Scientia*et*Fides 12(1)/2024 ISSN 2300-7648 (print) / ISSN 2353-5636 (online)

Received: October 26, 2023. Accepted: January 4, 2024 DOI: http://doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2024.012

The Transhumanist Point of View to the Evolutionary Indifference to Pain and Suffering

PAWEŁ ORZEŁ CSSR
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
orzelcssr@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-3268-959X

Abstract. The text presents a transhumanist point of view on evolution. It focuses on the lack of clear and obvious evolutionary solutions to the issue of involuntary suffering. It poses difficult questions about the possibility of enhencement of human nature and respecting the laws of evolution. It reflects on the positive role of pain for the development of individual people and the entire human species. It considers the thesis that perhaps evolution "needs" pain for proper human development. It asks whether the transition to a higher than evolutionary stage of human development, as proposed by transhumanists, will not lead to the extinction of our species? After all, it relates all this mosaic of thoughts and theories to God, Who can be the answer to many posed questions. The text also delves into the idea of suffering in Catholic soteriology, contrasting it with transhumanist aspirations, and examines how the redemptive act of Jesus Christ offers a path for humans to actively participate in overcoming suffering through atonement.

Keywords: evolution, transhumanism, theodicy, soteriology.

Introduction

Transhumanism is a philosophical and social movement based on two goals, as outlined by Nick Bostrom in his work "The Transhumanist FAQ". The theoretical goal involves examining the consequences, promises, and potential dangers associated with technologies that will allow us to overcome fundamental human limitations, as well as exploring the ethical issues related to the development and use of such technologies. The practical goal is to accompany an intellectual and cultural movement that aims to affirm the possibility and desirability of fundamental improvement in human condition through rational reasoning, particularly through the development and widespread access to technologies that eliminate aging and significantly enhance human intellectual, physical, and psychological abilities (Bostrom 2003). One of the most intriguing areas of human existence for transhumanists is the experience of pain. While many modern scientists are looking for ways to treat it, transhumanists aim to eliminate it altogether.

The text presents a transhumanist viewpoint on evolution and considers the thesis that perhaps humans existing in the evolutionary process "need" pain for their proper human existence. The question will be asked why evolution "tolerates" the existence of involuntary pain and suffering? Transhumanists, sparing no bitter words in describing the random nature of evolution as a source of involuntary suffering, propose radical solutions to this problem. Since natural evolution is unable to cope with the problem, such as involuntary suffering, perhaps we humans should take matters into our own hands and deal with the imperfections of our nature ourselves. We should, with the help of technology, prolong our lives and eliminate all nuisances in them, especially those causing involuntary suffering.

In the face of such transhumanist proposals, questions arise about the real relevance of such solutions. These questions will be addressed in the text. Isn't the search for a technological remedy for suffering merely a slick illusion? Is it not an attempt to divert attention from deeper, more introspective solutions that can be found in the realm of interpersonal

interaction and in the spiritual dimension, for example, in the relationship between God and man? In the end, aren't these solutions an attempt to step into God's prerogative and assume His saving role? In the face of the accusation of nature with its evolution of soullessness and the transhumanist proposal to eliminate suffering with the help of technology, how should Christian theodicy respond?

1. The transhumanist point of view to the evolution

Julian Savulescu from Oxford University, known for his work on ethical issues in medicine and biotechnology and Anders Sandberg a Swedish researcher and futurist, known for his work in the field of transhumanism and the study of human enhancement and the future of humanity, in their article *Neuroenhancement of Love and Marriage: The Chemicals Between Us* state that "[e]volution has not created us to be happy, but rather created happiness to keep us alive and reproducing" (Savulescu and Sandberg 2008, 41). Writing about the possibilities of making interpersonal marriages more lasting, they note that in the United States divorce has replaced death as the most common reason for marriage breakdown. They show the cruel of nature. On the one hand, it requires us, if we want to survive as a species, to create different-sex relationships, which in human societies, as indicated by the research they used, are most often monogamous, and therefore require a certain stability, and on the other hand, the same nature does not give us specific biological tools to maintain the stability of these relationships. And if it does give any, it is not to ensure a happy relationship for man, but to enable procreation and to effect natural selection. The cruelty of nature, they suggest, is also expressed in the fact that the breakdown of a marriage has a negative impact on the physical health of individuals, has a negative impact on well-being, and also brings a high risk of failure in raising children. In the cited text, the philosophers discuss the potential possibilities of enhancement human love and marriage. In conclusions, provoking a revolt against evolution and its laws. They state: "There is no human moral imperative to obey evolution" (Savulescu and Sandberg 2008, 41).

Max More, a British philosopher, futurist and one of the leading voices in the transhumanist community, writes in his *Letter to Mother Nature* that he is grateful to her for many things, but he sees that she has lost interest in human development around 100 000 years ago. For this reason, More declares that as an ambitious descendant of Mother Nature, he must take matters into his own hands. He gives seven amendment that he intends to implement to enhancement human nature. In the fifth amendment, it states "We will fix all individual and species defects left over from evolution by natural selection" (More 2009). In this way, he states that the purpose of Mother Nature is not to make human life pleasant and full of well-being. Mother Nature does not spare her descendants and dispassionately pursues her reproductive goals. Eduardo R. Cruz sums up this thinking aptly in his article *The evolution of human birth and transhumanist proposals of enhancement*: "Natural selection is not about happiness, but fitness for reproduction" (Cruz 2015, 846).

With these two references above, it is not difficult to understand that modern philosophers engaged in transhumanist reflection on human enhancement look at evolution quite critically. They see quite a few gaps in it, which we humans should correct. Looking at their assessment of evolution, we can conclude that evolution with its natural selection is a set of trade-offs aimed at maximizing reproduction. The philosophical reflection of transhumanists on evolution leads to many serious questions. Why does evolution allow us to be born dependent on others? Why does it agree to such a risky, from the perspective of chances for survival, process? Why does it tolerate the existence of involuntary pain and suffering? "In the transhumanist literature, unnecessary and involuntary suffering is generally viewed as senseless, yet another of the burdens inherited through the evolutionary process. Transhumanists do not spare words in describing the haphazard nature of evolution as a source of unimaginable suffering" (Cruz 2015, 841).

David Pearce, author of one of the more important transhumanist essays, titled *The hedonistic imperative*, suggests that "[a] few generations hence, the intoxicating joy of normal post-Darwinian life will be genetically pre-programmed. A reproductive revolution of "designer babies"

will hardwire happiness from the womb. [...] For pure well-being can potentially become a deep and natural presupposition of everyday life. Undiluted existential happiness will infuse every second of waking and dreaming existence; and pervade every aspect of one's body and psyche. [...]" (Pearce 1995). The end of the age of suffering will be followed by the end of current morality, Pearce predicts. Transhumanist "engineers", working under ideal conditions, will develop new values that are not based on current ethics. However, this process may risk focusing on hedonism, diverting attention from other important issues.

Philosophers of the future, addressing these and similar issues, are looking for potential solutions leading to the realization of their assumed scenarios. The predictions of transhumanists are bold and sometimes even radical. If natural evolution cannot deal with certain problems, such as involuntary suffering, then maybe we – humans should take matters into our own hands and deal with the imperfections of our nature ourselves? Many futurologists accept this possibility and look for ways to achieve it. Ray Kurzweil, a director of engineering at Google and a futurist, sees the way to overcome evolutionary limitations in technological development. It assumes that the complexity and perfection of machines will at some point in history surpass the complexity of the human organism and allow it to overcome its current limitations. He states that "we must overcome our genetic inheritance because our bodies are governed by antiquated genetic programs developed in a bygone era"(Kurzweil 2013, 365).

In the transhumanist reflection on evolution presented in this way, two fundamental questions arise: should we strive to improve humans, and whether and to what extent we should respect the laws of evolution in the process of human enhancement. When, in accordance with the transhumanist proposal, we answer positively to the first of these questions, one fundamental question remains: Can human enhancement help overcome evolutionary limitations? This is a serious question. Many transhumanists ask these questions of themselves. Among them is Nick Bostrom, a Swedish philosopher, head of the Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford. On the one hand, he recognizes the "wisdom of na-

ture" that is supposed to be behind evolution. On the other hand, he argues that even if evolution has its wisdom, we should improve it, because our desires are different from those of evolution. Man strives for happiness, and evolution seeks to create the best reproductive model. Thus, there is a dramatic mismatch between what we as humans value and what evolution promotes (Cruz 2015, 837–838).

Russell Powell and Allan Buchanan, the American ethical philosophers of human enhancement, criticize evolution as more of a handyman than a true engineer (Powell and Buchanan 2011, 10). They predict that intentional genetic modification of man can bring him a lot of good. Therefore, they propose the "enhancement-assisted evolution". This process would lead not only to the improvement, but even to the reconstruction of the human organism. It is claimed that improving a man limited by the biological conditions of his body does not lead to the achievement of perfection assumed by transhumanists in the long run.

Those promoting "enhancement-assisted evolution" seem to take the position that only genes are responsible for the final shape of an organism, which, according to Richard Dowkins, uses the human body to spread itself. According to this famous evolutionist, the body is for the genes, not the genes for the body (Ilnicki 2018, 52). Many transhumanists accept this statement as legitimate and optimistic about "enhancement-assisted evolution". This allows them to believe that "the human species will be in a position to assume substantial and deliberate control over its own evolutionary biological destiny, taking decisions that could affect the fate of human nature, the human species, and the future life on Earth" (Cruz 2015, 839).

2. Role of pain in evolution process

However, there is another side of the coin. Pain and suffering, which, in accordance with the transhumanist program, want to be eliminated from human life, have not only a negative role and are not only an evolutionary necessity. They bring various benefits. Pain has an adaptive role (Maul 2007). We can see it from the very moment of human birth, which is natu-

rally associated with pain. The fact that a woman bear in pain means that from the very moment of birth, a certain human community is created around the newborn, which helps not only the mother, but above all the child to survive. This community, summoned by pain, helps the young offspring to adapt to a hostile environment. Human children are born not fully developed and dependent on their parents, which can be blamed on evolution. However, it can be attributed to a set of evolutionary achievements that the dependence of human offspring on adults is overcome by the natural desire to actively counteract suffering, much less innocent suffering. Empathy, which makes you sensitive to the suffering of others, scientists find has a strong evolutionary basis (Howe 2013). Thanks to the screaming pain, a human baby is not isolated from its caregiver when it is born, and its chances of survival increase dramatically.

Perhaps evolution "needs" pain, because thanks to it, man acquires such skills and achieves such development that is not predicted at the genetic level. The birth of a child is a very dramatic event. From a transhumanist point of view, they carry involuntary pain and need to be enhancement. However, if we take a moderate direction and recognize that evolution with its natural selection "takes into account" not only purely genetic factors, but also environmental factors and uses them not only for survival but also for development, then it is easy to understand that pain, that accompanies birth is not entirely senseless. Its task is to arouse care for a specific individual, to create a certain social environment around the mother and her offspring, which has two basic tasks. Firstly, it is to reduce the risk of failure during childbirth, and secondly, it is to enable the newborn to adapt to difficult and constantly changing environmental conditions. Due to the fact that a person is born not fully developed, he has a chance to complete his development as required by the conditions in which he is to live. We can understand this from the immune system, which at birth is not ready for its ultimate role. However, when exposed to external factors, it learns very quickly and acquires great skills that, to a large extent, allow a specific individual to survive in a given environment for a lifetime. We refer to this ability as acquired immunity. This is an interesting evolutionary strategy, as it allows for quick and effec-

tive adaptation to changing external circumstances. Although even this evolutionary achievement must be subject to trades-offs (Radwan 20212, 155–162; Sakowski 2020). On the one hand, they make us evolve slowly, but on the other hand, they make our direction of development more effective and safe (Wagner 2022, 72).

The role of pain in this evolutionary-anthropological story is to trigger an effective response to a threat from the perspective of the survival of a specific individual, and thus the entire species. There is a well-known saying about this – "no pain, no gain". Pain is a great motivator for development. Let's look at how many technologies and techniques have been created just to avoid pain. One could be tempted to say that if it wasn't for the pain, transhumanist considerations about the revolutionary, technological overcoming of evolution would be impossible. I am not saying that pain is ethically desirable and morally good, but what I am saying is that, from the perspective of evolutionary anthropology, it can be assessed as an effective tool for the survival of the species and as a kind of complement, as transhumanists claim, of "blind" and imperfect natural selection.

3. Theological reflection on the problem of suffering

Suffering, which is noted in the evolutionary process, has an origin that is not only biological. There is an element of mystery in its existence, which, as it seems to many, cannot be explained using a purely materialistic approach. Ethicists such as Inmaculada de Melo-Martin, Maarten Boudry and Massimo Pigliucci, who are skeptical of transhumanist plans for genetic remodeling of humans to eliminate pain and suffering from human existence, note that not only genes but also environmental conditions play a role in human evolution. It is therefore not enough to change the human genome to solve the problem of suffering. Suffering also has a non-genetic source. This means that one should also look for non-genetic, or more broadly, non-materialistic solutions to the problem of suffering. One of them is culture, which is created by man. It is an element that compensates, to some extent, for genetic imperfections. It also influ-

ences, in a natural way, just as it is natural for humans to create cultural goods, evolution (Cruz 2015, 844).

Human activity and moral conduct, which is the basis of true human culture, is inherent in the evolutionary process. The struggle with suffering through culture, through its moral activity, makes man more human. "Rather than abolishing my suffering (à la transhumanists), it becomes instead a source of love for others in their suffering and thus a creative source of solidarity. […] We are challenged to reject that which separates us from one another and realize that suffering and sacrifice are necessary for the ongoing evolution of life" (Delio 2020, 9).

Perhaps it is the case that suffering is inherent in the condition of life on Earth. It is a testament to the inevitable laws of nature that have governed the world since the dawn of time. "Today we are aware that there has never existed a world free from lust, from the devouring of the weak by the strong, and from death" (Kałuża 2015, 42). Since there has been life on Earth henceforth there has been suffering. It is a kind of fundamental aspect of the existence of all living beings on Earth. It is a consequence of natural processes such as desire, competition for resources and survival, as well as the unavoidable phenomenon of death. It is an expression of the basic mechanisms governing life, which are intrinsic in the nature of the world and evolutionary history. Suffering, in this sense, is not only a manifestation of individual experiences of pain or loss, but also a broader phenomenon reflecting the universal regularities that prevail in the organic world, where the struggle for survival and domination determine the dynamics of life.

An interpretation that assumes the existence of suffering from the beginning of biological life and understood in terms of the domination of the stronger over the weaker and the necessity of competition for resources may conflict at first glance with the theological doctrine of original sin. "In theology, the belief has been established that human history includes three great stages: the initial state of perfection, the fall and redemption" (Kałuża 2015, 42). The state of perfection, as the term itself indicates, is an ideal situation. It is understood as a situation in which there was no suffering and deadly competition, but harmony and order.

This oversimplified division of the ages, however, needs to be clarified, in accordance with modern biblical hermeneutics, the properly interpreted pictorial language of the book of Genesis and its symbolic way of expressing about reality itself.

The Pentateuch, speaking of the source of the evil that causes suffering, notes two reasons for its occurrence in the good world created by God. In the first place is the moral conduct of the first humans, but the responsibility for the occurrence of suffering is also placed on the entire creation as such. "[…] [N]ot only humans, but all life on the earth degenerated, and it itself was contaminated […]. The earth is twice (Genesis 6:11.12) shown here [in Genesis] as an active participant in universal corruption. The attribute of goodness previously attributed to every kind of creature seems to have completely degenerated. The crescendo of creation's regression […] reaches its climax here [in the Flood]" (Majewski 2018, 166).

The Flood, for the texts in the Pentateuch, appears as an action contrary to the process of creation. It is not a mere rainfall, but rather a move by God to release the boundaries of the praocean previously contained at creation. These are the very waters that God separated on the second day of creation and which, unlike the rest of the creation, were not given the name of "good". The Biblical God is portrayed as the one responsible for creating both the perfect and the imperfect. Deutero-Isaiah, a creation theologian close in time and ideology to the priestly author of the Pentateuch, wrote: "I create light and I create darkness, I do good and I create evil. I, the Lord, do all these things" (Is. 45:7) (Majewski 2018, 176). Light and darkness, seen as manifestations of the evils of nature, both elements, are used to save the world. Everything, even phenomena associated with suffering, are part of God's plan and, as such, should be understood as a particular form of goodness.

Theodicy as a part of theology does not agree on the source of the origin of non-fault suffering. "P. T. de Chardin believed that suffering from evil is an involuntary human "by-product" of evolution, the price of freedom and even the price of love […]. Gisbert Greshake, believes that the question of reconciling God's goodness with suffering is still an open question" (Ilnicki 2018, 51). Addressing fundamental theodicy ques-

tions, one must ask: Is it possible to justify moral evil, that which is done by humans consciously, by shifting the blame to genes, which, according to the interpretation of evolutionary theory as understood by most transhumanists, were largely selected at random? (Asla 2019, 88) This is a question of whether man is not justified, despite his morally evil acts increasing the amount of suffering in the world, by having an imperfect nature, which could be described as *peccatum naturae*? And going further: shouldn't God be accused of endowing man with a nature capable of one evil or another?

One of the theodicy concepts – the theological-biological one, presented in Ilnicki's article "Theodicy in the Context of Contemporary Achievements of Biological Sciences", puts forward the thesis of the existence of human, in the personal, not genetic sense, responsibility for the existence of death and suffering in the world. Human beings are supposed to be the main responsible for the current suffering-prone situation of the animate world. However, this concept is constantly being enriched by modern discoveries coming from biology. Considering the origin of death in biological terms, he points out that it is an indispensable part of the cycle of life on Earth. It gives death, which at least in the transhumanist position is conceived as an element of imperfection, a positive dimension, since it makes it possible to eliminate less adapted beings in the struggle for limited natural resources. It points out that man, as a result of original sin, has secondarily and partially acquired or, to put it another way, reduced his human nature to an animal nature. The statement about the partial acquisition of animal nature is significant, "because it is unthinkable that the mere loss or privation of grace and original justice would assimilate man to beasts" (Franck 2019, 222). That the source of suffering or evil on earth is man, the crown of creation, does not, in the concept under discussion, contradict the idea of a Good God who wanted a happy world. The doctrine of original sin is part of the larger whole of God's plan, which we call "salvation history", which presupposes a redemption that reverses the deadly effects of original sin.

The theological-biological concept explains that the way through which each person carries the effects of "genetic corruption" is through

the acquisition of genes in the sense of their horizontal transfer. According to the Genesis account, this corruption appeared as a consequence of original sin. "Man, according to the concept presented, acquired a secondary, hybrid nature with a partially reprogrammed genetic apparatus, deviating from that of the first humans Adam and Eve. The consequences of these changes include human physique, physiology and mentality. Man's mental changes manifest themselves in self-destruction and aggression" (Ilnicki 2018, 59). The key consequence of the original sin is said to be the destructive change in human mentality. It is this that introduces disorder into the world, a disorder not intended by God. Still, we do not have an answer to the key question, why did God allow evil and suffering to appear in the world? To put it in more biological language: why has there been a contamination of what is corporeal with the wrong genetic code, which consequently changes the originally good mentality of human beings into an evil one? Where does the global genetic degradation of animate nature come from?

Until the original sin, man resided in a unique environment, called the Garden of Eden, which was devoid of threats from predators and pathogenic microorganisms. The deterioration of man's livelihood and condition came with the environmental change following the expulsion from Eden. It consisted of an increased threat from wild animals, parasites, and pathogenic microorganisms, including viruses. Recent scientific reports, Ilnicki writes, in the referenced article, indicate that viruses may be derivatives of free strands of nucleic acids that have separated from eukaryote cells. These free nucleic acid strands have a similar structure to transposons. Some of these free nucleic acid strands evolved by acquiring genes encoding structural proteins, allowing them to form capsids. This view suggests that viruses were not created directly as living organisms, but evolved later, when this global "corruption" of animate nature occurred. From a theological, not chronological, perspective, some believe that the emergence of viruses and pathogenic bacteria is the result of original sin. This would mean that their emergence is a negative effect of human activity in the world. In this perspective, death is a solution to overcome the effects of original sin. It is meant to be a kind of gateway

to a new life, one in which, as the Revelation of St. John announces, "God himself will be with them; he will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away." (Rev. 21:3-4).

The theological-biological concept does not justify the evil done by man. It does not claim that man is innocent when he does evil because he is predestined to do so by the genes he possesses. Nor does it charge God for the existence of evil in the world. It recognizes that God's grace can overcome the genetic predisposition of man's mental problems, and indeed does so. Man's guilt, then, lies not in possessing an imperfect genotype, but in rejecting the exculpatory grace that has the power to counteract evil inclinations that result, according to the concept presented, from an altered genotype.

The theological-biological concept should not be understood as suggesting a change in the nature of man involving a change in the essence of that nature. What constitutes the essence of human nature was not affected in original sin. Otherwise, we would have to speak of a change of species. This is an important observation in the context of considering transhumanism. In terms of theological anthropology, the goodness of human nature is constituted by three elements: 1) the principles that make up nature; 2) the propensity to virtue; 3) the gift of original righteousness. Original sin caused the loss of the third element. The second – the propensity to virtue has diminished, but not on the principle of being able to do good, but on the principle of wanting to pursue it. The first element, on the other hand, remained intact. When we speak of a change in human nature, we are talking about the loss of original righteousness and the diminished propensity to do good. What we are not talking about is a change in the principles that make up human nature. "The moral disorder does not affect human nature in its substance, [...] but in its disposition with respect to the good and, consequently, in its degree of integrity or corruption" (Franck 2019, 222). In original sin, the human will was subordinated not to reason but to lower goods. It is guided by its own impulses and not fully directed by reason. In this sense, it is not natural. It is not natural for a person to desire something beyond the limits of rea-

son. "So, an unrestrained appetite is contrary to human nature: «tending toward its object without restraint is not natural, insofar it is human; it is rather against its nature as human» (quod in suum objectum tendat irrefrenate, hoc non est naturale sibi inquantum est humana, sed magis contra naturam ejus inquantum hujusmodi. In II Sent. 30, 1, 1 ad 4)" (Franck 2019, 218). Nature is left to itself. Not in the aspect of fighting a moral defect, but in the sense of its natural limitations, i.e., pain, death and ignorance. "These defects have penal character in our present condition because they were not in God's plan for us and are now a consequence of the fall" (cf. Franck 2019, 219). Although some may perceive them as natural, not punitive, because their reason is subjected to difficulties in discerning the truth. Human nature remains tainted. The source of this contamination is original sin, which consisted of renouncing God's grace. However, this grace is again bestowed upon each person as part of the redemptive act of Jesus Christ.

Various theodicy concepts form the so-called "theodicy problem". One of its elements is "the demand that soteriology should move away from the previous paradigm of the redemption of sin, […] and move to theodicy thinking, i.e. thinking that is interested in human suffering and the need for (social) solidarity" (Kałuża 2015, 44). According to some representatives of this direction, such as Johann Baptist Metz, christian soteriology forgot too much about the problem of suffering in favor of focusing on sin. As a result, Christianity has ceased to be adequately sensitive to suffering. An attempt is therefore made to develop a concept that assumes that a moment will come when the Creator Himself will explain His actions in the context of the pain experienced by human beings in history. Magnus Striet, a professor of fundamental theology at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, as Krystian Kałuża writes, "put forward the thesis that the main cause of evil and suffering is not man, but God Himself, who made the decision to create a world that He knew would have room for evil, suffering and death. No theodicy, says Striet, can absolve God from the responsibility of making such a decision" (Kałuża 2019, 44).

Catholic soteriology sees the role of God and the mission of Jesus Christ differently from M. Streit, cited above. "Jesus did not in any way come for-

ward with the message: «I came into the world to suffer and thus make propitiation for the sins of the world. Follow me and suffer with me!»" (Kałuża 2015, 58). If the teaching of Jesus were to mean accepting suffering as a value, it would be a form of masochism. In reality, God seeks the salvation of humanity and the liberation of the world. Jesus wants to bring order and order leading to eternal happiness. He seeks to ensure that creation can achieve its original purpose. However, His message is rejected. In this situation, Jesus reinterprets His mission and, at the Last Supper, defines it as God's total and final self-giving to man, right up to death. Lohfink, whom K. Kaluza cites, writes: "In response to Israel's guilt, which now culminates in the death of Jesus, God responds by not taking away His people's chosen status, but instead permanently granting them life, even though they have disregarded that life" (Kałuża 2015, 59).

The ultimate call to participate in the salvific process of human liberation from evil, as Catholic theology teaches, is the redemptive act of the Son of God. This deed is a kind of propitiatory sacrifice understood, however, in a specific way. In pagan beliefs, people tried to gain favor or appease divine wrath through various acts of atonement. In Catholic theology, atonement is understood as a substitutionary atonement and propitiation made by Jesus Christ, the God-man. It occurs at the initiative of God (see Rom 5:8.10). In this way, the source of suffering (*misterium iniquitatis*) remains a mystery, and the emphasis is placed on the possibility of liberation from it. Since the initiative of liberation from suffering is taken by God, the action that man must take is not a kind of bribery, but rather is a kind of participation in the gift of liberation. Redemption is not a process that happens automatically. It presupposes the personal involvement of the person. God initiates the process of reconciliation, but does so in a way that allows man to actively participate in this process, primarily through making atonement.

What Jesus did to God in substitution for us is a sacrifice up to death. It is a process in which one person assumes the role of another, not to replace him, but to enable him to do the things he was called to do. "His sacrifice allows man to do good deeds that, by becoming meritorious, lead to eternal life" (Roszak 2021, 215). The act of Jesus does not incapacitate

man, but allows him to freely choose or reject happiness, which is the fullness of life.

Conclusion

The transhumanist overcoming of suffering throughout the living world is a project designed to enable the rejection of our evolutionary legacy. It is understood as something that was intended to serve "the inclusive fitness of our genes in the ancestral environment" (Pearce 1995). In this perspective, suffering was a signal that informed the organism of a potential danger or problem that required attention to protect life and health, which in turn increased the chances of passing on genes to the next generation. For example, experiencing pain in response to an injury or illness prompts the body to avoid or change behaviors that could increase the risk of harm to health, which in turn could harm the ability to pass on genes. Such evolutionary mechanisms are rooted in the environment in which our ancestors lived, where rapid response to pain or other forms of suffering was crucial for survival in the wild.

Transhumanists, among whom one can directly cite Pearce, who posits that "the long-term effect of genetic engineering will, as might be expected, be the abolition of this [suffering-related] category of experience" (Pearce 1995), by proposing to eliminate suffering through technological solutions, perhaps unconsciously, seek to replace the redemptive act of Jesus Christ with purely human solutions. Evaluating these demands from a theological perspective, it should be said that this may constitute a kind of exclusion of man from the New Covenant and bringing him into the areas of non Christian doctrine. Meanwhile, the proposal of Catholic soteriology "means […] allowing God Himself to deliver us from the power of culpable death" (Kałuża 2015, 63).

In conclusion, let's ask ourselves: Where did all this relentless effort to improve man come from? The cause may be unwanted pain. It accompanies a person from the moment of birth, through life until death. Although physical pain can be effectively eliminated by modern medicine, the pain that we call suffering still remains. We react with all commitment to the

moving cry of a newborn child, we suffer when we are affected by illness, we suffer because of the passing of a loved one. When we suffer, we feel bad. Transhumanists want this hard-to-name and unwanted lack of well-being to be transformed and eliminated from human life. But isn't it the pain that we call suffering that causes our growth?

In view of the above, the question arises whether the elimination of pain and the transition to a higher than evolutionary stage of human development will not lead to the extinction of our species? If we make it clear to evolution that we no longer need it, will we not deprive ourselves of the life-giving source of incomprehensible, and thus valuable, factors for our development. If a post-human abandons its biological shell and becomes a cyborg feeling only happiness and well-being, will it have enough energy and motivation to look for new solutions and ways to survive in a changing environment? Will not entering this level of "development" be the beginning of the end of the human species? Or is it also true, as some transhumanists claim (e.g. R. Kurzweil), that it is evolution that leads man in the post-human direction? If so, does that mean that entering this level probably won't eliminate pain and suffering, just new variations of it? What? One of them may be the worry where to draw infinite amounts of energy for the functioning of a cyborg man and how to provide him with a sufficiently durable, long-lived, material basis for existence?

References

Asla, Mariano. 2019. "On the limits, imperfections and evils of the human condition. Biological improvement from a thomistic perspective." *Scientia et Fides* 7, no. 2: 77–95. http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2019.017.

Bostrom, Nick. 2003. "The Transhumanist FAQ." Accessed February 15, 2023. https://nickbostrom.com/views/transhumanist.pdf.

Cruz, Eduardo. 2015. "The evolution of human birth and transhumanist proposals of enhancement." *Zygon* 50, no. 4: 830–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2050.0325.

Delio, Ilia. 2020. "Suffering and Sacrifice in an Unfinished Universe: The Energy of Love." *Religions* 11, no. 7: 335. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11070335.

Franck, Juan Francisco. 2019. "The *peccatum naturae* and the moral condition of the will. A convergence between Aquinas and Rosmini." *Scientia et Fides* 7, no. 2: 215–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2019.024.

Głąb, Anna. 2012. "Cierpię, więc jestem – problematyka teodycealna w tekstach abpa Józefa Życińskiego." *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 60, no. 4: 77–99.

Howe, David. 2013. *Empatia. Co to jest i dlaczego jest taka ważna*. Translated by Danuta Golec. Warsaw: Oficyna Ingenium.

Ilnicki, Tomasz. 2018. "Teodycea w kontekście współczesnych osiągnięć nauk biologicznych." *Teologia i Człowiek* 41, no. 1: 49–66. https://doi.org/10.12775/TiCz.2018.003.

Kałuża, Krystian. 2015. „Chrześcijańska soteriologia w obliczu wyzwań rozumu krytycznego." *Biblioteka Teologii Fundamentalnej* 10: 32–68.

Kurzweil, Ray. 2013. *Nadchodzi osobliwość. Kiedy człowiek przekroczy granice biologii*. Translated by Eliza Chodakowska, Anna Nowosielska. Warsaw: Kurhaus Publishing.

Majewski, Marcin. 2018. *Pięcioksiąg odczytany na nowo: przesłanie autora kapłańskiego (P) i jego wpływ na powstanie Pięcioksięgu*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II. Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Malina, Artur. 2014. "Sprawiedliwość Syna według Listu do Hebrajczyków." *Verbum Vitae* 26: 127–42.

Maul, Armand. 2007. "An Evolutionary Interpretation of the Significance of Physical Pain Experienced by Human Females: Defloration and Childbirth Pains." *Medical Hypotheses* 69, no. 2: 403–09. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2007.01.005.

More, Max. 2009. "A Letter to Mother Nature." Accessed February 15, 2023. http://strategicphilosophy.blogspot.com/2009/05/its-about-ten-years-since-i-wrote.html.

Nowicka, Justyna. 2021. "Cierpienie nie uszlachetnia?" Accessed February 15, 2023. https://misyjne.pl/justyna-nowicka-cierpienie-nie-uszlachetnia/.

Pearce, David. 1995. "The hedonistic imperative." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.hedweb.com/.

Powell, Russel and Allan Buchanan. 2011. "Breaking Evolutions Chains: The Prospect of Deliberate Genetic Modification in Humans." *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 36, no. 1: 6–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jmp/jhq057.

Radwan, Jacek. 2012. "Ewolucja zmienności genów głównego kompleksu zgodności tkankowej." *Nauka*, no. 4: 155–62.

Roszak, Piotr. 2021. "Aquinas on Christ's Will to Die and Our Salvation." *Nova et Vetera*, vol. 19, no. 1 (2021): 199–216. https://doi.org/10.1353/nov.2021.0010.

Sakowski, Łukasz. 2020. "Ewolucja układu odpornościowego i co ją hamuje." Accessed February 15, 2023. https://www.totylkoteoria.pl/ewolucja-ukladu-odpornosciowego/.

Savulascu, Julian and Anders Sandberg. 2008. "Neuroenhancement of Love and Marriage – The Chemicals Between Us." *Neuroethics*. no. 1: 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-007-9002-4.

Wagner, Michael. 2022. *Interpretacje rozwoju biologii ewolucyjnej na przełomie XIX i XX wieku*. Warsaw: Liberi Libri.