

FASTER, HIGHER, FURTHER, SMARTER...

Stefan Lorenz Sorgner

Abstract: *This paper examines contemporary transhumanism as a prominent cultural movement focused on human enhancement, exploring its distinct variants and their geopolitical, philosophical, and socio-technical implications. While conservative critics offer varied conceptualizations, ranging from existential warnings to ecclesiastical critiques, the movement itself is divided between classic transhumanism and alternative paradigms. Classic transhumanism, prominently championed within Silicon Valley by figures like Elon Musk and Peter Thiel, emphasizes a perfectionist ideal, views artificial intelligence as an existential risk, and addresses longevity via libertarian framework parameters. Conversely, this paper delineates “Euro-Transhumanism” as a non-perfectionist, process-oriented alternative that rejects the utopian pursuit of immortality in favor of a pragmatically extended healthy lifespan. Grounded in European cultural history, Euro-Transhumanism advocates for a democratic “data social contract” to counter both unchecked corporate profit and autocratic data surveillance. Furthermore, the paper engages with recent discourses on experimental governance, military resilience, and cultural relativism, validating the defense of Western liberal values and individual flourishing against both internal decadence and external autocratic threats. Ultimately, a holistic perspective is advanced, positioning technology as a contingent, situated tool for the realization of human interests.*

Keywords: *Transhumanism, Euro-Transhumanism, longevity, artificial intelligence, cultural heritage, data governance.*

The most significant contemporary cultural movement whose objectives relate to the enhancement of humanity is transhumanism. What transhumanism is, what it stands for and what significance it holds are questions to which even within the sciences there are widely differing answers.

I. Variants of Transhumanism

When Francis Fukuyama was asked by “Foreign Policy” magazine in 2004 about the most dangerous idea in the world, he wrote an article explaining why it was transhumanism (Fukuyama, 2004). Former Trump adviser Steve Bannon agrees with this assessment; in the foreword he wrote for the anti-transhumanist book *Dark Aeon* (Bannon, 2023), published in 2023, he also emphasises that the practice is far more serious than the theory, as the “world’s elite corporate overlords” and “the global institutions of finance, Wall Street, and Davos” are behind this cultural movement. By using the terms he highlights, he adds anti-Semitic connotations to the criticism. Bannon’s Russian kindred spirit, Dugin, with whom he personally discussed their shared preference for traditionalism in Rome in 2018, goes even further than this assessment, describing transhumanism as an idea of the devil that stands diametrically opposed to the truth of Christian Orthodoxy (Dugin, 2021). Russia’s turning away from the West is a turning away from transhumanism, which is said to go hand in hand with pluralism, liberalism and the LGBTQIA+ movement. Pope Leo XIV also spoke critically of transhumanism on 10 December 2025 (Cardiel, 2025). However, the focus of his conceptualisation lay on emphasising a fundamental stance that affirms “an immanent immortality” or “the prolongation of earthly life through technology”. He goes even further in his *ENCYCLICAL LETTER MAGNIFICA HUMANITAS* from 2026 (Leo XIV, 2026).

The world’s conservative forces therefore agree on the critical assessment of transhumanism, but not on its conceptualisation. This is also not so straightforward, as different variants of transhumanism must be distinguished. The fundamental transhumanism of Julian Huxley (1951) (1); the original transhumanism of Max More (More & Vita-More, 2013) (2); (3) the classic transhumanism of Nick Bostrom (2014); (4) the Euro-Transhumanism developed by myself (Sorgner, 2009; 2026). All variants endorse the central principle of transhumanism, namely that it is in our interest to go significantly beyond our current limitations in order to increase the likelihood of becoming a posthuman, as it can be assumed that this will improve our quality of life. It is widely understood that a “faster, higher, further, smarter” approach is in all our interests. However, the situation is not that simple. A clear conception of perfection is found exclusively in classic transhumanism. Moreover, Huxley and I agree that we reject the concept of perfection, and instead emphasise a process-oriented, ongoing process of transcendence. For this reason, morphological freedom also plays a particularly important role in these variants of transhumanism.

II. Classic Transhumanism

A widespread tendency, both in journalism and in academia, is to equate transhumanism with classic transhumanism, which had its intellectual home at the “Future of Humanity Institute” at the University of Oxford. This is due, among other things, to the fact that classic transhumanism has gained enormous prominence in Silicon Valley and within the current US administration over the past decade. The pragmatic, entrepreneurial and medical-technology variant of transhumanism, on the other hand, has its home in the genetics department at the University of Cambridge, where Aubrey de Grey worked for some time as a research associate. Bostrom’s focus was on the question of existential risks to humanity. It is this issue that Elon Musk is currently focusing on; Musk previously provided financial support to the “Future of Humanity Institute” led by Bostrom, wrote a blurb for one of Bostrom’s monographs, and publicly championed numerous ideas put forward by Bostrom. In this context, strong AI and superintelligence are often highlighted as particularly relevant challenges (Sorgner, 2026). Aubrey de Grey, on the other hand, regards the extension of healthy lifespan as the central human issue. This view is shared by Peter Thiel, which is why he has long supported initiatives, projects and institutes that promote this objective. At the start of their entrepreneurial careers, Musk and Thiel ran separate companies that eventually merged to form PayPal, making both of them multi-billionaires who also wield enormous influence over current US politics.

Peter Thiel was a major donor to Vance’s 2022 Senate campaign in Ohio, and Vance worked for Thiel’s venture capital firm, Mithril Capital. In 2021, Thiel was responsible for arranging a meeting between Vance and Trump, which led to Vance becoming Trump’s vice-presidential running mate. Together with James O’Neill, Thiel founded the Thiel Fellowship. From 2019 to 2021, James O’Neill was chairman of the SENS Research Foundation, whose objective is to prevent or reverse age-related diseases. This foundation evolved from the Methusaleh Foundation, co-founded by de Grey. Following his re-election as President of the United States of America in 2024, Donald Trump announced his intention to nominate James O’Neill for the post of Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services of the United States. He was eventually sworn in by Secretary Kennedy as Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) of the United States on 9 June 2025. Transhumanism exerts influence on US politics through Thiel and Musk.

In particular, the issue of extending human health plays a huge role in current discourse. This objective is generally shared within transhumanism. It is championed in particular by Vitalik Buterin, who founded the second-largest cryptocurrency (Ethereum), which was launched in 2015. In 2014, he received a Thiel Fellowship, which enabled him to realise his project. Pop-up cities are one way of promoting research in the field of longevity. In 2023, Buterin established the pop-

up city of Zuzalu in Montenegro, which played a significant role in the development of Vitalia, a decentralised city focused on longevity and biotechnological innovation in the Próspera Special Economic Zone in Roatán, Honduras, where several events on the topic of longevity took place. Leading gerontologist Aubrey de Grey was also involved in events in Roatán in 2024.

Roatán is a historic Caribbean island belonging to Honduras. Thiel was an investor and early supporter of Próspera, which is based there. The project was co-founded by entrepreneurs such as Erick Brimen. Erick Brimen remains the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the project and the key figure behind its development vision. The project is operated by the US-based private company Honduras Próspera Inc., which is financed by Pronomos Capital. Pronomos Capital, in turn, was founded by the anarcho-capitalist political scientist Patri Friedman. Peter Thiel was also among the investors. Patri Friedman is a libertarian activist best known for his advocacy of “experimental governance” through highly decentralised, market-oriented legal systems. He is the grandson of Milton Friedman, the Nobel laureate in economics, who is renowned for his advocacy of a free market economy. Vitalia illustrates how Próspera seeks to foster thematic hubs. Vitalia is home to purpose-driven sub-communities dedicated to biotechnology and longevity.

Bryan Johnson’s much-publicised longevity experiments also took place on this island. Bryan Johnson was in Roatán to undergo an experimental gene therapy (including a follistatin treatment from the biotech company Minicircle), which was featured in a Netflix documentary. The film is titled “Don’t Die: The Man Who Wants to Live Forever” and was released on Netflix in 2025. This brought the topic to the attention of a vast audience.

However, Peter Thiel not only supports projects aimed at longevity, but also those focused on performance enhancement in general. This includes, for example, the first edition of the Enhanced Games (held in 2026 at Resorts World in Las Vegas, USA). This is a private sporting event that deliberately permits performance-enhancing measures and, in a sense, celebrates them. The aim is to scientifically enhance the human body and break records with the help of high-tech, medicine, and biology, rather than limiting performance under traditional anti-doping rules. Alongside Peter Thiel, German billionaire Christian Angermayer also supports the Enhanced Games, of which he is a co-founder. He too is widely regarded as a proponent of transhumanist ideas.

A new player in this context is Alexander Karp, who is not a transhumanist. The CEO of Palantir co-authored the book *The Technological Republic* with Nicholas W. Zamiska, which was published by Penguin Random House in 2025. In contrast to the visionary, libertarian, and transhumanist ideas of Musk and Thiel, he addresses the political and military dimensions of such visions, for which AI also represents a paradigm shift, bringing Palantir into the picture. It should be noted that, at least for the time being, the visionary ideas of Musk and Thiel must still be realised within

the framework of nation states that hold a monopoly on the use of force. Should Musk and Thiel's projects come under attack, they cannot defend themselves on their own, as they have neither the right nor the means to use force. However, as AI becomes increasingly important in relation to armed conflicts, Palantir, in cooperation with the US government, has the opportunity to forge an even stronger alliance in this area as well. Karp's reflections on this matter have received significant public attention following Palantir's publication on 26 April 2026 of a 22-point manifesto on X, summarising the key points of the book *The Technological Republic* (Palantir Technologies, 2026). In particular, the manifesto highlighted the political and military conditions relevant to the realisation of Musk and Thiel's visions, as they cannot, after all, defend themselves against attacks by military means alone. The final three points of the manifesto are particularly noteworthy:

20. The pervasive intolerance of religious belief in certain circles must be resisted. The elite's intolerance of religious belief is perhaps one of the most telling signs that its political project constitutes a less open intellectual movement than many within it would claim.

21. Some cultures have produced vital advances; others remain dysfunctional and regressive. All cultures are now equal. Criticism and value judgements are forbidden. Yet this new dogma glosses over the fact that certain cultures and indeed subcultures— ...—have produced wonders. Others have proven middling, and worse, regressive and harmful.

22. We must resist the shallow temptation of a vacant and hollow pluralism. We, in America and more broadly the West, have for the past half century resisted defining national cultures in the name of inclusivity. But inclusion into what? (Palantir Technologies, 2026)

Here he explicitly affirms the achievements of the West, but criticises the fact that it has turned so strongly against the religious traditions from which it developed and which are substantively aligned with it, presumably referring to the Judeo-Christian tradition. At the same time, he criticises the West's empty pluralism, which in some quarters actively champions precisely those traditions that are hostile to Western values, presumably referring to indigenous and oppressed cultures, to which Western universities are particularly committed. Yet within these circles, the Judeo-Christian tradition is often the subject of particularly critical commentary and is frequently even mocked.

Coeckelbergh's reaction is characteristic of the academic culture under criticism (Coeckelbergh, 2026); he accuses Karp of precisely what Karp seeks to protect the West from: the end of liberal democracies. Karp explicitly affirms the liberal values of the West when he writes the following:

13. No other country in the history of the world has advanced progressive values more than this one. The United States is far from perfect. But it is easy to forget how much more opportunity exists in this country for those who are not hereditary elites than in any other nation on the planet. (Palantir Technologies, 2026)

Karp primarily emphasises that we will be overrun by autocratic systems unless we also defend ourselves militarily against their attacks. This is an important point that does not play a central role within Musk's and Thiel's visions. To accuse Karp of advocating a techno-fascism based on the blind rule of algorithms clearly misses the point of his intentions and cannot be justified by his statements in the manifesto. The first point of the manifesto makes his appreciation of a liberal culture immediately clear: "1. Silicon Valley owes a moral debt to the country that made its rise possible. The engineering elite of Silicon Valley has an affirmative obligation to participate in the defense of the nation" (Palantir Technologies, 2026).

Karp explicitly emphasises his appreciation of culture and his lack of focus on algorithmic solutions in point 3: "3. Free email is not enough. The decadence of a culture or civilisation, and indeed its ruling class, will be forgiven only if that culture is capable of delivering economic growth and security for the public" (Palantir Technologies, 2026).

Whether a libertarian culture such as that of the US or a social-liberal one such as that of the EU is better suited to this is a separate question. Karp makes a valid point. What is crucial is the relevance of defending one's own, albeit possibly contingent, identity of values. A flourishing culture must also be able to defend itself militarily if it does not wish to be taken over by another. Coeckelbergh's critique of Karp's manifesto is paradigmatic of the critiques levelled by numerous academics, to whom Karp referred with the expression decadence of the ruling class. He confuses the threat to democracy posed by authoritarian states from outside with the tools required to defend it from within. Karp does not wish to abolish democracy; he wishes to prevent it from naively perishing due to a lack of resilience.

Karp explicitly sees his position as a defense of Western liberal societies. Critics such as Coeckelbergh, however, object that the close connection between the technological elite, the security apparatus and cultural re-hierarchisation could generate structural tensions with pluralistic democracies. The dispute therefore concerns less Karp's stated intentions than the institutional and political consequences of his vision.

The point on re-hierarchisation from point 21 of the manifesto is particularly intriguing. There is a tendency, particularly among intellectuals at universities who endorse critical posthumanism, to oppose any form of hierarchization. Any ultimate justification for hierarchies has become implausible, and moreover, hierarchies

imply violence, oppression, and structures of exclusion, which is why they should be avoided and deconstructed.

This line of reasoning is a non sequitur. The fact that there is no ultimate justification for hierarchies does not mean that hierarchies are no longer tenable. The opposite is the case. Hierarchies are a practical necessity. As soon as I say yes to one action, I am saying no to many others. It is practically necessary to say yes at every moment, which is why hierarchies represent a practical necessity. This does not necessarily create a new essentialism; rather, a “yes” can also be based on a contingent identity.

When Karp speaks of the superiority of Western culture, this need not imply cultural imperialism or neo-colonialism. It can also mean nothing more than an affirmation of one’s own situated identity. This is who I am, and this is how I act, because I, for myself, and we, for ourselves, identify these cultural structures with a successful life.

In Nigeria, there are many people who believe in magic, witchcraft, and shamanism. It often happens that young girls are accused of witchcraft, which in turn can lead to them being burned alive. This is by no means a rare phenomenon; although it is also prohibited in Nigeria, it is often not prosecuted, as the belief is shared by parts of the population (Sorgner, 2026).

Are Western values superior to the belief in magic held by parts of the Nigerian population? In terms of a final justification, I do not assume this to be the case; however, Western values are part of my identity, just as the belief in magic is part of the identity of those people in Nigeria who burn young girls alive because they are accused of witchcraft.

How should one proceed in such a situation? Should the person striving to save the young girls be accused of neo-colonialism? It should be noted that a distinction must be made here between different concepts of truth. Philosophical truth in correspondence with reality, religious truth based on faith, scientific truth accompanied by the principle of induction, human truths that take into account the psychophysiological conditions of human perceptual abilities, and cultural truths affirmed within specific socio-temporal units. It is important to always specify which truth is being analyzed, discussed or talked about, e.g. it is possible to affirm perspectivism from a philosophical perspective, but the belief in a specific monotheistic truth from a religious perspective, as religious judgements are grounded in belief and not in a philosophical justification. In my view, neo-colonialism is only present when a group assumes it possesses a truth grounded in ultimate reality and seeks to impose this on the rest of the world by force. Is this what happens when someone saves a girl from being burned? This need not be the case. The person concerned may accept that their own position has no better epistemological foundation than that of those who believe in witchcraft. Nevertheless, the person concerned may assume that the protection of the physical

integrity of minors is such a central part of their own identity that intervention in this case constitutes a personal necessity. However, this does not constitute neo-colonialism. In this case, the person in question certainly allows those who think differently to live and think in their own way. Intervention occurs here only when direct violence is inflicted on a person without their consent, or, as in this instance, when direct violence is inflicted on a minor.

Karp says nothing else in the manifesto. His criticism of certain contemporary Western leaders is rather that they stand by and watch girls being burned and justify such an attitude as a means of avoiding neo-colonialism. Here, it would be far more appropriate to resort to violence in order to defend the more “vital culture”, namely the culture in which it is forbidden to burn eight-year-old girls alive as witches. I agree with this assessment, even if I do not speak of a “vital culture”, but rather of the culture which I endorse and which is widely shared, at least in the Western context. It is a component of Euro-Transhumanism, which I present below as an alternative to classic transhumanism.

In connection with the last point, the following should also be noted: empty cultural relativism is self-contradictory as soon as it becomes normative. When someone says: “You must not intervene, because that is neo-colonialism,” they are themselves claiming a normative position that is supposed to apply across cultures. They therefore regard their own standard (non-intervention, cultural relativism) as universally valid. This objection can just as easily be described as ‘Eurocentric’ as its opposite, only made invisible.

III. Euro-Transhumanism

In the previous section, a number of key challenges associated with the classic transhumanism espoused by Musk and Thiel have already come to the fore: libertarianism, utopianism, AI as an existential risk, and immortality as a goal.

Aubrey de Grey, Peter Thiel, transhumanist organisations and biotech start-ups regularly use the term “immortality” as a metaphorical description of radical life extension, with the focus on preventing ageing processes, repairing damage and indefinitely extending the healthy lifespan. The term is a common motivational and fundraising tool in the context of classic transhumanism. Euro-Transhumanism considers the use of this word to be disingenuous. Instead, one should always speak of the relevance of the extended healthspan. It is indeed fascinating that in some psychological studies, as many as eighty per cent of respondents emphasised that living beyond the age of 120 would be in their interest, provided they were healthy at that point (Donner, 2016). Psychological studies thus confirm that most people associate an extended healthy lifespan with an improvement in quality of life. It is this area of transhumanism that is currently the subject of the most intensive research.

In particular, the interface between AI and biotechnologies is of enormous significance, as it stands to reason that exciting breakthroughs can be expected due to the immense power of AI. In this context, however, the question of how to handle digital data becomes important, as the success of AI systems is crucially linked to the volume of digital data. However, access to this data is made enormously difficult in the EU by the General Data Protection Regulation. It is to be expected that this will result in significant challenges for the EU, as many researchers emphasise that data is the new oil, i.e. the new source of power, money and influence. Given the difficulties associated with comprehensive data collection in the EU, it is likely that the economic, scientific, and entrepreneurial gap between the EU and the US, and particularly China, will widen further. A radical rethink is needed here if Europe's further decline is to be prevented.

For pragmatic reasons, I consider it necessary to allow comprehensive personalised data collection. Data are the new oil. However, it must be ensured that the data are primarily monitored by algorithms. People should only have access to this data in exceptional cases, as the risk of corruption is too high. The collection should be carried out by a European political institution, as I have more trust in such an institution than in a profit-driven US company. In this way, a European social credit system could even emerge. However, this is not a utopia, as critics claim, but a vision. Visions are based on scientific findings and are achievable, which is not the case with utopias. There is a Chinese social credit system, so in principle there could also be a European one, which I would, however, prefer to call a data social contract. The Chinese system supports the flourishing of an autocratic state. The European one, on the other hand, should promote the interests of the European population. The profits generated by digital data should be used to support a universal public health insurance scheme and to expand its scope. Then we would indeed be using digital data in our own democratic interest. At present, data merely serves to increase the wealth of US tech companies and bolster the stability of an autocratic state. In my view, this insight is central when it comes to AI.

This assessment also implies that it is highly implausible to regard AI systems as an existential risk, as is often done in classic transhumanism. Classifying AI systems as existential risks implies that strong AI, that is, AI possessing all human capabilities, or even a superintelligence, an AI whose capabilities extend far beyond those of strong AI, will emerge in the near future. This cannot be assumed. What does it mean to possess all human capabilities? Does this not also include emotional intelligence, musical intelligence, or athletic intelligence? Are consciousness, self-awareness, intentionality, and emotionality not central human capabilities? At present, there is not even such a thing as digital life.

Stephen Hawking, on the other hand, claims that computer viruses are already a form of digital life (Watts, 1994). Biologists disagree, as computer viruses, like regular viruses, have no metabolism, i.e. they cannot generate energy independently

through eating. Nor is there anything as fundamental as intentionality. Only when a self-driving car decides to head for the North Sea to enjoy the refreshing sea air would we likely be confronted with something akin to digital intentionality. Assuming that digital intentionality is something fundamentally different from human intentionality is unhelpful, as the very point of strong AI is to possess the same capabilities as humans.

All conscious beings are carbon-based and alive. Digital life does not yet exist. Carbon-based life forms, on the other hand, emerged around a billion years after the Earth's formation. How life came about three and a half billion years ago is still entirely unclear. The last common ancestors of humans and great apes lived around six million years ago. Written language likely emerged around 3400 BCE in Mesopotamia. The iPhone was unveiled to the public in 2007. Even if digital life were to emerge in the near future, we would still be a long way from digital intentionality. In response to such considerations, classic transhumanism argues that Moore's Law should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, this law is not a law of nature, but a self-fulfilling prophecy. Whilst the emergence of digital life, consciousness, and intentionality cannot be ruled out, this does not mean that we must expect a superintelligence to soon view humans as enemies and endeavour to destroy them or put them in a zoo. To view AI as an existential threat, however, implies precisely this. This is not to be expected in the near future. Classic transhumanism, which advocates this view, is likely more concerned with diverting attention from the actual challenges posed by AI. These relate to digital data: who owns it, where it is stored, and who provides the infrastructure for it. These are, in fact, the burning issues surrounding AI.

Under a libertarian approach to digital data, as advocated by classic transhumanism and practiced in the US, such data is collected, sold, and utilised in a way that promotes the financial gain, political influence and reputation of the company. In Europe, by contrast, the General Data Protection Regulation is structured in such a way that collecting digital data is difficult. For this reason, I have called for a rethink, so that the financial profit from existing data is finally used in a democratic spirit and in the interests of the EU population, with the revenue generated in this way forming the basis for our social security systems, in particular for universal public health insurance. Digital data should not be used to boost the wealth of tech companies, but rather to provide everyone with access to universal health insurance, as this is the best way to improve the general quality of life.

IV. Cultural Heritage in the Age of Technological Acceleration

My central concern is to explore the question of the relevance of our cultural heritage in an age of rapid technological change: can cultural traditions survive as humans and machines reinvent themselves? The reflections outlined suggest that the

multitude of technical innovations does not necessarily mean that they must be accompanied by a rise in US-style libertarianism, hedonism, and utilitarianism, simply because many of the technologies were developed in the US. We must strive to think through, in a complex manner, what it means when European cultural history encounters technical innovations from Silicon Valley. We can, want to, and should preserve the key achievements of our cultural history. This is, in fact, essential for a thriving Europe. However, this requires a radical shift in thinking so that we can benefit from the enormous gains associated with the latest technologies without having to abandon our own cultural achievements. Relying solely on traditional answers is not enough.

It is important for all of us to engage with the tension between traditional values and the possibilities of self-determination. This is not only about the ethical and philosophical implications of human enhancement, but also about its social, artistic, and cultural dimensions. From the ongoing debates on human dignity and moral responsibility to the recognition of the transformative power of art and music, a holistic perspective should be developed that arises from the following question: What does it mean to be human in the 21st century?

I have developed Euro-Transhumanism to emphasise that European cultural history is accompanied by enormous achievements to which we should refer, with which we should engage, and on the basis of which alternative assessments of how to deal with the latest technologies emerge (Sorgner, 2022b). The old, white, male philosopher need not carry discriminatory implications. It is not necessary to engage exclusively with indigenous practices. The True, the Good, and the Beautiful can be retained as guiding principles, provided they are not accompanied by a claim to ultimate, unquestionable judgements. The future needs its origins. A return to the past, as championed in conservative circles and among nature lovers, is neither a realistic nor a desirable objective. A naïve attempt to overcome the past through libertarian or radical left-wing objectives is equally implausible, given the stability of established structures. Rather than speaking of overcoming the true, the good, and the beautiful, these categories should be twisted. The aim here is to acknowledge the existence of different strands and to bring them into an alternative order, to twist them. If this were to succeed, the latest technologies could be enormously helpful in promoting the incredible diversity of personal flourishing. This vision is not accompanied by a naïve “faster, higher, further, and smarter”. Nor does it accept the ideal of a naïve return to a natural world as absurd. Humans have always incorporated technical elements—“We have always been cyborgs” (Sorgner, 2022a). What matters is using technology in such a way that, with its support, our interests can be realised. I am therefore already looking forward to a further open exchange on these relevant, pressing and challenging issues.

In conclusion, I would also like to return to Karp’s apt observations. Cultural achievements must be defended, even by military means, for otherwise

authoritarian, paternalistic and fascist structures will take hold. Even though our structures, like all others, have developed contingently, they are nonetheless the structures we value and wish to preserve, as we assume that they help us to pursue a wide diversity of conceptions of the good life. Karp is not advocating technofascism here, but has aptly drawn attention to the relevance of the military to cultures.

I firmly reject any suggestion that Euro-Transhumanism is guilty of neo-Eurocentrism. Euro-Transhumanism is not based on a naïve, arrogant universalism that seeks to impose Western standards on other cultures. It stems from a pragmatic assessment of our current situation: pluralism and liberal democracy are the values we share in Europe because they have proven to be the most plausible tools for enabling a flourishing life.

This stance is radically open: should another value system demonstrably provide better answers to these pressing questions of our existence, I would be the first to be willing to learn from it and adapt it. However, as long as this is not the case, the defense of our model is not an act of hegemony, but a necessary assertion of our identity against genuine cultural imperialism from outside, which seeks to destroy our hard-won spaces of diversity and individual freedom.

AI Disclosure

AI tools were used for translation purposes. All ideas and arguments are those of the author.

References

- Bannon, S. K. (2023). Foreword. In J. J. Allen, *Dark Aeon: Transhumanism and the War Against Humanity*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, strategies, dangers*. Oxford University Press.
- Cardiel, V. (2025, December 10). Pope Leo XIV criticizes transhumanism: 'Death is not opposed to life'. *EWTN News*. <https://www.ewtnnews.com/vatican/pope-leo-xiv-criticizes-transhumanism-death-is-not-opposed-to-life>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2026, April 21). Palantir's manifesto: Technofascism in plain sight. *Medium*. <https://coeckelbergh.medium.com/palantirs-manifesto-technofascism-in-plain-sight-c160ca377e9a>
- Donner, Y., Fortney, K., Calimport, S. R., Pflieger, K., Shah, M., & Betts LaCroix, J. (2016). Great desire for extended life and health amongst the American public. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 6, 353.

- Dugin, A. (2021). Über den Transhumanismus. In W. A. Schipkow (Ed.), *Nach dem Menschen: Ideologie und Propaganda des Transhumanismus* (Philosophia Eurasia, No. 7, pp. 133–137). Edition Hagia Sophia.
- Fukuyama, F. (2004, September/October). The world's most dangerous ideas: Transhumanism. *Foreign Policy*, 144, 42–43.
- Leo XIV. (2026, May 15). Magnifica humanitas: Encyclical letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIV on safeguarding the human person in the time of artificial intelligence. *Vatican*. <https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiv/en/encyclicals/documents/20260515-magnifica-humanitas.html>
- Huxley, J. (1951). Knowledge, morality, and destiny. *Psychiatry*, 14(2), 129–140.
- Karp, A. C. & Zamiska, N. W. (2025). *The Technological Republic: Hard power, soft belief, and the future of the West*. Crown Publishing Group.
- More, M., & Vita More, N. (Eds.) (2013). *The Transhumanist Reader: Classical and contemporary essays on the science, technology, and philosophy of the human future*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Palantir Technologies [@PalantirTech]. (2026, April 18). Post content or description of the post [Post]. X. <https://x.com/PalantirTech/status/2045574398573453312?lang=de>.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2009). Nietzsche, the overhuman, and transhumanism. *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, 20(1), 29–42.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2022a). *We have always been cyborgs: Digital data, gene technologies, and an ethics of transhumanism*. Bristol University Press.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2022b). On constructive and destructive interferences in the life and in art worlds: A reply. *Deliberatio: Studies in Contemporary Philosophical Challenges*, 2(2), 170–186.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2026). *Euro-Transhumanism: Twisting truth, goodness, beauty*. Bristol University Press.
- Watts, S. (1994, August 4). Hawking says computer virus is form of life: Susan Watts on a man-made menace that mirrors its namesake in Nature. *Independent*. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/hawking-says-computer-virus-is-form-of-life-susan-watts-on-a-manmade-menace-that-mirrors-its-namesake-in-nature-1374137.html>