

*Homo Sapiens or Cyborg Sapiens?*  
Fourth Industrial  
or First Biotechnological “Revolution”?  
*The Elucidation of a New Mythology*

Dimitrios Th. Orphanidis\*

I.

The First Industrial Revolution that has taken place from the mid-18th century onwards, was related to the use of steam and the invention of the steam engine. The Second one, in the 19th century, was associated with the discovery of electricity and the organization of production. The third, from the mid-20th century onwards, had to do with the discovery and use of computers on a large scale, both in the economy and in everyday life.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution of the 21st century is inextricably connected with the discovery and imminent use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across the economy and everyday life.

All these revolutions are related to the discovery and use of increasingly sophisticated machines in the economy. Machines were also used in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, though their use had not been extensive; there was no reason for them to be massively produced, because there was the mass manual slave and serf labor, which was the reason why the use of steam from Archytas did not lead to the first industrial revolution in the 4th century BC.

---

\* Dimitrios Th. Orfanidis (LLM) is a Doctor of Labor Law, President of the Athens Court of Appeal, and Vice President of the Circle of Greek Literary Judges.

AI is the most advanced form of technology. But it is a general term, which does not cover the phenomenon. AI is part of the phenomenon, not the phenomenon. The phenomenon is *posthumanism*, which is also known as *transhumanism* and *super-humanism*. Whatever it is called, it represents a complex endeavor, linking computer technology with neurotechnology, molecular biology, robotics, nanotechnology, medicine, genetic engineering, eugenics, physics and AI research<sup>1</sup>.

At the same time, transhumanism appears as a philosophy of anthropology, the mind, technology, as well as a political<sup>2</sup>, cultural and literary movement<sup>3</sup>, promising the upgrading of man, while claiming the introduction and establishment of a new religion.

But what man's upgrading does mean for the transhumanism? Why is that Klaus Schwab, the founder of the International Economic Forum, argues that the Fourth Industrial Revolution will go so far as to raise the question: "What is man?" («Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος;»)<sup>4</sup>.

According to transhumanism, upgrading is the intervention in the man's nature and the latter's modification by technological means. According to an imaginary narrative, this will be done to free man from suffering; this will be achieved by augmenting his physical abilities with nano-implants, by eliminating old age and extending his life expectancy to 500 years, and by perennially transcending his biological limitations, making man immortal and colonizing the Universe.

In order for the phenomenon of transhumanism to be understood, which has existed for decades but is still invisible to the average person, since it is not yet directly promoted by the media, we must go back to its essence, that is, to its origin. Only then will one be able to understand what it is all about, when the term *posthumanism* will start to spread in

1. For a more thorough presentation of the phenomenon, its name, history and individual currents, see Th. Tasis, *Φιλοσοφία τῆς ἀνθρώπινης ἀναβάθμισης*, Harmos Publications, Athens 2021, with many references to the relevant bibliography.

2. U.S. Transhumanist Party, Transhumanist UK, Transhumane Partei Deutschland, Transhumanist Party – India.

3. See indicatively: G. Aloï and Susan McHugh (eds.), *Posthumanism in Art and Science – A Reader*, Columbia University Press, New York 2021.

4. <https://www.weforum.org/about/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab> [29.9.2023].

society as the New Promised Land, as an extension of Freedom and Democracy.

## II.

The term *AI* is widely known; still, it is not equally well known that it refers to *Trans/Posthumanism*, a term which is still completely unknown to the average citizen. Despite the fact that the term *AI* does not fully cover the phenomenon of *Trans/Posthumanism*, its starting point is artificial “intelligence”, called *computer*. In 1950, Alan Turing poses the question: “Can machines actually think?”. This already implies the extension of *AI* from the “computer” machine to the construction of other “thinking” machines.

In the very same year, Julian Huxley, biologist and eugenicist and first Director-General of UNESCO [1946-1948], published the article: “New Bottles for New Wine: Ideology and Scientific Knowledge”<sup>5</sup>, in which he argues and suggests the following: evolution bridges the gap between man and animal, spirit and matter, organic and inorganic; it shatters the pretext of human isolationism and brings man face to face with his relationship –a very important one– with the Universe. Once we realize what evolution means, we will understand the role we are called upon to play in the Universe. If we do not listen to evolution, we will overlook our universal task, which is to continue the cosmic progress through our evolution. In order to achieve this, we need a new belief-system or ideology; we or our descendants are obliged to try working through it. Once people reach the point where they feel that they are interested in realizing new possibilities of experience and individual growth, and that it is not just a physical transition from one phase of life to another, new rituals will be required. The entire existence is always –to some extent, at least– incarcerated, so it is good to escape from this prison, achieving more freedom. Self-transition, the desire for social progress, practical

---

5. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 80, 1-2 (1950), pp. 7-23.

idealism, hope constitute forms of escape and can be good and right, as long as they do not lead to heavenly rewards and pious fantasies.

In 1957, Julian Huxley published a collection of essays under the general title *New Bottles for New Wine: Ideology and Scientific Knowledge*, in which he included the above essay, but also baptizes the system as a *belief system* or *ideology*.

In his essay entitled “Transhumanism”, after having stated that the Universe, as a result of thousands of millions of years of evolution, has begun to realize itself and that it is capable of understanding something of its past and its possible future, a fact that has been realized by only a few people, not excluding the possibility that it has been perceived by other beings on other planets, and after having formulated the view that evolution on planet Earth is the history of the realization of all new possibilities, he then proceeds to name this new belief system or new ideology by saying the following:

The human species can, if it wishes, transcend itself – not just sporadically, an individual here in one way, an individual there in another way, but in its entirety, as humanity. We need a name for this new belief. Perhaps “transhumanism” will serve: [the] man remaining man, but transcending himself, by realizing new possibilities of and for his human nature<sup>6</sup>.

Despite denouncing dogmatic formulations and similar “clanging cymbals”, and having stated “that man remains man”, Julian Huxley’s idea about the transcendence of man means that the latter ceases to be a distinct species. Otherwise, there would have been no need for him to be renamed *transhuman*. By distorting the objective fact of natural evolution, he attributes to man a destiny, which he arbitrarily associates with a universal task – to incessantly evolving himself, i.e. to exceed his potential; nevertheless, from the moment that he turns destiny into a task, it opposes man’s natural evolution, the evolution that man himself cannot control; otherwise he would not specify that this transition of man is not natural; and since it is not natural, it can only be technical,

---

6. J. Huxley, “Transhumanism”, *New Bottles for New Wine*, Chatto & Windus, London 1957, p. 13.

that is, a technology through which man intervenes in the natural evolution of his species.

Turing's "AI" is the construction of "thinking" machines, in the sense that they operate according to algorithmic procedures. Their function, though, is not actual thought process, but operations on certain well-defined symbols-concepts, in the context of an appropriately defined mathematical formalism<sup>7</sup>. It is a statistical "intelligence", without understanding, which needs to be fed with data by man in order to "think". It is not thinking, because thinking presupposes consciousness and subconsciousness. Consciousness, hence thinking, hence judgement, is not a series of predetermined actions deriving from well-defined symbols; that is to say, it is not an algorithm. If "AI" had a consciousness, it wouldn't be artificial and the machine would be human. Man is an unpredictable being. It conceives, creates concepts and understands, living a life distinguished by complexity and numerous possible contingencies. Consciousness is interwoven with emotions; the latter's disappearance results in man's inability to make decisions. The answer to Turing's question is self-evident: Machines cannot think; yet, nowadays, from the moment that such a question is asked, as soon as Klaus Schwab predicts that the question "what is man" will be raised, the obvious things should not be omitted.

Since Julian Huxley used the term *transhumanism* to name the technological transition to it, then he gives the direction of extending the Turing's question, i.e. the next "thinking" machine being the same man and –simultaneously– gives a religious direction, since it will be the necessary belief system, so that each and every one of us, that is all of us as members of a society, can accept transhumanism as evolution; thus, the question we must ask is not whether machines can think, but whether it is in the interest of some to prevent man from thinking by turning him into a machine. Julian Huxley did not coin the term *transhumanism*; it is a neologism attributed to Dante, at the point where he meets Beatrice in Paradise, in order to convey with the greatest possible intensity his ascendance to the heavenly realm –apparently inconceivable for the

---

7. S. Theodoridis, «Τεχνητή Νοημοσύνη: Τὸ τέλος τῆς Ἐποχῆς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου;», *Θεολογία/Theologia* 92, 1 (2021), pp. 51-70.

human consciousness— as a transcendence of human nature. Obviously, it was not a transcendence via the technological intervention; still, the English eugenicist uses the term in this sense.

In his essay “Transhumanism”, Huxley, by completing this naming, writes the following:

“I believe in transhumanism”: once there are enough people who can truly say that, the human species will be on the threshold of a new kind of existence, as different from ours as ours is from that of Peking man. It will at last be consciously fulfilling its real destiny.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word “belief” means: “a strong feeling that something/somebody exists or is true; confidence that something/somebody is good or right”. Therefore, it misleadingly refers to science, since it actually seeks to induce to us the concept that transhumanism –man’s turning into an algorithm– is good, right and possible. He also uses the word *ideology* and the term *belief-system*. The term *ideology* means a set of moral, social and philosophical ideas, principles, opinions and beliefs; according to the Oxford English Dictionary, “ideology” means “a set of ideas on which an economic or political system is based”. The term *belief-system* is a set of strong feelings based on various fields –art, politics, religion, science– related to the rightness of transhumanism, insofar as it constitutes the fulfillment of the cosmic duty of our species to constantly evolving. For many people, ideology has ended up to simply represent a system of beliefs; but *posthumanism*, as Ihab Hassan has renamed *transhumanism* in 1977<sup>8</sup>, is a system of artificially induced feelings, announcing the end of humanism and its replacement by a superintelligent intelligence<sup>9</sup>. Thus, for that very reason, it cannot be called an ideology. However, transhumanism can be included in a variety of ideologies, which express different economic and political systems. It is noteworthy that Julian Huxley relates political and social to biological and psychological terminology: he identifies the terms *ideology* and *belief system* with the terms *psychological needs* and

8. Tasis, *op.cit.*, p. 23.

9. Tasis, *op.cit.*, p. 237.

*genetics* respectively, and the term *coercion* with the term *embryology*, seeking to reintroduce eugenics into political thought and action with the necessary psychological acceptance.

Consequently, the Fourth Industrial Revolution differs from all the previous ones; in so far as it concerns the technology's intervention to man's natural evolution, it is the First Biotechnological "Revolution". Its common feature with the previous ones is the existence of an elite, which had an interest in controlling society, and therefore the consciousness of the majority. All the elites, including the pre-industrial ones, had in the means to manipulate consciousness; none of them, though, had at their disposal the vast technological capabilities that the contemporary one possess. The control of consciousness was achieved in the past – and is still achieved today in various ways; still, never before in history has it been possible to reach the absolute point of controlling the *unpredictable*. Having had the experience of the unpredictable, what it has been previously called the "*catalytic event*", which in the past has caused them upheavals and reversals, the elites are using biotechnology to achieve absolute control. But not knowing how consciousness is formed in man, they need multi-level scientific research<sup>10</sup>.

In view of the aforementioned, no one should be surprised by what follows – and this is just a mere indication:

Raymond Kurzweil, Google executive and leading figure of transhumanism, talks about the singularity, the AI's inevitable culmination due to its constant evolution; man will be become an inferior species. He presents this singularity as the fulfillment of the ancient religious expectation, i.e. the liberation of the Universe from suffering and ignorance and its transformation into a self-conscious *Whole*. In one of his interviews, he stated that the singularity is the closest thing to God one can imagine, a God that does not exist... not yet, at least. He promotes the fusion of man and machine and the creation of a new species: the Cyber-Organism, or Hybrid, or Cyborg. Red blood cells will be enriched with artificial respiratory cells, so that we can operate at great depths or altitudes without breathing apparatus. Nano-machines will next replace

---

10. Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds, URL://<https://info.publicintelligence.net/GlobalTrends2030.pdf> [29.9.2023].

the blood cells, powered by microscopic hydrogen combustion, so that the heart will become superfluous. Nano-implants in the brain will allow full restoration of vision and hearing, and in the next phase will make it possible to connect it to computers<sup>11</sup>. At the second transhumanism conference on “World Future 2045”, that have taken place at 2013 in New York, R. Kurzweil presented the paper “Immortality by 2045”, arguing for a false dichotomy between the biological and non-biological parts of the human being and the strategic goal of totally replacing the former by the latter.

Andy Clark in his book *Minds, Technologies and the Future of Human Intelligence*, and Braden Allenby and Daniel Sarewitz in their book *The Techno-Human Condition* argue that “we have always been cyborgs”, because since the invention of the first tools we have been constantly upgrading ourselves<sup>12</sup>. This is sophistry: Tools from primitive times and technology in general up to the present day have been upgrading man’s living standards; technology has not been used for the elites to interfere with the man’s biological nature in order to strip him of his status, turning him into a mechanized species.

Donna Haraway, in her essay “A Cyborg Manifesto” [1985 original version, 1991 subsequent], defends the mutation of man into a cyborg organism, as she rejects the dualisms body/mind, male/female and human/nature.

In our time we are all chimeras [...] in short, we are all cyborgs. Communication technologies and biotechnologies are the main means through which our organism is constantly restructured. These means are materializing and empowering new social relations for women around the world.

11. Tasis, *op.cit.*, p. 246.

12. F. Nikolaos Loudovikos, «Διαλογική (Βιο)τεχνολογία; Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς (Βιο)τεχνολογίας ὡς ὀριστικῆς καὶ ἀμετάπτωτης οὐτοπίας; ἀπὸ τὸν Marx καὶ τὸν Heidegger στὸν Bostrom, τὸν Stuart Russell καὶ τὸ σκοτεινὸ ἄστρο τῆς ἐπιθυμίας», *Θεολογία/Theologia* 92, 1 (2021), pp. 23-50, here p. 31.



She introduces cyberfeminism by declaring the feminist liberation through the “evolutionary union” of the women with the machines<sup>13</sup>.

Fereidoun M. Esfandiary, renamed FM-2030, one of the first professors of futurology studies at the New School for Social Research in New York in the 1960s, described the “transhuman” as the transitional man to the age of trans-/posthumanism. As the latter’s main features, he cites a globalized lifestyle, androgyny, intensive use of telecommunications, in vitro fertilization, the absence of religious beliefs and the rejection of traditional family values<sup>14</sup>.

According to transhumanism, even the distinction between man and animal is rejected as a false anthropocentric conception; in its place, the “correct” conception of “animal-man” is been promoted<sup>15</sup>.

### III.

What is the position of the Law in relation with the “wise men [who] perceive approaching things”<sup>16</sup>?

The applicable law is always the law that has been decided and is applied by the courts, so it is the existing law. None of the above is currently applicable law, so the question should be reformulated: can the law in force today prohibit transhuman mutation? If the future law in force will be transhuman, all of the aforementioned will be visible to all and legal. The provision and the pursuit are to make them visible and legal. By 2045, the post-/transhumanists hope that the hybrid mutation will have prevailed; post-/transhumanist parties will have been elected, or the existing political formations will have embraced

---

13. “A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology and Socialist-Feminism in the late Twentieth Century”, in: *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York 1991, pp. 149-181.

14. N. Bostrom, “A history of transhumanist thought”, *Journal of Evolution and Technology* 14, 1 (April 2005).

15. Pr. K. Nayar, *Posthumanism, Themes in 20th and 21st Century Literature*, Polity Press, 2012, pp. 77-93; see also Al. Katsiaras, «Σώμα: από τη βιβλική κατάφαση στη μετανεωτερική απο-σωματοποίηση;», *Θεολογία/Theologia* 91, 3 (2020), p. 6.

16. K. P. Cavafy, «Σοφοὶ δὲ προσιόντων» [1915].

the transhumanist program, which will have long since been presented by some media as a value system and legislated appropriately. This legislation will have been facilitated in its acceptance by the technology and consequently by its owners: Mobile phones used to be expensive and owned by a few; nowadays, they are affordable and almost everyone owns one. Today there are implants, with which someone can enhance his or her physical abilities, but they are still very expensive. Tomorrow they will be cheaper and everyone will be able to pay for them. There will be no law enforcement for someone to incorporate them; he or she will be “free” to remain immutable, as long as their religion, philosophy, or morality dictates it; but their colleague at work will, who will also be “free” to upgrade his or her productivity with one, two, three implants, will be promoted by their employer faster and receive a higher salary, even if he or she has fewer years of service than them.

Such a situation cannot be forbidden by the existing law; a human-centered jurisprudence, which is possible under the current law, is not excluded; however, it is doubtful that it will continue to exist, when the practical, technology-dominated everyday life and the need for survival will either convince the judge himself that it is obsolete or make it inapplicable. Already today a German bank advertisement shows a lady opening the door of her house using an implant in her arm, which she has obtained free of charge after financing the purchase of her house from the advertised bank; already a contemporary Greek advertising shows a man full of make-up declaring that there is no male and female hair and that he wishes to express himself by getting rid of stereotypes – as if the distinction between male and female, which transhumanism rejects, is not an element of human nature but a convention, as if human rights cannot be fully protected within the framework of natural biology, so the latter must be eliminated. The advertising framework of the transhumanism’s anti-humanist current is based on an alleged progressivism; anthropocentrism’s future adherents, regardless of their ideology, will be called “bio-conservatives” and “neo-luddites”. Nowadays, there are legal classes which have already imposed the use of the terms *parent one* and *parent two*, in an attempt to deprive man of the two most fundamental concepts of human existence, mother and father. In this

way, the ground is being prepared for a transhumanist law. Suitably adapted, the Transhumanist Declaration<sup>17</sup> could become the textual basis for constitutions, international conventions and common law well before 2045. A future Greek constitution could therefore enshrine freedom of form<sup>18</sup> and, if not, the next or subsequent EU Treaty could enshrine it in the following Treaty on the Functioning of the EU; thus, due to its prevalence over the Constitution, the Greek courts should be obliged to apply it – it will be recognized as a right by the European Convention on Human Rights. The same could apply with the “genetic freedom” of the Transhumanist Manifesto<sup>19</sup>. If not the UN –although this cannot not be excluded–, constitutions, international conventions, organisms as well as the EU, could enshrine the Transhuman Bill of Rights, according to which human beings, sentient artificial intelligences, hybrids and all forms of intelligent life will enjoy internationally recognized rights<sup>20</sup>. At the core of the transhumanist “law” will be the rejection of human nature and self-determination<sup>21</sup>. If a transhumanist “law” might perhaps try to prevent an anthropocentric jurisprudence, we should consider the case of its application by the “Artificial Justice”. It would be utterly naive for us to accept that the administration of justice will be exempt from the emerging First Biotechnological “Revolution”. A generous voluntary exit program of a state’s government, of yet another one, and so on, and the *homo sapiens* judges will gradually retire, possibly even happily not having to read tens of thousands of pages, something which, in any case, is extremely difficult, if not impossible; but the *cyborg sapiens* judge will be able to perform this task. Without even any legal obligation, judges who will not opt for voluntary exit will perhaps make sure to “upgrade” their brain functions with implants, so that they can quickly

---

17. <https://www.humanityplus.org/the-transhumanist-declaration> [29.9.2023].

18. A. Sandberg, “Morphological Freedom – Why We Not Just Want It, but Need It”, in: M. More, Natasha Vita-More (eds.), *The Transhumanist Reader: Classical and Contemporary Essays on the Science, Technology, and Philosophy of the Human Future*, 2013.

19. <https://www.humanityplus.org/the-transhumanist-manifesto> [29.9.2023].

20. “Transhuman Bill of Rights”, Wikipedia: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transhumanist\\_Bill\\_of\\_Rights#:~:text=The%20most%20current%20version%20of,to%20possess%20the%20capacity%20for](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transhumanist_Bill_of_Rights#:~:text=The%20most%20current%20version%20of,to%20possess%20the%20capacity%20for) [29.9.2023].

21. “Transhumanism and law: from human nature to self-determination as the foundation of human rights”, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34543051/> [29.9.2023].

issue hundreds of decisions and read thousands of pages of briefs on a single case; this will result in increasing salaries and a faster rise in the hierarchy, and in occupying –as being the most efficient ones– the highest positions in their countries’ highest courts. The “upgraded” will be able to resolve the extremely demanding legal and complex substantive issues that *cyborg sapiens* lawyers will bring before them, since the *homo sapiens* advocates, who will choose “stagnation” over “upgrading”, will have been annihilated by the competition. The efficiency and rapidity in the administration of justice will result in a booming economy. When the time comes, everything will seem even more “natural”; the hybrid lawyers will no longer represent *homo sapiens* but *cyborg sapiens*. For now, justice is not artificial, in the sense that it is administered by *homo sapiens* judges; nevertheless, AI is already being used in its administration. But that is not the point; its use is inevitable and not negative in itself. The issue is whether its use, under the pretext of progress, facilitation, efficiency, and human rights, will “imperceptibly”<sup>22</sup> lead to transhumanism. It is clear that man –the plaintiff and the defendant, the accuser and the accused, the lawyer and the judge– must remain human; they should not mutate into a hybrid/posthuman, or replaced by “thinking” machines. Therefore, the use of AI in the *homo sapiens* era, in which we are still living, should not facilitate the latter’s extinction and the transition to a biotechnological period dominated by hybrids. This concern lies at the core of anthropocentric legislation. The legislator at the beginning of the 21st century is called upon to regulate the complex and interconnected issues that are constantly emerging, due to the most complex and powerful technology ever available to states and individuals – compared to all previous centuries; thus, the legislation will necessarily be both multilayered and complex; in order not to lose its anthropocentric character in the extremely difficult environment of complexity, the legislator will be able to preserve its core by not allowing the man’s indirect and, of course, direct mechanization. The prohibition of the concepts of *mother-father* and their replacement by *parent 1-parent*

22. «Ἀνεπαισθήτως μ’ ἔκλεισαν ἀπὸ τὸν κόσμον ἔξω»: C. P. Cavafy, «Τείχη» (“Walls”) [1896, 1897] [“Imperceptibly they have closed me off from the outside world”; translated into English by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard].

2 under the pretext of equality and the fight against discrimination [I wonder, which parent is 1 and which is 2?] undermines the core of anthropocentric legislation and constitutes a subtle step towards its transformation into anti-humanist legislation.

To predict recidivism in criminal cases, the “Correctional Offender Management Profiles for Alternative Sanctions” [COMPAS] is used in the USA by judges in some states. Those who are in favor of using algorithms such as COMPAS say that the algorithms reduce the number of incarcerated people because they make the assessment of recidivism risk more objective. COMPAS uses data from the criminal record and a 137-question questionnaire, including questions such as: “Is a hungry person allowed to steal? I strongly disagree, disagree, etc.” But as we have seen, the brain’s physicochemical processes are not algorithmic and by this we are not even referring to the mind, which is a flow of subjective experience, creativity, and imagination<sup>23</sup>. The 137 questions addressed to the algorithm are answered by the Criminal Code, to which there is an attempt to stop the judge from having recourse, whereas in reality «ψυχῆς πείρατα ἰὼν οὐκ ἂν ἐξεύροιο πᾶσαν ἐπιπορευόμενος ὁδόν; οὕτω βαθὺν λόγον ἔχει»<sup>24</sup>; and while the transhumanist might declare that «ἐὰν μὴ ἔλπεται ἀνέλπιστον οὐκ ἐξευρήσει, ἀνεξερευνήτον ἐὼν καὶ ἄπορον»<sup>25</sup>, this cannot be done excessively, because «ἥλιος οὐκ ἂν ὑπερβήσεται μέτρα»<sup>26</sup>. Man should not transcend his present biological form, as he transcended his animal nature; he did not transcend the latter by being technologically mutated, but by evolving naturally and creating civilization. Therefore, when the judge uses the AI of the algorithm *in order to judge*, then, at that moment, he quitclaims his consciousness, but not to the algorithm, as we might think, because AI is a human construction, fed with data from man; it cedes it to the owners of the company that has built it and to their interest for building it, i.e. the greatest possible control of consciousness, which in this case may even coincide with that of some state agencies. An anthropocentric legislature

---

23. See S. Theodoridis, «Τεχνητὴ Νοημοσύνη...», *op.cit.*, p. 61.

24. Heraclitus, Ἀπόσπ. 17/45, H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin 1960.

25. Heraclitus, Ἀπόσπ. 1/18, Diels – Kranz, *op.cit.*

26. Heraclitus, Ἀπόσπ. 73/94, Diels – Kranz, *op.cit.*

should prohibit the use of AI in the judiciary in cases where the judge's judgment is required, such as, e.g. for a decision of guilt or acquittal, sentencing, suspensive or non-suspensive effect of an appeal. But even if this might be the case, the current anthropocentric legislation could not prohibit the composer, the poet, the director from using AI programs, nor the advertisement "there is no such thing as male and female hair", while it is already tending towards transhumanism by imposing the "parent 1-parent 2" doctrine, seeking to destroy intelligence in its infancy –i.e. from the infancy– by deconstructing the most fundamental concepts. Existing legislation does not regulate AI in its entirety, only specific forms of it<sup>27</sup>. Thus, it fully regulates only a fraction of transhumanism. Before the legislation though, contemporary education will not teach the humanist values to the future composers, poets, directors, judges, lawyers, workers, public or private employees; according to them, as long as there is no absolutes, relativity and subjectivity are not absolute and man must be and remain human, both physically and spiritually.

The issue of AI –and not that of transhumanism– is gradually being promoted more and more often by the media. There are frequent references to the concerns of experts on the subject, that man is in danger of being enslaved by AI, which will be so highly developed that it will be able to repair and manufacture its own next generation. The emphasis is given on the engineering side of the technology, and not on the biological one. Thus, the average citizen often hears about the danger of the enslavement of our species by machines and not about the lurking danger of technology interfering with its material and spiritual substance, turning it into a hybrid. There is emphasis on the danger of enslavement in order for the average citizen to not realize the latter, for the occurrence of which, without his knowledge, is being prepared.

The first danger is not real, because: a) Self-repairing machines and machines that produce other by themselves do not imply consciousness; they will act in this way because they would be programmed to do so; the acquisition of consciousness would render them non-machines;

---

27. Th. Tasis, «Κοιτάζοντας τή Σφίγγα στα μάτια: Τεχνητή νοημοσύνη και άνθρωπινες αξίες»: <https://mag.frear.gr/koitazontas-ti-sfigga-sta-matiotechniti-noimosyni-kai-anthro-pi-nes-axies/> [29.9.2023].

they would seek to fully own their technology; the contemporary *homo sapiens* elites and the future *cyborg sapiens* elites do not intend to be overthrown either by *homo sapiens*, by some super-evolved machines, or by *cyborg sapiens*. b) We haven't yet discovered what the unpredictable human existence really is, or means, and we will never be able to do so – the consciousness will remain scientifically unknown. c) Thus, although we will not stop trying to discover what consciousness is, in order to discover what is the cause of man's unpredictable reaction, the owners of the technological means of production will focus on the man's biological mutation, on the construction of *cyborg sapiens* – the second danger is therefore real.

The second risk of the mutation of *homo sapiens* into *cyborg sapiens* is for the elites both more realistic and more advantageous: a) In the absence of the possibility, despite their technological power, to discover what consciousness is, the mutation of our species is the best they can achieve in terms of securing the greatest control of consciousness to date. b) Self-repairing and self-producing machines would bring about complete automation of production; what would the billions of wage-earning people do then, every day, all day long? Would they go on excursions? Would they play chess? Would they read books? Would they talk or go for fishing? But, if that sort of life were to prevail, then humanity would have moved to a different economic system: the elites, whether human or hybrid, would have no reason to exist; and we've already noted that they don't intend to drive themselves to extinction. c) If the wage-earners did not work, there would be no profits; machine labor is not profitable; therefore man, by mutating into a hybrid, will have increased capabilities; he will be "productively upgraded"; but he must remain human for as long as it would be necessary to produce profit with his labor and to buy the products he produces; machines do not buy products.

In this way, we return to our starting point – Julian Huxley. His phrase "perhaps transhumanism will serve: [the] man remaining man, but transcending himself, by realizing new possibilities of and for his human nature" actually means: "Through biotechnology, which is the property of some people, man transcends his natural abilities and interferes with



his own nature by mutating into a machine in order to become more productive, maintaining his humanity only to the extent needed to buy the many more products he will produce because of his semi-transformation into a machine”. Of course, the new species, in order to work and buy, must be healthy on the human side and repairable on the mechanical one. On the path to mutation, transhumanism will be moderate and attractive: Medical technology will meet the real human need of treating and curing diseases that are till today incurable, but also providing increased possibilities of protection against other diseases, that in the meantime will probably arise; spiritual biotechnology will make feasible man’s desire to incorporate into his brain the complete works of his favorite composer or poet, the knowledge of a family of languages he worships; each of us will have a powerful motive or compelling need to become transhuman.

Because of the technological progress, jobs were ceased to exist while others have been created during the previous industrial revolutions; this will also happen during the so-called Fourth Industrial Revolution – the first Biotechnological one. Its owners hope to overcome possible social backlash. If the intended “normalcy” of the First Biotechnological “Resurrection” is established, full automation of labor will only occur in those sectors which it is in the interest of the elites to have complete automation, such as that of the Justice Department. In those where the interest will dictate partial automation, AI and trans-humans will coexist.

Martin Heidegger, in his 1954 book *Die Frage nach der Technik*, investigates what is the essence of technology. However, he posed and addressed this question in a lecture in Bremen on 1 December 1949, that bears in German the title „Das Gestell“, which it can be translated as “The Frame”. In this lecture, he states that modern technology treats human existence as an available stock. In an interview with the ZDF television channel in 1969 he clarified:

First of all, I have to say that I am not against technology. I have never been against technology. I try to understand its essence [...]. I think about what is being developed today as biophysics: in the foreseeable future, we humans will



be able to construct man in a particular way; that means to build his organic essence, in the way that someone needs it<sup>28</sup>.

The First Biotechnological “Revolution” is biotechnology for the mutation of man as needed by the governing elites, for whom man is no more than an available resource to serve their purpose; in order to extract his consent to do so, they gently and gradually entrench him within the transhumanist framework.

In 1964, Kostas Axelos wrote that a certain folly will gradually intensify, disorientation will become generalized, the rules of supposed normality will break down, a mild madness will turn into mania; psycho-sociological and bio-chemical techniques will want to intervene<sup>29</sup>. Fifty-nine years later, it turns out that he is right, except that all of the above, even if they do not have as their primary cause the interest, they acquire the interest of certain formations as their cause of reproduction; psycho-sociological and biochemical techniques have owners and managers; they are not produced, advertised, submitted, sold, or taught on their own.

In his book *The Game of the World*, published in 1969, Axelos notes:

The end of man and the end of history mean the end of man and history as powerful theoretical principles, the end of a certain philosophy of history and an anthropology based on an earlier philosophy of history and an earlier anthropology [...]. The man and history seem to find their end in the humanities as subject-object, constituent-established and useful/advantageous dissolved<sup>30</sup>.

This is an accurate description of transhumanism and is crucial to its understanding: The end of man and history will eventually come not because man is disappearing as the dinosaurs disappeared in the past, but because an attempt is being made for the existence of man – and, therefore, of history– to be continued on a different ontological and

---

28. Wikipedia: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin\\_Heidegger](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger) [29.9.2023].

29. K. Axelos, *Πρός την πλανητική σκέψη*, Vivliopoleio tis Hestias, Io. D. Kollaros Publications, Athens <sup>5</sup>2016, p. 56.

30. K. Axelos, *Τò παιχνίδι τοῦ κόσμου*, transl. Katerina Daskalaki, Vivliopoleio tis Hestias Publications, Athens 2018. p. 425.

anthropological basis: in the post-ontology and anthropo-mechanics of *cyborg sapiens*, promoted by the owners of biotechnology. Any way, it is by no means in question, and certainly not by chance, that the human being, also in the form of *cyborg sapiens*, will remain an available resource. Aristotle expressed the view:

*εἰ γὰρ ἡδύνατο ἕκαστον τῶν ὀργάνων κελευθὲν ἢ προαισθανόμενον ἀποτελεῖν τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔργον, καὶ ὥσπερ τὰ Δαιδάλου φασὶν ἢ τοὺς τοῦ Ἥφαιστου τρίποδας, οὕς φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς αὐτομάτους θεῖον δύνεσθαι ἀγῶνα, οὕτως αἱ κερκίδες ἐκέρκισον αὐταὶ καὶ τὰ πλῆκτρα ἐκιθάριζεν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἔδει οὔτε τοῖς ἀρχιτέκτοσιν ὑπηρετῶν, οὔτε τοῖς δεσπόταις δούλων<sup>31</sup>;*

thus, Aristotle expressed the view that advanced technology will free man not only from toil and suffering, but also from slavery! Slavery was the first form of dependent labor in the history of the human species and slavery was the dominant economic and social mode of production during the antiquity. Aristotle declared that this system would collapse with the use of advanced technology, provided, however, that every instrument, i.e. every machine, would be able to perform the task for which it was intended, whether it was ordered to do so or had a premonition for it. Consequently, Aristotle: a) did not consider that the AI would be able to replace man ontologically, even if it were engineered, therefore programmed, to seemingly function at the level of consciousness, b) but only in the production process, abolishing the dependence of a man (slave) on another man (owner); c) not only because technology would have evolved to the level of an artificial intelligence, but because every machine was used to perform the work for which it was foreordained. From Aristotle's time to the present, technology has been evolving without interruption; there have been three exclusively industrial revolutions, while the first biotechnological one is emerging;

31. Aristotle, *Πολιτικά*, 1253b, 34-35. ["And every assistant is as it were a tool that serves for several tools; for if every tool could perform its own work when ordered, or by seeing what to do in advance, like the statues of Daedalus in the story, or the tripods of Hephaestus which the poet says 'enter self-moved the company divine', – if thus shuttles wove and quills played harps of themselves, master-craftsmen would have no need of assistants and masters no need of slaves" – English translation by Harris Rackham].

nevertheless, the dependence of labor force was continued in another form during the three industrial revolutions, and the aim of the first biotechnological one is not to free man from toil and suffering by freeing the employees, but to further deepen them. To achieve this, apart from presenting transhumanism as philosophical, political and legal current of thought, it will also try to make it a faith<sup>32</sup>.

Y. N. Harari argues that creativity means that someone is able to identify a pattern and then break it down in a new way, to make something new, and that is something that AI is very good at. People have to be retrained, otherwise they will be a class not of unemployed but of useless persons, because they will not possess the skills that the new economy demands<sup>33</sup>. Thus, it tells us that we must stop being *homo sapiens* and turn into *cyborg sapiens* in order to remain competitive –of course, this would be an endless process. In order to keep a job, we should constantly be more competitive by upgrading our skills, thus “upgrading” ourselves in perpetuity, by implanting our bodies and brains with increasingly sophisticated “upgraded” nano-devices. If we live 500 years of constant upgrading, when will we retire? Is there anyone who wouldn’t want to live 500 years? Maybe we will become immortal – will we then retire or work forever? But what is the new economy to which Harari is referring? There is no new economy; the same old one of dependent labor exists, whose new feature is a technology of the mutated human existence. Nothing will be the same any more, as the various supporters of transhumanism declare, except dependent labor; nothing will be the same any more, except the managerial right of the posthuman employer over the posthuman wage-earner.

What’s next? The direction is relentlessly transhuman. Although the phenomenon has not yet become visible, and AI is increasingly becoming a subject for discussion, although not in its real dimensions, in the scientific circles of the First Biotechnological “Revolution” it is already considered obsolete, as the *Organoid Intelligence* is being prepared: the

---

32. See in more detail, Sp. D. Kyriazopoulos, *Ἡ καταγωγή τοῦ τεχνικοῦ πνεύματος*, Alfeios Publications, Athens 1965; see also Tasis, *op.cit.*, pp. 37, 283 and Julian Huxley, *op.cit.*

33. A new class of “Useless” people are appearing to the Internet.

construction of biological computers with millions of human brain cells. Biological computers will include arrays of brain organoids, i.e. miniature three-dimensional neural structures made of human stem cells, which will be built in the laboratory and linked to sensors and outputs and trained through machine learning<sup>34</sup>. Odysseus Elytis, in an interview he gave in 1976, said about the future the following<sup>35</sup>:

It is barbarism. I see it coming in disguise, under illegal alliances and prearranged enslavements. It will not be Hitler's ovens, perhaps, but a methodical and *quasi* scientific subjugation of man; his complete degradation; his disgrace.

In any case, as Cavafy assures us with his work, the defeat of man is not predetermined<sup>36</sup>. Transhumanism has not only followers. Anthropocentrism still exists; what is needed, however, is a convergence of its different perspectives, with the common purpose of preserving the human substance. To stand up against the transhumanist barbarity is going to be very, very difficult, as it has always been in history; but if it were not difficult, it would be neither civilized nor God-pleasing. Evil's attraction lies precisely in its easiness; still, as long as there is conscience, the catalytic event that will put an end to the transhumanist "practicality"<sup>37</sup> is bound to come.

34. <https://www.kathimerini.gr/life/technology/562299028/viologikos-ypologistis-me-eg-ke-falika-kyttara-tha-echei-organoeidi-noimosyni/> [29.9.2023].

35. «Καινούργια βαρβαρότητα απειλεί να μάς κουκουλώσει», Συνέντευξη στον Γιώργο Κ. Πηλιχό, *Τὰ Νέα*, 26 Νοεμβρίου 1976, από το βιβλίο: Odysseus Elytis, *Σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις – 37 συνεντεύξεις*, Ioulita Iliopoulou (ed.), Hysylon Publications, Athens 2011.

36. For more details on this, see: Dim. Orphanidis, *Ὁ 21ος αἰώνας τοῦ Κ. Π. Καβάφη, Μία discipline de vie*, Rodakio Publications, Athens 2018. The term *Cyborg sapiens* that I've used for the title of the present paper is also the title of one of my poetical collections (Helkystis Publications, Thessaloniki 2022), the first one that is dealing with the transhumanism.

37. Cf. Elytis, *op.cit.*