

Principles of Transhumanism

Contents

Introduction	3
What is Transhumanism?	3
What is a mode of political action?	3
What is a technological method?	3
Isn't that a ridiculously broad definition of technology?	4
What would not be a technological method by that definition?	4
Would self-defense be allowed by transhumanists?	5
Would a strictly rehabilitative prison be accepted by transhumanism?	5
What is meant by "individual people or society at large"?	5
Isn't transhumanism just supposed to be about robo-arms?	6
What is the difference between transhumanism and liberalism?	7
What is the difference between transhumanism and anarchism?	7
What does transhumanism generally think of technological innovation?	8
What about bad technologies?	8
What about the environment?	9
How would a transhumanist approach to a problem work concretely?	9
Wouldn't transhumanism also build technology without it being a response to a problem?	11
What if a think tank doesn't work well?	11
Can taxation be allowed by transhumanism?	11
How will transhumanism be established in places that don't abide by it yet?	12
What is the transhumanist approach to geopolitics?	12
How does transhumanism fit into history?	13
How would a transhumanist society defend itself?	14
What is the relationship of Marxism to transhumanism?	15
What is the relationship of hedonism to transhumanism?	15
Can other ideologies use transhumanism too?	16
Final thoughts	16

Introduction

“Transhumanist” is perhaps the one most misunderstood of my ideological labels. It’s very unclear to most people what I mean by it. Not just in the sense of them not knowing the term, but in the sense that they do know it and imagine something entirely different. This is a guide to my definition of transhumanism, an overview of my arguments and points, as well as a basis for further discussion and writing at a later time. It is based on the format of “Principles of Communism” by Friedrich Engels, meant as a quick introductory text as well.

What is Transhumanism?

Transhumanism is the mode of political action that sees the application of technology to individual humans or society at large as the only method by which true societal advancement can be achieved. It rejects all other ways of attempting to change society as futile, ineffective, and/or immoral. In particular, it is opposed to punishment as a way to force people into acting more desirably.

What is a mode of political action?

A mode of political action is how political theory is put into practice. Politics is the field of study concerned with the structure of society as a whole. It attempts to find out how society does work, how it could work, and which of these possibilities is most desirable. Political action (i.e. political practice) is the things actively done to move society towards being more desirable.

Politics done right is a dialectical process: Society has certain practices, that exhibit flaws, and the contemplation of these flaws helps us develop theory as to how to correct them, political practice attempts to implement these corrections, and after the results of the political practice have shown themselves to exhibit flaws too it’s back to contemplation.

A transhumanist is simply someone who says that the practice ought to be exclusively technological, i.e., both the things that are applied to society and the methods by which we seek to compel their application have to be technological methods.

What is a technological method?

A technological method is a method that uses, invents, and/or applies technology. Technology being defined as anything that helps people to do more than their biological base form would be capable of. Therefore, a technological method is a method which, at every purposefully taken step, enhances human capabilities.

Isn't that a ridiculously broad definition of technology?

No. There is no way to define technology that is just as or more sensible which is narrower. A smartphone can help me communicate with people far further away than I could by using my mouth, just as a labor union can help me bargain for far higher wages than I could simply by bargaining with my own skills. It doesn't matter whether that enhancement comes from a metal device or a social arrangement. They are all technologies. Even in what we colloquially consider to be technology there are certain social arrangements. The assembly line, for example. Conveyor belts, steam engines, and tools have already existed before the assembly line as an arrangement. None of the actual devices that made up the assembly line were new. Yet we consider the introduction of the assembly line into the productive process a technological innovation. Transhumanism simply acknowledges arrangements of people as technologies consistently, as opposed to the inconsistency that is the everyday designation. And even if there is disagreement with this definition still I would implore the reader to simply go with it and to judge the following arguments on their merit instead of their semantics.

What would not be a technological method by that definition?

Any method that, in at least one step, consciously goes out of its way to diminish the abilities of at least one person. We also call this type of method a punitive method, or simply a punishment. Punishment can also be equally defined as "any action that aims specifically to disempower an individual in particular because of something they have done after said action is completed" while meaning the same set of actions. If the process doesn't aim to disempower i.e. doesn't aim to take away an individual's abilities) then it's technological as there is only an empowerment aim. If a person simply happens to be disempowered without it being a purposeful step of the process then the same can be said. (e.g. If a barrier is built to block nondisabled people from parking in a disabled parking lot then this may indirectly disempower the ones who can't park there anymore, but as that's a side consequence and not an aim of the barrier it isn't a punishment.) Lastly, it must be after the deed is completed. If I disempower a person by punching, stabbing, or shooting... them while they attempt to harm me the aim isn't the disempowerment of the attacker but the avoidance of my own disempowerment. Again, no punishment as it is not aimed specifically at disempowerment. Also, if it isn't aimed at someone for doing something but for another reason then it's not the punitive method because then it's no method at all, there is no aim. It would be a

far cruder and simpler type of cruelty. And no one seriously proposes to solve societal issues, as again, it is no method to begin with.

Would self-defense be allowed by transhumanists?

Yes. As explained above, in a situation of self-defense the aim of the defending party isn't the harm of the other party but the protection from harm. The empowerment of oneself to not be harmed instead of the harm of those who wish to harm. Revenge, however, would obviously be discouraged by transhumanists. There exist many technological ways to enhance people's abilities to defend themselves. Pepper sprays and Tasers are among the things that can aid in self-defense and are even considered technology in more colloquial terms. And by our broader definition that includes arrangements of people as such in the term "technology" a neighborhood watch can also be considered a self-defense technology. So not only would transhumanism accept but potentially enhance self-defense by implementing technologies to enhance the self-defense powers of people.

Would a strictly rehabilitative prison be accepted by transhumanism?

This is a case right at that border that one can fight over. I would tend towards not accepting it. The case can obviously be made that a prison that is as nice as possible and only attempts to rehabilitate criminals within it and goes out of its way to maximally empower them in the process can't be said to aim for harm and therefore be punishment. However, the fact that they would still be locked up and forced to participate in rehabilitative therapy does very specifically and explicitly diminish their power, even if minimal. Of course, if the entire process has no explicit intention to do harm it technically could still fall under the definition of a technological process, with technologies of rehabilitation and escape-avoidance being combined to create it. However, due to the obvious and targeted nature of (even if intentional) disempowerment, I would still say that the advocates for these institutions bear the burden of proof. However, if the burden of proof is met and these institutions are implemented then I wouldn't see it as transhumanism being disproven either.

What is meant by "individual people or society at large"?

That a technological process can be applied at many different scales, one can modify singular genes in DNA, Humans via augmentations at the macro scale, or society by

placing within it a new technology. The first can cure diseases, enhancing capabilities by taking away the shackles that an illness has put on a person. The second can enhance human capabilities on a larger scale like artificial eyes allowing us to see more of the electromagnetic spectrum. Lastly, technology can also be applied between humans. Social technologies, these technologies which consist of the organization of multiple humans, are necessarily such, as they require coordinated action. But also the colloquial device-technologies can be interpersonal. The device you are reading this on connects you and me. It is, at least in this use case, an interpersonal technology. So whether it's a small correction of our bodies, a great augmentation, or whether the augmentation is applied to groups of people only insofar as they are groups without any usefulness to any particular individual, they are all technologies and we must think about them on all levels to know how to best improve society.

Isn't transhumanism just supposed to be about robo-arms?

The robo-arm misconception of transhumanism stems from its old definition. "The augmentation of human beings with technology". It ignores that technology can mean both device and social technology, just as it ignores that technology can be applied at every level instead of just the human body. This expansion of transhumanism from recognizing these semantic points alone already does much of the legwork to make it what this text defines and defends. Also, it must be a mode of political action, as it by itself neither describes nor prescribes reality. It's more a vague "apply technology", which can only mean that it's a general plan of action. Some transhumanist groups do try to prescribe goals (e.g. immortality) but firstly, these are not in the common dictionary definition either, and secondly, they propose vague future states and are thus mere utopian products of the whims of thought instead of transhumanism being a concrete, currently applicable thing. In that sense, it cheapens transhumanism to add a general prescription to it. It's best kept as a mode of action. Now, as a vast majority of people want to affect at least some change via technology, it needs something as its unique value proposition. A reason anyone in particular would call themselves a transhumanist. Thus, the addition of exclusivity, that it *only* seeks to propose technological solutions.

The issue can also be approached from the other direction. If one concludes that the only way to truly improve society is via the application of technology, what better label is there than transhumanist? It conveys a generally optimistic attitude to technology, a willingness to insert technology into one's body as we do with all levels of society, and it carries with it a futuristic and optimistic aesthetic. And it's no lie, as we have seen by just logically modifying the original definition we can get to the new one. So, it's a win for the transhumanists as they now have a more semantically consistent and

uniquely standout definition, and it helps the technologyexclusive solution proposers get a label.

What is the difference between transhumanism and liberalism?

Liberalism as a mode of action is unconcerned with technology. While liberalism does think that certain technologies must be applied, such as the separation of the three branches of government, and people who refer to themselves as liberal are generally very open to technological solutions, they do not see any intrinsic value in the solutions being technological.

Liberalism can be seen as an early stand-in for transhumanism. With political action through the ballot box and the separation of powers, it managed to guide governments towards less punitive solutions and methods. Yet it thinks that the particular things that helped it be less punitive are the ends in themselves rather than a possible means. As the possibility for better institutional forms for implementing technological solutions exists now, the liberal ones ought to be discarded when the opportunity arises. We can, of course, work with liberals to implement any particular technological solution or set of solutions, however, we must never forget that we aren't liberals but transhumanists.

What is the difference between transhumanism and anarchism?

Anarchism describes a set of ideologies that all have some opposition to power/the government/the state in common. These terms are often vaguely defined and a common object of infighting amongst people who call themselves anarchists. Transhumanism is far more concrete as it defines what punishment is very clearly. While an understanding of the object of critique seems agreed upon within singular branches of anarchism, there is barely any agreement between them.

Also, some types of anarchism share a problem with old transhumanism as their aspirations are very utopian. It's more about reaching an abstract goal to them than about actually solving concrete problems in the here and now. The issue arises from that that it becomes impossible to solve any problems in the real world which have only solutions that necessarily take us farther away from whatever their dream society is.

That being said, I do think that anarchism can make use of transhumanism. There is already an ideology called anarcho-transhumanism which seeks to combine them. Also, Harry Hooton who called himself an anarcho-technocrat was among the greatest inspiration for this iteration of transhumanism within this text.

What does transhumanism generally think of technological innovation?

We have a very positive view of it. With technology being the only possible way to improve human society at large it should be developed as much as possible to allow for the proliferation of ways in which said improvement can be done. The more technology exists, the more potential ways to apply it and improve society, the more society does improve, the more innovation based on that. Another dialectical positive feedback loop of the best kind, the kind that advances humanity!

What about bad technologies?

Technology is a tool. An enhancer of human capabilities. Its goodness or badness is entirely determined by what it is aimed at. It is just as impossible to have a bad technology as it is to have a bad skill. There are skills used for good as there are skills used for bad, but none are intrinsically one or another. If a technology is developed with bad intentions the goal should be not to interrupt, ban, or stop the development but to counter it. Develop a technology that can stop the bad one.

It is a futile attempt to try and stop the development of a technology. If research into a field is banned or heavily regulated, then a terrorist group, rouge state, or wealthy individual could still find a way to do so in secret. By allowing and promoting technological developments we allow open-source projects, publically accessible government programs, and non-profit organizations to openly do so, enabling us to prepare for and potentially counter bad people developing technology. You can't stop terrorists from developing technology by writing "no" to it in some lawbook. You can only try to build counter-technology. Every resource expended in an attempt to stop a rogue state from obtaining a technology could be spent on having a counter for it instead. It is not a question of if but of when a bad actor obtains any technology. Only by developing better technology ourselves can we permanently keep the good people in humanity safe.

Now, let's tackle why exactly no technology is bad. The reasons are simple and can be illustrated by using the nuclear bomb. A technology undoubtedly developed with bad intentions which, every time it's been used so far caused incredible suffering. The poster child of what some would call "bad technology". Firstly, while many technologies are developed with the worst of intentions, they still may find good uses later. An example of that would be how there is an idea for rocket propulsion based on nuclear explosions. So atom bombs, the bane of humanity and threat to the world, could become the very thing taking us to the stars and helping us to develop beyond existential threats. Also for the second argument for there being no bad technologies can we find inspiration with nuclear weapons. In the process of development of even the most ill-intent technology, we may discover things helping us develop good technolo-

gies. For example, discoveries made as the nuclear bomb was developed later helped us to develop nuclear power plants.

What about the environment?

The environmental questioning of technological proliferation is based on two fundamental misunderstandings. Firstly, not every technological advancement is primarily quantitative. I.e., not every technological advancement implies that more devices are being made, more often than not they are simply being replaced or upgraded. Therefore, not all technological advancement needs an increase in production but sometimes merely an alteration or recycling of the existing technologies that become obsolete now.

Secondly, it also contains a misunderstanding of the nature of environmental problems. The environment isn't in trouble because of *how much* production there is but *how* said production is done. When humans currently produce things they create waste, defined as things that neither other humans nor the environment have a use for. This causes the environment to lack the useful-for-it things used to make the waste while now having the waste itself in it which can be a disturbing factor. The actual quantity of production wouldn't matter for the environment to fulfill its functions if all products of production were used for either more production or were useful to the environment. If the production of a product p only produces said product p, byproducts useful for the environment, or byproducts useful for the production of other products, which in turn would only create these types of byproducts and so on, then there would be nothing lacking in the environment (as everything gets fed back eventually) and there would be no damaging substances within it (as all not environmentally useful products would be fed back into the productive process and not thrown out into the environment). However, to achieve that a new productive process (a form of new technology) would be needed. Thus, technological development isn't damaging to the environment but is the only thing capable of saving it. Any attempt to stop it or be doomerist about it simply hurts this process.

How would a transhumanist approach to a problem work concretely?

First, a problem needs to be identified. This can take multiple forms. If a certain number of people in a region face the same problem, a problem's occurrence happens with greater frequency or someone sees an issue that could lead to something like this happening in the future. Of course, there are individual problems too, but as transhumanism is a political and not an individual mode of practice we will exclude

these simply because they aren't relevant in this context. Of course, solving them is important too, but that's simply not within the scope of what's discussed here. Thus, we will focus on more large-scale issues. And a large-scale issue is implied if a region has a problem occur more often, the problem happens more often than before, or there is a threat of such a regional or over time proliferation of problems happening.

There are a myriad of ways to identify and compile problems. I don't want to prescribe any particular way of doing this. However, I will use examples to illustrate. But I want to say again that this is NOT the one and only way to do transhumanism, and every transhumanist may build whatever organization type they see fit for their particular time and place.

But for the sake of example, one can imagine a transhumanist think tank. A group of technological experts that aim to solve problems for society. They receive petitions from the people around them about the various problems they face. If a certain number of people report the same problem then the think tank devotes resources to its solution.

The second step is to propose a solution. For example, if the community think tank has many people from their community petitioning them about muggings, then they will look for the reason so many people out on the street get mugged. After that reason is found they propose multiple technological applications that the people could do. Maybe put more street lights up so that at night a potential attacker can be seen from farther away, distributing pepper spray among the people or building a community neighborhood watch.

Last but not least is the actual application. As this resolution isn't enforceable via punishment since that would defeat the whole point of transhumanism the people choose themselves which of the proposed solutions to apply, if any. However, since it was their requests that made the think tank look into it in the first place it's unlikely that they will reject all proposals. If proposals need funding then these will just be provided either by all affected equally, according to the ability to pay, or (if the society is already fully transhumanist) via public money. Since everyone is facing a problem and the richer people in a society know that some benefits have to go to either all or no one they are likely to voluntarily choose to pay for more of a community defense, as it benefits them directly and you can't have a defense force that only protects some people. Lamps can't be made to shine only for those who pay and a neighborhood watch that first checks whether you're someone who pays before protecting you would be remarkably ineffective.

Wouldn't transhumanism also build technology without it being a response to a problem?

Transhumanism as such is by definition only concerned with societal problems. It simply seeks to replace all punishment-based problem-solving approaches on a societal level with technology-based ones.

However, of course, transhumanism also seeks to make technology in general flourish. As technology is the means by which we wish to solve problems, that means the more technology the more ways of solving a problem we have. Also by getting rid of punishment, we will get rid of one of the primary tools holding back technology. Therefore, transhumanism will proliferate general technological development as a side effect.

What if a think tank doesn't work well?

Again, this was only an example of something possible. However, in that hypothetical if the think tank didn't work well anymore for whatever reason it could simply be replaced by another think tank or a different institution entirely. As said, transhumanism by definition is opposed to punishment and hence any truly transhumanist institution can't punish you for rejecting its resolutions. It's all about finding a constructive and non-punitive answer to all the various cruelties of the world. There's nothing stopping a transhumanist from building a new institution for the development of technological solutions. In fact, transhumanism requires it of them. If a transhumanist institution fails to deliver for whatever reason it itself will become a problem and hence its removal and replacement by new technologies is required.

Can taxation be allowed by transhumanism?

Of course. If it's built into society in such a way that its effective enforcement doesn't require punishment then it can be compatible with transhumanism. From a transhumanist perspective, a tax is simply a technology to alter the distribution of purchasing power. Of course, there are people who are out of principle opposed to taxation and they can be transhumanist. But opposition to taxation isn't a necessary part of transhumanism. Opposition to all taxation is allowed but not necessitated by transhumanism. An exception is of course all the taxes that require punishment to even be carried out. However, not all taxes do. A land value tax can for example simply be enforced by just not recognizing the land property claims of all those who don't pay it. No threat of punishment is required.

How will transhumanism be established in places that don't abide by it yet?

What holds back transhumanism is the traditional, punitive governing apparatus. In a society without punishment, there is nothing but technology that can help people and therefore they will automatically turn to it. This turn to technology will also cause more general tech-positivity among the people. Therefore, the only thing standing in the way of transhumanism is the fact that punitive systems still exist and that these systems will use all their punitive mechanisms to avoid themselves being replaced.

In order to build transhumanism one must do transhumanism. Achieve transhumanism by transhumanist means. There are many ways to do that. One can already build transhumanist problem-solving systems that people can approach to find solutions, building dual power against punishment. This would show people practically that the existing systems can be done away with and would provide a basis upon which to build more such systems whenever we manage to remove a punitive one. Also, transhumanist-built systems to help people and communities defend themselves against various threats can include threats of punishment, thus directly fighting against the punitive apparatus. Sabotaging said efforts. Any type of disruption of the punitive system that isn't punitive in itself can be considered transhumanist praxis. One of the easiest things to do on behalf of transhumanism is to simply live it personally and inspire. If you hear about problems in your community then think about them and tell people a technological solution if you find one. Be enthusiastic about technological development and share said enthusiasm. Don't participate in cheering if you hear about a bad person being punished. Lastly, one can even try to use the established political system to effect change. While this will prove to be difficult as the present, punitive apparatus will actively fight against changing itself it's not necessary to get rid of it only by such means. Politicians mentioning transhumanist principles at public events can get transhumanism into the public consciousness, reforms can weaken the system to make it more susceptible to attack, and they can be used to allow people to self-organize their communities more which opens the door for more transhumanist dual power. Here too I must say that these are merely suggestions and you can adapt them to whatever conditions you find yourself in. As long as both your methods and ends are transhumanist there is nothing to object to.

What is the transhumanist approach to geopolitics?

Transhumanism as a method isn't locally bound and thus knows no borders. Transhumanists do what they do independently of where they do it. Of course, certain methods are more or less effective in certain places, but their general aim remains the same. Build transhumanism within communities, use it instead of and against the existing system, use reforms in order to increase the effectiveness thereof, etc. As

stated above. These methods are differently effective in different places, but the fact that these are the methods and that they should be applied as effectively as possible remains. Thus, a geopolitical conflict is to us merely another particular condition to adapt to. Transhumanists should look at the world, see where punishment happens and what ways there are to stop it, and then do whatever disrupts the punitive systems most. They don't side with particular countries on conflicts, but merely see a conflict as a change of conditions in countries that our methods of fighting against punishment in either country have to adapt to. Transhumanism isn't about one country or another, it's about humanity fighting on behalf of technology against systems that were obsolete from the start and that hold us back. If a more punitive were to fight against a significantly less punitive one then it may be helpful against punishment to support the less punitive country, but even that should be done only by focusing sabotage efforts on the more punitive country. Weapons are tools that a state can use against its own population too, often in a punishing manner. Therefore, it should only be transhumanists and systems built by them directly that fight against the more punitive country to avoid that. No weapon aid should be sent to the less punitive country but transhumanist fighting efforts themselves should merely be concentrated on the more punitive one in order to avoid the less punitive country using them to be more punitive again. Meanwhile, non-lethal types of aid for the civilian population such as food or water should be provided to either side as it can't be abused by either country. Similarly, sanctions are to be opposed as they mainly make life worse for innocent bystanders. In short, whatever condition you find yourself in, use it to fight punishment as much as possible. A conflict is simply a change in said conditions.

How does transhumanism fit into history?

Transhumanism was discovered now because of the limits of liberalism. As liberalism has spread across the globe its systems have often allowed it to be overturned and turned into preliberal systems. Liberalism collapses by itself more often than by invasion or coup. There is something inherent to it that allows it to be hijacked and turned into totalitarianism. The mode of political action prior to liberalism can take over liberalism from the inside. Transhumanism explains that by saying that liberalism isn't sufficiently different from totalitarianism. Liberalism allows for both technological and punitive solutions like totalitarianism, as opposed to transhumanism which only allows for technological solutions. The difference is that liberalism believes in "rights", which are legal limits to punishment (in practice sometimes also to technology but I will steelman here). These rights are ensured by various types of societal technologies such as representative democracy or separation of powers. But since punishment is allowed in principle it can turn back into totalitarianism, or a society of unlimited punishment, at any time. Since the government is able to punish and therefore can use it as a defense against those who wish to receive or maintain having a right and

thus can use it against any demand for rights. If an institution to punish exists said institution must have the capacity to punish and if it decides to use said power in spite of the limitation by rights there is nothing within the institutions to stop them. Except maybe a more powerful punishing organization against them but then that organization has the power to do so. The most powerful punitive institution can only be stopped from using its power in a totalitarian manner if either the ones controlling the institution do so or the people rise up against it. In the first case, the goodwill of the ones in charge isn't a permanent guarantee but merely a kind concession, in the latter case if the people themselves have to fight for their rights that means the punitive institution has already decided to be totalitarian and now is the fight against that. A punitive organization is either totalitarian or not, and if it is not it is so by choice or people's force. By choice can't guarantee that it will stay that way and by force already means it's too late and already turned to totalitarianism and now has to be brought back to choosing not to be totalitarian. As transhumanism seeks to abolish all punitive entities and institutions this is no longer an issue. But to recognise that we had to go through liberalism first.

This means the reason transhumanism hasn't been discovered earlier isn't that people just weren't smart enough, but because the conditions to recognize that punishment must be done away with entirely haven't existed before. However, as opposed to socialism transhumanism can be applied at any stage of development. Since punishment is positively detrimental to any society it exists (thus there is no use) and technological development and its application can be done independently of the state of technology (the only difference it makes is in what can be developed, not in that technology can principally be developed) there's nothing stopping a slave or feudal society from becoming anti punitive. The only thing it's historically bound by is its discovery, not its applicability. If a discoverer of transhumanism were to time travel a book about it to ancient Rome where an emperor would apply it then it could be applied. Meanwhile seizing the means of production can only happen if there are means of production to seize.

How would a transhumanist society defend itself?

There exist people and institutions that wish to preserve the existence of punishment, how can they be defeated without punishing them? First, we need to undermine them as much as possible. On a global scale. Only by fighting them everywhere will we ever get zero punishment anywhere. Then, if these systems break down so much that the first regions without any punishment form, these regions will only have internal enemies to worry about. The regions that still have punishment will try to keep themselves punitive first before spreading punishment to places that no longer have it and the fact that places where punishment already doesn't exist require such drastic, global efforts to reach that in such a scenario everywhere would already have domestic

attacks on punishment. In short, to get rid of punishment somewhere we must attack everywhere, and the anti-punitive pockets that form won't have external enemies as the external punishing forces will already have their fighting to worry about. So, how do we defeat internal enemies? How do we stop people from rebuilding punitive institutions without punitive institutions of our own?

Firstly, the self-defense allowed and enhanced by transhumanist systems would still be able to defend people against punishment attempts and dismantle systems built within it.

Secondly, the longer a society is transhumanist the more people will unlearn punitive thinking. People growing up in a society in which punishment is actively fought will see their natural revenge instinct diminish and thus every society with an active fight against punishment within it will produce fewer and fewer people with a strongly expressed instinct to want punishment.

What is the relationship of Marxism to transhumanism?

Marxism is a descriptive philosophy. Marx changed his views on many things throughout his life, not to be popular or to fit in but quite the opposite. His ever-changing views brought him into conflict with the Prussian state, his comrades, and his political opponents. He changed his opinion because of his scientific and philosophical rigor. Therefore, if Marxism is anything it's adherence to Marx's method of finding out what's right and what it was generally aimed at. The critique of everything including himself. Marx himself described communism as "the real movement to abolish the present state of things", by which he meant the movement working within what is really possible that aims at advancing society as much as possible.

Transhumanism is the best method for such a movement to use. The abolition of punishment removes one of the ways that old society overstays its welcome, while the enhancement of and enthusiasm about technology further enhances the possibilities of new social arrangements. Engels even said that the government after the dictatorship of the proletariat would turn from a state to a mere "administration of things", implying a very similar arrangement.

What is the relationship of hedonism to transhumanism?

Hedonism gives an aim to transhumanism. Transhumanism as such is merely a political method that can be aimed at a myriad of goals. Hitherto we have simply talked about "problems" and transhumanist "solutions" in the abstract. Not of what

constitutes a problem or when we can talk of a solution or of societal improvement. Hedonism gives transhumanism a goal. The pleasure level of society must be increased. A problem is something that happens that decreases the general pleasure level of society. A solution is when said pleasure decrease is resolved. And society is improved if it changes in a way that the average member receives more pleasure.

Simultaneously it provides a more concrete ground on which to base opposition to punishment. Since punishment must by definition be unpleasant and, in a hedonist system, creating displeasure can only ever be justified by creating a greater amount of pleasure, placing the burden of proof upon the one who wishes to punish becomes a logical extension thereof.

Can other ideologies use transhumanism too?

Of course, as long as the ideology doesn't contain an inherent mode of action that is opposed to transhumanism they can adapt it as theirs. I welcome that. Every ideology immediately becomes improved if its system of finding truth and ethical aim is combined with the transhumanist method of getting from the is to the ought. Transhumanist praxis, by avoiding punishment, avoids ever making the worst mistakes of ideologies past. Prison camps and mass executions, for example. I welcome all people who wish to be transhumanists!

There is however one thing transhumanism seems quite incapable of. Supporting a conservative ethical system. "Conservatism" as a term implies ascribing some inherent value to the old. However, without punishment, one of the most common ways of conserving the old becomes closed off. You could still theoretically have "defensive" organizations to immediately protect old values and traditions while they are attacked, but there is no punitive way to enforce it after the fact. This will allow far greater attacks on old values that are no longer wanted and therefore provide more basis for a popular uprising against them to happen. Therefore, conservatives may find dealing with transhumanist methods inherently difficult.

Final thoughts

I will expand upon these points at a later time. This is intended as both an overview for newcomers as well as a guide to myself to what to build upon. These arguments will of course need to be put on a far more solid foundation. Especially the opposition to punishment and methods one can use instead need to be expanded on. However, for now, this is a sufficient basis to explain what I mean when I call myself a transhumanist.

The Ted K Archive

Principles of Transhumanism
2025

<archive.org/details/principles_of_transhumanism>

www.thetedkarchive.com