other handheld devices, assistive technologies, and other technological systems upon which most of us depend on every day (15). To see more obvious radical samples of hybridity, could find in stories of athlete Aimee Mullins, in a well-known TED talk (4). One may thus dispute, with Donna Haraway, that we are already in posthuman era (19). Nevertheless, we could have concern with investigating the transhumanist promotion of a specie, for future posthuman, transhumanists believe to be increased in some dimensions it would be difficult to assign the word “human” to this being.

There is a diversity of senses of posthumanism. Transhumanism’s sense of the posthuman is not the only current meaning of the term and differentiating among various meanings of posthumanism will help clarify transhumanism’s utility. The concept of transhumanism’s posthuman concept is not equivalent, to the concept of posthuman used in critical animal studies to challenge philosophical or the moral relevance of traditional species boundaries. Cary Wolfe forcefully distinguishes transhumanism from the critical posthumanism (What is Posthu-

manism?). Wolfe draws this line precisely because he recognizes the humanism that Bostrom identifies as the “roots” of transhumanism, as a sense of “posthumanism and it originates directly from ideals of human perfectibility, rationality, and agency” (13). Wolfe uses his own posthumanist critique to mark these ideals to show that the positive “objectives” of humanism are “undercut by the philosophical and ethical frameworks used to conceptualize them” (15). Among these objectives are better treatment of nonhuman animals and persons with disabilities that the deceiving “normative subjectivity” of humanism prevents (15). Wolfe compares posthumanism to transhumanism in the way of: “posthumanism in my sense isn’t posthuman at all—in the sense of being ‘after’ our embodiment has been transcended—but is only post humanist, in the sense that it opposes the fantasies of disembodiment and autonomy, inherited from humanism itself.” (15). By comparing to Bostrom’s vision of the posthuman as a realization of the fantasies of disembodiment and autonomy, rather than a question of normative subjectivity.

A version of posthumanism has been qualified to Foucault because of his opinion the human being, as known to us, is a modern invention that could probably may be left behind or die out (18). Foucault’s sense of posthumanism would provide to the recognition dialogue. Moreover, it could power some relations of human identity shape, which could be changed or be modernized. It’s unlikely that Bostrom, considering that intellect trapped in the body (as an inheritance from Plato, who implied the same thing about the soul). We have to admit Foucault’s assumed that the soul is the “prison of the body” (19). In the classification of bodies, Arnold Davidson, in an introduction to the *Abnormal lectures*, try to explain, that Foucault provides a “historical analysis” and “political history” of the body by centering on the the concepts of the psyche and personality came about, the contribution of “gradation from normal to abnormal” (20). We have to remember, that Foucault investigated and uncovered systems of subject-making and normalization. That’s because he was a critic of Enlightenment humanism (16). Foucault theorized that developing concepts of the human structure acceptance and rejection of particular bodies need normalization practices. But, transhumanist thinking of notions of abnormality that are in turn used to exclude particular bodies from social and political privileges.

Regardless of a vision of the posthuman, transhumanism is not identical with the cyborg utopia pictured by Donna Haraway in 1985. Haraway is another philosopher of posthumanism and the author of “The Cyborg Manifesto” (1991), an iconic essay of political ironic in which she imagines border crossings that break oppressive dualisms and acknowledges that human beings are already chimeras and cyborgs. Wolfe identifies the legacy of Haraway, as the “cyborg” strand of posthumanism and claims that although transhumanism takes clues from her work, it does not much look like the spirit of Haraway’s intervention (22). Transhumanism looks forward to a time when posthumans arrive, but Haraway’s work disputes that distinctions of the human as autonomous, whole, and rational are already broken down and irrelevant.

We have various limitations. Also include biological limitations often attributed to animals and even “the capacity to form a realistic intuitive understanding of what it would be like to be a radically enhanced human” (22). Our lack of this capacity, because the posthuman is a former human with radically increased capabilities. Bostrom’s arguments that the opportunity range of a posthuman is larger in scope than that of a human. An opportunity variety is an unrealistic set of possibilities based on available capacities. Bostrom appeals that increased opportunity ranges and the unknown potential of increased intellectual capacity is desirable, granting it is currently unknowable to us (6).

Another limitation of human is our limited lifespan, which Bostrom believes currently does not allow enough time for projects or characterize development, and our intellectual capacity (6). We have to remember about worries that our current “cognitive makeup” closes the door to “whole strata of understanding and mental activity” (6). It means that we do not have enough brain power to understand every book in the Library. We have to link the situation to Plato’s cave, Bostrom speculates whether the seeming of major problems in philosophy could be due to the fact that we are not intellectually able to reach answers to them (6).

The main summaries of other human limitations, as well as bodily functionality, receptors of sensory modalities, special capabilities and sensibilities, also mood, energy, and self-control (6). Human as it is desires to protect ourselves from disease, form our bodies freely, by the possibility offered by replication a version of our brain in silicon. These and other improvements of body functionality will improve our quality of life (6). His concept of human senses, which he seeks “higher levels of sensitivity and responsiveness” (6). Human ability of mood and energy, he references the well-known view that “we often fail to feel as happy as we like” (6). The obviousity that as a human, we do not always feel the best possible sensations or simple feel as happy as we are in our greatest moments, is a dilemma for Bostrom have same important level as existential risk and death. Regrettably, many of us are not so good at detecting these issues as problems. Our limited will power to break. However, Bostrom, notifies that movements to make bad habits an easier to break “the ability to form stable, hard-to-break habits” (6). This definitely implies that we should not choose the posthuman above human life, moreover some of our ideals are currently not approachable to us. Therefore, transhumanism, in its pursuit of the posthuman, would allow us to “explore hitherto inaccessible realms of value” (6).

While currently available tools are not to be dismissed, Bostrom claims that low-tech means to this exploration, like education, have limits which can be surpassed by technological means. (6). But, in order to engage technological means to explore the posthuman realm, he sets out several objectives for policy that he sees as “basic conditions” for transhumanist goals. These include, as a non-negotiable requirement, global security, including the avoidance of existential risk. Existential risk is a situation in which “an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential” (6). Further, technological progress, augmented by economic growth,

is necessary. This is because “aging, disease, feeble memories and intellects, a limited emotional repertoire and inadequate capacity for sustained well-being” are difficult problems to solve (6). Finally, he believes it would be “sub-optimal” if wide access to exploration of the posthuman were not possible. He believes there are many good reasons to support wide access to new technologies (6).

We have to remember, these commitments which means that transhumanists value is individual freedom and choice. The limitations to bodily modification based on another person’s disgust “would not normally be a legitimate ground for coercive interference,” and “centrally planned efforts” for making better people are wrong (6). Democracy promotion in the world over order to help in accountable decision-making in regard to new technologies. Human ability relay on “our old habits and beliefs” and make “wise choices” based on our “gut feelings” should be changed to take benefit of the insights of artificial intelligence as it could exceed human intelligence (6). Moreover, transhumanists value the well-being of all conscious life, we have to count, as we practice posthumanism (the more urgent main concern which Bostrom implies). As a summary, posthumanists highlights that we must save lives, because it’s of primary moral wealth. It’s includes working against involuntary death and aging. The most important, as we could learn, that antiaging medicine is of primary importance and cryonic suspension should be made available as a possibility to wait before technology develop ability to re-birth human.

We have to underline that this image is not appealing to everyone. But the idea of new technologies, exceptionally genetic enhancement technologies, is a are central of discussion, and we shouldn’t consider them morally wrong (7). The transhumanist does not believe that bad outcomes like making children into products and increasing social prejudice against persons with disabilities, would also be bad from a transhumanist perspective pursuit of posthumanity outcomes and some worry about it. The general concerns may arise, as Fukuyama’s widely cited concern that the human species will split into two across already-existing fault lines of inequality (7; 21). Certain inequalities are unfair, but we don’t think that all are. Therefore, some of the same explanations that permit for an inequality today could allow inequality that results from germline engineering. We might to consider requiring positive genetic enhancements that would reduce the inequality that arises from free choice. It’s probable that instead of rising inequality, “the lot of the genetically worst-off is radically improved” (7).

There is a misleading dilemma between control and chance, complacent misery and the altitudes of happiness. We could see, that for transhumanists, only two reactions to technology possible: passivity and activity. The dilemma between techno-optimism and techno-pessimism are misleading. More preferable is activity, because technology has the ability to change or even eliminate human suffering. But passivity should be refused, because it may increase, human suffering. This perspective, looks like, that particular subject to be as anti-human, anti-progressive. Taking in consideration these ideas, many transhumanists reject such arguments like suffering closes off conversation prematurely.

DISEASE-FREE HUMAN BEING CONCEPT

Another concept of the externalization or internalization of a human function.

A disability, as possibility to integrate or substitute a technological organ in our body to decrease our deficiency. It allows to externalize a human function and counterbalance the deficit. As an example, some artificial sensory systems: an eye, ear or robotic hand, or exoskeleton for paralyzed human.

The use an exoskeleton to help a worker to lift heavier loads, which already used at Tokyo airport. More over human ability running faster, ride faster on a bicycle. This augmented humankind or cyber techniques placing in devices designed to enhance a human function. At the currently level of transhumanism, the defects, diseases can be fixed. We have to remember, that human beings' ability and capacities could be improved. The ethical aspects in these two examples, is discussible. The question is could we favored one and reject other? The answer to these questions, we will find by recall the definition of ethics of transhumanists: "Ethics is a philosophical discipline that reflects on the values of existence, the conditions of a happy life and the notion of 'good', justice or (when questions of morality are not yet defined), according to our own conscience, the behaviors to be followed to make the world humanly habitable and sustainable" (25). We have to remember that some concepts may be hazardous or unpredictable:

- genetic manipulation and the use of nanocomponents of fractal structures: all of them may have amplified actions we cannot yet predict.
- bio-engineering or bio-robotics: there are those who consider that in the depths of biology they are only machines (as recently seen with molecular motors) and that at the nanotechnological level, everything can be (re)programmed (25).

Nowadays acceptable and already used technique is cobots. The cobotics (i.e. collaborative robotics) is an extremely fast developing branch of technology. The main aim of it - to produce robots able to assist humans by automating some of their tasks. Exoskeletons, or even specific cobots: as a mechanized robot, controlled by artificial intelligence. But they could not be autonomous.

Anti-aging medicine and emerging technologies, including genetic screening and editing procedures such as CRISPR, capture center stage. Nootropic drugs (cognitive enhancers like modafinil), also receive high levels of attention (1). So, what is uniquely at stake in contemporary discussions is the acceptability of heritable medical interventions, with special attention to the mind.

The the British newspaper Daily Telegraph performed a survey among the 20,000 respondents. According to a survey, 87% of the respondents would choose to "take an anti-aging pill in order to live until 120" if they could. Moreover, about 87% belongs to the group of technoproggressives and no more than 13% were bio-conservatives. It shows us how our acceptance of anti-aging therapy is (12).

SUMMARY

While transhumanists proclaim that futuristic technology opens the door to greater diversity in the human form and capability, transhumanist enhancement strategies propagate the power of nonconformity as a normative concept. Future to various forms of life require the improvement of the stigma of disability. It requires reconsidering the ideals of normality. As a substitute, transhumanists operate with a sense of what counts as normal. They recommend strategies for enhancement implementation of changes and refusing to create persons with disabilities. The main goals of disability rights are in opposition of eugenic goal. The objectives of transhumanism and disability rights are in the most important respect and fundamentally opposed. The transhumanist futures totally exclude any disability.

We have to increase our impact to political, social, and technological, that will be a connection between the body and individual life goals whom the suggested technology would get involved. This creates an expression of care and would bring to mind neither positive nor negative eugenics. We have to refuse improvement strategies which based, on discusses of risk. It favors autonomy and visions of joyfulness that depend on additional abilities rather than multipart correlations.

REFERENCES:

1. Battleday, R. M., & Brem, A. K. (2015). Modafinil for cognitive neuroenhancement in healthy non-sleep-deprived subjects: a systematic review. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 25(11), 1865-1881
2. Bostrom, Nick. 2004. "The Future of Human Evolution." Accessed July 31, 2016. www.nickbostrom.com/fut/evolution.html.
3. Bostrom, Nick. 2005b. "In Defense of Posthuman Dignity." *Bioethics* 19: 202–214.
4. Bostrom, Nick. 2005c. "A History of Transhumanist Thought." *Journal of Evolution and Technology* 14, No. 1: 1–25. 2005d. "Humanity's Biggest Problems Aren't What You Think They Are."
5. TED. Accessed December 1, 2012. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yd9cf_vLvil
6. Bostrom, Nick. 2009. "Transhumanist Values." In *Contemporary Bioethics: A Reader with Cases*, edited by Jessica Pierce and George Randels, 619–624. Originally published in *Journal of Philosophical Research* 30 (Supplement): 3–14. 2010. "Letter from Utopia." Accessed June 15, 2012. www.nickbostrom.com/utopia.
7. Bostrom, Nick. 2012. "Human Genetic Enhancements: A Transhumanist Perspective." In *Arguing About Bioethics*, edited by Stephen Holland, 105–114. Originally published in *Journal of Value Inquiry* 37, No. 4: 493–506.
8. Bostrom, Nick and Toby Ord. 2006. "The Reversal Test: Eliminating Status Quo Bias in Applied Ethics." *Ethics* 116, No. 4: 656–679.
9. Bostrom, Nick and Anders Sandberg. 2011. "The Wisdom of Nature: An Evolutionary Heuristic for Human Enhancement."
10. In *Human Enhancement*, edited by Julian Savulescu and Nick Bostrom, 375–416. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
11. Bostrom, Nick and Julian Savulescu. 2011. "Human Enhancement Ethics: The State of the Debate." In *Human Enhancement*, edited by Julian Savulescu and Nick Bostrom, 1–14.
12. Daily Telegraph Accessed: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/foodanddrink/healthy-eating/11218303/Want-to-live-to-120-Heres-how.....html>
13. Garreau, Joel. 2005. *Radical Evolution: The Promise and Peril of Enhancing Our Minds, Our Bodies—and What It Means to Be Human*. New York: Doubleday.

14. Rubin, Charles T. 2008. "What is the Good of Transhumanism?" In *Medical Enhancement and Humanity*, edited by Bert Gordijn and Ruth Chadwick: 137–156. Springer.
15. Wolfe, Cary. 2009. *What is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
16. Sawicki, Jana. 1994. "Foucault, Feminism and Questions of Identity." In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting: 286–313. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Francis, Leslie Pickering. 2009. "Understanding Autonomy in Light of Intellectual Disability." In *Disability and Disadvantage*, edited by Kimberley Brownlee and Adam Cureton, 200–215. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Foucault, Michel. 1973. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books.
19. Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Random House.
20. Foucault, Michel. 2003a. *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975*. Edited by Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni. Translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Picador.
21. Fukuyama, Francis. 2002. *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
22. Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge
23. Humanity +; Accessed <https://humanityplus.org/philosophy/transhumanist-declaration/>
24. Humanity +; Accessed <https://humanityplus.org/philosophy/transhumanist-faq/>
25. Pierre Massotte, *Ethics in Social Networking and Business 2: The Future and Changing Paradigms*, John Wiley & Sons, 2017