



HUMAN AT THE HEART OF LABOUR PEDAGOGY RESEARCH

Waldemar Furmanek

ORCID: 0000-0002-1032-4266

University of Rzeszow

e-mail: furmanek@ur.edu.pl

Keywords: human, theoretical models of human, marxism, liberalism, personalism, transhumanism

Abstract. Human research is constantly producing new results. Despite this, a human is still a mysterious subject of research in various scientific disciplines. This also applies to labour pedagogy. Realizing the fact that only humans work, labour pedagogy is faced with the need to explain the phenomena concerning a working person. In the presented study, I discuss various concepts of a human being, being the basis for building pedagogical ideas referring to Marxism, liberalism, personalism and transhumanism.

CZŁOWIEK W CENTRUM BADAŃ PEDAGOGIKI PRACY

Słowa kluczowe: człowiek, teoretyczne modele człowieka, marksizm, liberalizm, personalizm, transhumanizm

Streszczenie. Badania nad człowiekiem dostarczają ciągle nowych wyników. Pomimo tego człowiek ciągle jest tajemniczym obiektem badań różnych dyscyplin naukowych. Dotyczy to także pedagogiki pracy. Uświadamiając fakt, że pracuje wyłącznie człowiek, pedagogika pracy staje wobec konieczności wyjaśnienia zjawisk dotyczących człowieka pracującego. W prezentowanym opracowaniu przedstawiam różne koncepcje człowieka stanowiące podstawę do budowy idei pedagogicznych odwołujących się do marksizmu, liberalizmu, personalizmu i transhumanizmu.

Introduction

Currently – in addition to the war in Ukraine – we are experiencing the phenomena of a so-called *hybrid war*. It has the character of **an axiological war (ideological war)**. It is a war based on a strategy combining, at the same time and on the same battlefield, hybrid conventional, cyber, terrorism and criminal actions, all for political gain. Such warfare is often waged without official declaration (at the so-called *subliminal level*). One extremely important dimension of axiological warfare is the **battle for human beings** (Furmanek, 2013b). This requires an understanding of **anthropological assumptions**, answering the questions of **who a human is** and **what their key characteristics are**. This is needed to plan activities that change their consciousness. The further development of pedagogical science, including labour pedagogy, depends on the answer to this question. These are the so-called first questions of all sub-disciplines of pedagogy. We consider the answers to these questions to be the **paradigms of pedagogy**.

The post-modern dispute over the mystery of man focuses on the search for answers to the first questions of pedagogy formulated years ago by I. Kant. These questions are multidimensional in nature. Here are the basic ones of these dimensions: What can I say? (the question of metaphysics, ontology); What should I do? How to live? (question of ethics); What am I allowed to expect? (question of religion); What (who) is man? (question of anthropology); Who am I: I-man? One can agree with Max Scheler, who wrote that „all the central problems of philosophy can, in a certain sense, be reduced to the question of **who a human is and what metaphysical place and position they occupy within the totality of entities, the world and in relation to God**” (Scheler, 1987).

The post-modern dispute over the mystery of man is still present in research and scientific discourse. Despite undoubted scientific achievements, man is still a mystery. This claim encompasses all dimensions of man. A human, the discoverer of so many secrets of nature themselves, must be constantly rediscovered. Still remaining an „unknown being” to some extent, they still demand a new and increasingly mature description of this being. Above all, it seems significant that we strive to understand the human person for their own sake, in order to respond

to this challenge brought by the human experience in all its richness, as well as the existential problems of man in the modern world (Mruszczyk, 2010)¹.

Anthropological error and its consequences

The essence of naturalism – taken for granted by many researchers – is **an inappropriate conception of man**, reducing humans to natural entities. According to this, in the opinion of the representatives of this trend, a human should be studied in accordance with the paradigms of natural science methodology (Pieja, 2020). The error of naturalism is an expression of methodological reductionism, revealed, among other things, by the proliferation of quantitative research and the use of statistics. And behind all the proposals of reductionism is the **objectification of human beings and human life**, treating human beings as equal to other biological organisms².

This error – called the anthropological error – is expressed in the adoption of a naturalistic model of man, and this means adopting *an erroneous image of man* (Pieja, 2020). The very core of the so-called „anthropological error” lies in the fact that man is seen and treated fragmentarily. This is because the whole sphere of man’s spirituality is usually left out of the analysis, which leads to *a false understanding of the essence of man*.

The result of the anthropological error is, among other things, the **depreciation of personal dignity**, and the **deprivation of human freedom** which is expressed in decision-making. Indoctrination, degradation of professional ethos, imposition of political correctness, deformation of culture or commercialization of democracy all lead to this (Chudy, 2003). The importance of error is also revealed in analyses of individualism and collectivism.

A consequence of the anthropological error is also the proliferation of **individualism**, or concern for **one’s own material well-being**. The so-called „quality of life” is interpreted most often or exclusively in terms of economic efficiency, disordered consumerism, attractions and pleasures derived from physical life, while the deeper – relational, spiritual and religious – dimensions of existence are forgotten (Furmanek, 2016).

¹ In 2021, eleven new facts have been uncovered concerning only the corporeality of man. What about man’s mental and spiritual realm?

² Naturalism was fully developed in the behaviorist model of man. Nowadays, we can vividly see its use in the views of transhumanism aiming at the construction of *a transhuman*, and then *a posthuman*.

Not the least consequence of the spread of the anthropological error to the extreme is the **development of collectivism** as a category in social theories. Proponents of collectivism place the good of the group above that of the individual. Collectivism is the product of two distinct worldviews: liberal and communist.

As I noted, **atheism takes the naturalistic model of man as its basis and sees no significant difference between anthropology and zoology**, and denies the existence of the peculiar functions and properties (attributes) of man as someone who is significantly different from animals. In this system, there is only room for a caricature of man as someone who is only a slightly „doddering” animal. The above view also applies to liberal (neoliberal) currents, but also to neo-Marxism (cultural Marxism). According to representatives of these currents, there is no **difference between drives and freedom, between instinct and love**, as a volitional phenomenon (Furmanek, 2009)³. The consequences of the functioning of these views in the lives of individuals and societies require separate studies.

Multiple views of the human model

Over the past two centuries, various attempts have been made to point out what is essential in a human. Such an attempt was made by **materialism**, largely responsible for the totalitarian and practitioner mindset of modern man; materialism, which ruled that man is nothing but a highly complex matter (Furmanek, 2019).

At the antipodes to the materialist conception of a man stood **idealism**, especially in the view of Hegel, who stated that what is primary and real in all reality is only spirit, which is absolute. This impersonal spirit, according to Hegel, develops in the process of self-realization into the matter and finally comes to the realization of itself in a human, who therefore in their deepest essence is the self-development of the divine spirit, not a creation of God Almighty.

From the experience of the phenomena of dynamically developing societies, the so-called **sociologizing image of man was born**, which expresses the belief that the human individual is nothing in itself and that they are merely something

³ Cf. chapter: *Transhumanism – the greatest threat to man and community*, in W. Furmanek, *Threats to the personal world of values* (in print).

that grows out of the whole. „You are nothing” – tell us the proponents of this concept. „It is the society that is everything” – sociologists state.

Sociologism, on the other hand, is opposed to **individualism**, which states that in reality only the individual is of value, since what is right is always lost in the multitude. **Determinism**, according to which everything is subject to irrevocable, impersonal compulsion, takes an even different view of man. Everything in human life happens as it must happen, and no one or nothing can free us from the iron hoop of our fate, adherents of this view state.

In contrast to determinism, the independence of the human individual is accentuated by **existentialism**, which sees them as completely, even desperately free, and at the same time devoid of any support. According to existentialists, there are no rules that define the life of human beings. They are similar to a solitary atom flitting about in the vacuum into which they have been thrown. They decide for themselves on their sovereign, and at the same time boundlessly desperate freedom. A human being gives themselves meaning, which is already absurd by definition. In addition to the above-mentioned attempts to define **what a human being really is**, there are other opposing approaches to this problem.

The first of these, related to so-called **processualism**, states that it is not at all possible to determine what a human is, since they are a reality, they are subject to a process of continual becoming, that man is the result and outcome of continual encounters and collisions with the world, with history, with a myriad of people and their affairs, as well as with the challenges and tasks of the time in which they have come to live.

This view is opposed to the realistic conception of man as a child of God, the constant echo of which is found in the teaching of the Catholic Church, and which defines what belongs to the essence of humanity and what does not; which treats this essence as a human, immortal, God-created soul, remaining in indissoluble connection with the body, constituting an unchangeable element, the same always and everywhere. From the above considerations, it is clear that there are different, opposing and even contradictory conceptions of man, which cannot be reconciled⁴.

⁴ Furmanek W., *Man at the center of the research of labour pedagogy* (in print)

Humanistic model of man

In the *newspeak* popularized thanks to liberalism, we experience the rape carried out on the content of concepts. Insidious senses change their meaning (Furmanek, 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to ask the question: what is now hidden in the content of the term *humanism, humanist*?

As I understand it, humanism is the way in which man, at a given moment in history (and in a particular personal and social cultural space), **understands, values and expresses in their works what distinguishes them from things and from animals, what constitutes them in their true greatness** (Furmanek, 2013a). In every form of humanism, there is a certain conception of man, inexpressible in definition (*Moral Dimension of Culture...*).

Humanists consider the fact if something facilitates the development of man and their humanity, improving their relationship with other people, as well as with the environment of their life as a measure of the usefulness, rightness and desirability of the existence of a thing, or the products of labour.

Humanists will positively evaluate, for example, only such conduct that directs toward the good of man, toward their noble sensations, feelings and moral choices. They will refer negative evaluations to results and actions that satisfy lower material or pleasure needs. In this context, it is also worth noting that for a humanist, the measure of things may not be work (as a form of activity), but the working man. We speak, for example, not about the dignity of labour, but about **the dignity of the working man** (Furmanek 2020a, Furmanek 2020b).

For the humanist, it is particularly important to turn **from** determining what a person should be due to immediate social needs, **to** what they can be due to their own creative activity in an already changed living environment. Attempts have been made to catalogue those qualities of man that are of a constitutive nature.

From the plethora of catalogues presenting the model of the multidimensional man, I cite the one presented by Renata Tomaszewska after Urszula Ostrowska. It represents the result of an analysis conducted by R. Tomaszewska (Tomaszewska, 2021). A person is:

- 1) a unique (one-time...W.F) **person**, distinguished from all other entities by the highest development of the psyche and social life, as well as the ability to think and reconstruct abstractly, to consciously decide on their actions and to have higher feelings;

- 2) **an individual** capable of subjecting their own existence to reflection and understanding, to a sense of moral responsibility for actions taken or not taken;
- 3) **a being** characterized by the capacity for internal self-control and moral self-reflection, possessing the inalienable dignity of *dignitas hominis*, which defines the special status of the human being;
- 4) **the individual** has the ability to create... they use the language to influence humanity stimulatingly to the point of creative fulfilment (Tomaszewska, 2021, p. 59).

U. Ostrowska adds that man is an entity distinguished from all other entities. We say that man is an axiological entity. Their identity is experienced by inalienable **dignity, self-determination and self-reliance** externalized in the functioning of the will, but also reasonable **responsibility** (Ostrowska, 2017).

A human being is a person – it is a complex *compositum* of body and spirit, will and intellect – functioning in an impenetrable wealth of diverse values...making value judgments about the surrounding reality... this **uniqueness of the human** being among living beings is a privilege that distinguishes the human species. Human life is all the more valuable the more *it is saturated with values and value-making processes*, as well as the realization of declared values and the results experienced as a result.

Personalistic model of man

Nowadays, it seems particularly important for pedagogy to pay attention to the personalistic conception of the person and their systemic approach, which promotes the constitutive values of man as a person. The classical philosophical definition of a person constructed by Boethius defines a person as „an individual substance of rational nature” (Furmanek 2018). This means that „a person is an entity that is indivisible, possessing the attributes of reason and will, by virtue of which it has a consciousness of its mental self.” As Archbishop I. Dec notes: *only personalistic humanism in the Thomistic edition most objectively and integrally describes and explains man, showing them as a personal being, as an incarnate spirit, fulfilling themselves in life in the context of truth, goodness and beauty, as a rational and free being, capable of knowing and loving* (Dec, 2003, p. 17).

Personalism opposes the reduction of man to their social role. It differs from **individualism** in its belief in the possibility of harmony between the interests of the community and its individual members. Advocates of personalism believe

that because this world is God's, it is possible to care for one's own well-being in such a way that it is at the same time a **social service**, and at the same time to care for the common good in such a way that it is my own way through life. The personalist solution is true only on the condition that the ultimate dimension of our humanity is **love**. If this is not true, or if we do not believe it, then the personalist solution will be just an idealistic pipe dream that should be thrown in the trash.

Personalism appears in philosophy as an idea expressed in a multitude of varieties resulting from slightly different interpretations of its basic assumptions, but their common features include: advocating the autonomy of persons, their dignity and their ability to transcend nature and history. The term refers to the Greek word *prosopon* (person) and is applied to all currents and theories that expose the person as an autonomous being with dignity and reason (Furmanek, 2018).

The fulfilment of a person in an act in moral terms takes place whenever a person performs the act. This is because every act has an axiological reference – it is morally good or bad (Galarovich, 1996).

Personalism is an ontological-axiological conception of man as a person who is an entity in and for themselves. Being part of the material world, they surpass it with their supernatural reference. The person is endowed with due rights and as such is a constituent part of the family and other communities⁵.

A person, a phenomenon of reality, an axiological entity (which is a value) is taken by us from the point of view of **values** (Furmanek, 2017). We often define this value system as a personal **axiological space**. In it, we find the individual axiological categories (values and anti-values), and it is in the personal and social dimensions that they bring unquestionable personal benefits to those who practice them. For values:

- give life meaning, which is the source of our happiness and sense of fulfilment,
- are a signpost in relations with people and are an important element of good
- interpersonal communication,
- make it easier to make the right decisions and achieve lasting success,

⁵ Christian personalism is built on the basis of Christian metaphysics and the anthropology of St. Thomas Aquinas, and refers to the Boeotian definition of the person as a unitary substance of rational nature.

- constitute an internal brake on immoral behaviour,
- protect against demoralizing external influences,
- build harmony in the life of a person living according to the values and in the lives of their loved ones and those around them (Furmanek, 2019; Godawa, 2017, pp. 319 – 340).

Values, determining people's feelings of the meaning of life, influence decisions on how to live and whether life is worth living at all; this educational impact gains weight and gravity here, as we are dealing with exerting direct and indirect influence on components of another person's life.

The value of human beings stems from the concept of *dignitas humana*, which is expressed in the granting of personality to each person and the recognition of their right to the free development of this personality. Human dignity and freedom are closely related (Furmanek 2020a, Furmanek 2020b). **The dignity of the human person is a „value of values,”** for human dignity is both the person themselves as the first value and the prototype of all other values and their ultimate test. **Dignity is an objective, permanent property, to which every person is entitled** regardless of circumstances. „Dignity is something obliging, determining the human person's axiological spectrum of their actions. The fact of discovering this objective truth about oneself and the other person is a source of duty for a person – as Fr. Tadeusz Styczeń puts it – „the duty of a person to affirm a person because of the dignity to which they are entitled.” This means the duty **to affirm the other person and oneself**” (Chudy, 1998).

Freedom is the essence of a person's self-determination, which actually makes them identify with it. Self-determination, in turn, is a real and objectively given to the subject personal structure in a man. „What is irreducible in the human person is manifested first of all in the specifically human dynamics of free action. At the centre of the organization of the human person is the personal **structure of self-determination**. [...]. Freedom is a personal structure of the human being potentially inscribed in human existence. This means that its **development and its self-realization** become possible and even necessary. **Freedom is the condition of self-realization**, and this is what **the fundamental freedom** consists in, which is both endowed to man and which they can develop by being endowed with it” (Galarovich, 1996, pp. 126–127, 131–132).

Freedom, on the other hand, is expressed in causality that has consequences in **responsibility**, since only the perpetrator can be responsible. **Freedom and human dignity** are values that grow out of placing the human person at the centre. The place of education is the meeting of a master and a disciple.

Therefore, also freedom, being a condition of the person's causality in the act, is most clearly marked by the person's sense of responsibility for the act, for its moral shape, and consequently – for the moral shape of the person. Therefore, according to K. Wojtyła, **responsibility is a reality not only closely related to the person but above all – an intrapersonal reality** (Wojtyła, 1985, p. 112).

Personalistic pedagogy

Personalistic pedagogy assumes that man is a person, which Wincenty Granat puts in the words: „The human person is a unitary, individual, substantial, bodily-spiritual subject capable of acting reasonably, voluntarily, morally and socially, in order to harmoniously enrich themselves and other people in terms of culture.” Thus, a person is not reduced to a worldview or ideological context, because these depreciate them as a person (Godawa, 2017).

Bogusław Sliwerski (2012) notes that the personalistic view of man in the process of socialization and upbringing results in their affirmation as a fundamental and autotelic value, the primacy of spiritual life, the irreducibility of the person to things, the body, senses and biological needs, the inalienability of the rights inherent in human nature, an awareness of duty to others based on principles of justice, and a rejection of the anarchic concept of freedom of the person. Such assumptions suggest that the scope of interest of personalistic pedagogy extends well beyond any diminishing dignity conceptions of education, just as personalistic philosophy extends the understanding of man beyond materialistic approaches. One of the characteristics of an upbringing that puts the human person at the centre is integrity.

The fundamental idea is to **direct this developmental process to achieve true freedom and to protect the pupil from pseudo-values**. The target stage of personalistic upbringing is to reach the level of self-education, that is, to arouse in the pupil the motivation for such activities. Self-reliance is one of the essential features of self-education. The pupil is the first factor in the process of upbringing, and the educator plays only the role of a co-operator. Creating the conditions for an alumnus to direct their own development and preparing them to do so is an important educational task.

Integral human model

From the perspective of integral personalism, a person should take care of both their body and their mental and spiritual life. This integral system of „self” and „body” has been called **a person** by humanistic psychologists, and the model integral **concept of man**. It is man, as a person, who lives in the external world, remaining an integrated whole. Going further, man and the environment are also a whole, a unified system.

One of the essential features of pedagogy in the view of the personalist Pope John Paul II is **integrity**, which is expressed in a **holistic view of man** and their life and aims to build a critical and systematic awareness of all reality (Czekalski, 2008). Pedagogy as seen by John Paul refers to **adequate anthropology**, which is based on the truth about man and the world around them; through which it contributes to their liberation. *Adequate anthropology, however inspired by modern man, carries the timeless truth about man as such, man who is who he is, and as he is, regardless of the conditions of life, the possibilities for action and cognition* (Mruszczyk, 2010, p. 9).

It is necessary to look at the human being holistically (systemically, or at least holistically). Such a solution is adopted by proposing **an integral model of man, which is** part of the subject and point of view of the humanities. After all, it deals primarily with man: in personal terms, a social, creative being; man creating various results and works, which are the works of people and through them, man expresses themselves, their abilities and desires. They form personal and communal cultures; they are empirical indicators of the level of *intellectualized nature*. Through all this, they touch on values, including those that most clearly constitute man as a human person. And these are **dignity, freedom and responsibility**.

The explanation of who a man is in the concept we have adopted can be based on the following statements: they are an entity who experiences themselves as a person; who experiences the world and their existence in it, especially in relation to values (existence). They are characterized by: the so-called inner life, spirituality and uniqueness or otherwise individuality (singularity called individualism). The special attributes of the human person are dignity – a sense of self-worth, self-awareness of values, openness, and the continuous process of becoming human (historicity, variability over time, transgression) (Furmanek, 2019).

Man is their **Self** and that which is **Theirs** (Stępień, 1974), which means that man: „has a certain (unchangeable) constitutive nature and (changeable) properties and dispositions. The constitutive nature is the self, the axis and the core of the whole. The self, although directly revealing itself in experiencing, exceeds by its essence and role the immanent content of experiencing.” „Opposing that which is foreign (other’s) and that which is theirs (and is not them) is the self.” *He appears as the numerically (absolutely) immutable subject of states, dispositions, the fulfiller of actions, the one who gives direction to attention, makes choices, decides, and thus actively self-determines the whole that he constitutes or co-constitutes*” (Ibid., p. 86). „*In this self-constituted whole: „consciousness is the condition (necessary, though not sufficient) of the personal mode of existence and action*”(Ibid., p. 86).

Postmodern man

In today’s world, one notices the so-called **fashion for postmodernism**. People like to use the terms *postmodernity* or *postmodernism* to describe certain trends in many areas of human endeavour. The characteristic part of the expression in question is its prefix **post**, indicating something new following something old. In this case, postmodernism is the period after modernity (modernism), and *post* is identified with **anti**. Hence the reference to **anti-modernism**, or the negation of modernism⁶.

Postmodernism is essentially **a new way of thinking and seeing the world** involving the rejection of the certain, the proven, and the unambiguous – in favour of agnosticism, relativism and scepticism. The chaos and disorder of the world of axiology begin with language. This is reflected in the colloquial language of today’s politicians, journalists, scientists and others abusing the relativizing word of all statements – the word „as if” – without fail (Wielgus, 2001).

The main ideas of postmodernism include: questioning the universality of reason, rejecting the idea of truth and objectivity, rejecting the idea of unity, and granting primacy to the principles of pluralism, tolerance and chaos. According to them, it is assumed that:

⁶ Some sample definitions of postmodernism are given by A. Bronk in his book *Spór o postmodernizm* [in:] *Understanding the Modern World*, edited by A. Bronk, Scientific Society of the Catholic University of Lublin, Lublin, 1998, p. 23.

- 1) **Man, thanks to their reason**, perceives the world in their own individual way. They accept an adulterated picture of reality created by their mind. Cognition is subjective, and the claims uttered by people are just a „word game.” Therefore, there is only „subjective truth,” which is the intellectual product of a rational being. There is no objective criterion of truth, and the existence of many legitimate truths must be accepted: each person has their own.
- 2) **every person is free and has the right to their own tastes**, no one can judge someone’s behaviour or impose some values on another person or forbid them to do something. Hence, „at the basis of social life must be disagreement, understood as the right to distinguish, and chaos resulting from consistent respect for the freedom of all people” (Sarelo, 1998, p. 11).

The model of postmodern man depicts an entity full of extremes, capable of establishing interpersonal relations only for a limited time. Not following any authority. Acting according to their own vision and denying the values accepted by society. If they find that they are unnecessary for them personally, they do not take action and, conversely, what pleases them or what they considers good for them becomes the motive or goal of the activity (*Do whatever you want*). Their attitude to life, ethics and denial of real values is an ideology for lazy people who are primarily concerned with their own pleasure. Such a person becomes insensitive, arrogant, selfish, etc.

The man of the postmodern era responds to these questions about the general principles of human conduct with a **new ethic**, which they recognize as only true and calls it: **my ethic of life**. They oppose this philosophy of morality to the existing moral systems, calling them the **old ethics**, which should be rejected along with its ethical norms (Bauman, 1994). The age of free morality is upon us, a time for „morality without ethics,” since the latter has already lost its socio-regulatory power in times of „a strong sense of moral ambivalence” in times of great pluralism and freedom of choice (Wisniewski, 1996).

A person of postmodernism might say, „good is whatever is good for me and needed at the moment to satisfy my needs.” Thus, the good chosen depends on the individual’s goal. The measure of goodness becomes the purpose of a person’s actions, and relations with other people are reduced to the desire to satisfy one’s desires. The man promoted by postmodernists is a true egoist, an insensitive „moral stone,” full of dreams, desires and fantasies, the fulfilment of which is for him the most important goal in life. Their ethics boils down to one main

principle – „the most important thing is me and my needs.” For them, fulfilling their own goals is more important than any human ties.

The philosophy of life of the postmodern egoist is therefore utilitarianism and the related principle of utility, „which can also be described as a directive to multiply the good,” and hedonism focused on short-term pleasures and avoidance of suffering. Empathy and the fate of the other are alien to them (Bauman, 1995, pp. 24–25). The postmodern man, a free egoist, can do and think whatever they want. The only rules that apply to them in their dealings with others are the laws of the consumer market. Not surprisingly, postmodern society can also be called a consumer society.

Postmodern man advocates relativism, **creates their own truth and definitions of the good. For them, there are no absolute values.** At the same time, they proclaim their fundamental right to freedom. They recognize freedom as only a valid truth while saying that „to be moral is as much as to be at the mercy of one’s own freedom” (Bauman, 1996, p. 83). This freedom is, above all, a negative attitude towards omnipresent orders and prohibitions or censorship. It is „the freedom of man, who is for themselves the autonomous legislator of norms of conduct and judge of conscience, [its] limit is only the freedom of another person (Bronk, 1998, p. 42).

For example, the **human body** becomes a commodity that can be managed at will. In another human being one begins to see only a „human disposable product”, which, like everything disposable, wears out and must be replaced with something else. *Consumer freedom reigns, which (...) is based on the market game.* The so-called „*macdonaldization* phenomenon” is emerging, [which] casts a *shadow over interpersonal contacts, displacing the mark of humanity from the other person* (Ponikiewski, 2010). The ideas of transhumanism also grew out of this background.

The idea of transhumanism

The term *transhumanism* is used in many meanings and evokes a variety of associations (Skrzypulec, Soniewicka, 2018). The common denominator for the multitude of interpretations of transhumanism is the concept of *transcending* – which is emphasized by the prefix *trans-*. But it is not about transcending barriers set by human nature – because its existence is often rejected by transhumanists – but rather about transcending the human condition (e.g., extending life span) (Furmanek, 2021, pp. 82–83). Transhumanists view the exclusively

biological human condition as an internal environment that can be objectified, objectified and shaped as the external environment in which humans live. The ambition of transhumanism is to bring about the creation of a post-human, or biotech product (Tomaszewska 2021).

Posthuman

Transhumanism, as a strand of human philosophy, is associated with the use of technology to **overcome the biological limitations of man and improve the human condition**. This overcoming and improvement are understood as the liberation of man from disease, ageing processes, and their attainment of **full happiness** and – permanent – peak excitement, as well as the **replacement of many of his organs** (and one day the whole body) with artificial (better than the prototypes) elements (*cyborgs*, „*singularities*”). As M. Falenczyk: *the bag of human flesh will be replaced by an unadulterated, easily discarded and easy-to-use microchip box* (Falenczyk, 2021, p. 243). Transhumanism has **three goals**: repairing man (therapeutics), increasing their physical-psycho-intellectual capacity and, finally, transforming their nature. The idea is to make man transcend their own limitations.

The plan is exactly the same as in the „isms” of the 20th century. **First the deconstruction of humanity, and then the construction of a new man**. There is a very powerful, influential group of scientists who blindly set their sights on technology to bring societies to a tipping point, they call it **singularity**; it is the technological *singularity* (in place of the term *person*) (Tomaszewska, 2021, pp. 33–34). This group of scientists, for whom God does not exist, has created a new „technological idol” for themselves. They believe that by using technologies that have been invented to help people, they will create **a transhuman** who will replace „obsolete” people (**transhumans**). This „new human” will be coupled with the technological capabilities of technoscience and will eventually transfer their consciousness to the virtual space created just at the point of singularity. They have a well-developed plan for this technological transition, the only discrepancies are in terms of technical capabilities, the most recently discussed issue being whether this will happen in the 20s or 40s of the 21st century. This plan includes the following stages: **from human cognition to the transitional cyborg (transhuman), and then to the ultimate cyborg (posthuman)** (Ibid., pp. 275–276).

Homo deus

The ideologues of transhumanism are already able to use very advanced technologies to develop the concept, and after that to construct and build a new human being. The new philosophy promotes the concept of a new human, which, like any product of technology, can be designed and constructed. Already today, medicine has at its disposal a number of new technologies related to replacing (transplantation), improving or replacing certain components of the human body with artificial creations (such as prostheses) (Furmanek, 2021).

Technologies already make it possible to transform the human body almost at will through transplants and prostheses. *What will a person become in the future? Will it still be a person or a singularity? It will soon become possible to manipulate emotions and intelligence. It will be making humans more like gods. For, further states the referenced Y.N. Harari: Since we have achieved so much, we will probably want to reach **for happiness, divinity and immortality** – even if it kills us.*

As Harari writes: technologies will allow us to freely modify our bodies. In line with the question: *does a person have a brain? Does the brain have a human being? When we gradually change our minds, a new species, a man-god – homo deus – will imperceptibly emerge* (Harari, 2018, p. 60).

The analysis of the phenomena of modern man's life can be carried out in relation to three pillars, which include a) **immortality** – the length of life; b) **happiness** (enjoyment of life); c) divinity – the **quality of life** (overcoming poverty).

If people possess knowledge of the biological basis of life, they will also master the mechanisms that determine the **length of human life**. This involves medical achievements in combating pain and the threat of death. ***The ageing and deteriorating body is only a technical problem. Soon the wealthiest people will be able to afford to extend their lives. If man will be immortal, how will societies and religions change? What dangers await us? Perhaps the black scenario will come true according to which a handful of modified „people“(!) will rule the world, and the rest will become superfluous. What will the pursuit of happiness by superhumans (singularities) look like?***

Will artificial intelligence take the place of humans? Artificial intelligence, which, as a modern science and technology, was created to assist humans in multiple forms of undertaken activities can be used for a completely different and dangerous purpose.

References

- Adamski, F. (1993). *Kultura między sacrum i profanum*. [In:] F. Adamski (ed.), *Człowiek, wychowanie, kultura. Wybór tekstów*. Kraków: WAM.
- Adamski, F. (2005). *Personalizm – filozoficzny nurt myślenia o człowieku i wychowaniu*. [In:] F. Adamski (ed.), *Wychowanie personalistyczne*. Kraków: WAM.
- Adamski, F. (2005a). *Personalizm i pedagogika personalistyczna*. [In:] T. Pilch (ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XX wieku*, vol. 4. Warszawa: Wyd. Nauk. PWN.
- Bauman, Z. (1994). *Dwa szkice o moralności ponowoczesnej*. Warszawa: Instytut Kultury.
- Bauman, Z. (1995). *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna, nowoczesność wieloznaczna*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Bauman, Z. (1996). *Etyka ponowoczesna*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Biesaga, T. (2003). *Błąd antropologiczny i jego skutki w bioetyce*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (ed.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Boruta, T. (2009). *Wobec wszechogarniającej ponowoczesnej rzeczywistości*. [In:] J. Wojciechowski (ed.), *Nowoczesność/ponowoczesność. Fenomen i wyzwanie*. Warszawa: UKSW.
- Bronk, A. (ed.). (1998). *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*. Lublin: TN KUL.
- Bronk, A. (1998a). *Spór o postmodernizm*. [In:] A. Bronk (ed.), *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*. Lublin: TN KUL.
- Chałas, K. (2006). *Wychowanie w ujęciu Jana Pawła II inspiracją do budowania programu wychowawczego reformującej się szkoły*. [In:] K. Chałas (ed.), *Wychowanie ku wartościom w świetle nauczania Jana Pawła II. Elementy teorii i praktyki*, vol. 2. Lublin–Kielce: Jedność.
- Chudy, W. (2003). *Kłamstwo społeczne i jego skutki*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (ed.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Czekalski, R. *Personalistyczna pedagogika wychowawcza Jana Pawła II*. *Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne*, vol. XXI (2008).
- Dec, I. (2003). *Humanizmy i ich roszczenia w wyjaśnianiu człowieka*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (ed.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Dziewiecki, M. (2002). *Wychowanie w dobie ponowoczesności*. Kielce: Jedność.
- Dziewiecki, M. (2010). *Pedagogika integralna*. Warszawa: Wyd. Sióstr Loretanek.
- Dziewiecki, M. *Ateizm, czyli urojona wizja człowieka*. *Cywilizacja*, 43 (2012).
- Furmanek, W. (2006). *Zarys humanistycznej teorii pracy*. Warszawa: IBE.
- Furmanek, W. (2009) *Miłość wyzwaniem współczesnej pedagogiki*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2013a). *Humanistyczna pedagogika pracy. Charakterystyka dyscypliny naukowej*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2013b). *(Po)nowoczesny spór o system wartości współczesnego człowieka*. [In:] Cz. Plewka (ed.), *Nauka, edukacja, rynek pracy. Przede wszystkim współdziałanie*. Szczecin: US, PK.
- Furmanek, W. (2016). *Humanistyczna pedagogika pracy. Praca a jakość życia człowieka*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2018). *Człowiek jest osobą, stając się i staje się będąc nią*. [In:] M. Chrost, K. Jakubiak (ed.), *Wychowanie. Socjalizacja. Edukacja*. Kraków: Ignatianum.

- Furmanek, W. (2019). *Człowiek w badaniach współczesnej pedagogiki zorientowanej personalistycznie*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2020). *Godność człowieka. De dignitate personae humane*. Rzeszów: Wyd. UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2020a). *Wielorakość godności*. Rzeszów: Wyd. UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2021). *(Nie)Ład aksjologiczny wyzwaniem dla pedagogiki*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Godawa, G. *Integralna wizja człowieka jako fundament kultury i wychowania*. *Analecta Cracoviensia*, 49 (2017).
- Harari, Y.N. (2017). *Pożegnanie z wojną*. An interview for „The Guardian”, 19th March 2017, reprinted and translated by A. Ehrlich, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 15–17th April 2017.
- Harari, Y.N. (2018). *Homo deus. Krótka historia jutra*. Kraków: Wyd. Literackie.
- Harari, Y.N. (2018a), *21 lekcji na XXI wiek*. Kraków: Wyd. Literackie.
- Harari, Y.N. (2018b). *Sapiens. Od zwierzęcia do bogów*. Kraków: Wyd. Literackie.
- Liberalizm, <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/pdf/1/liberalizm.pdf> (23.02.2022).
- Liberalizm, Encyklopedia PWN, <https://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/liberalizm;3932244.html> (23.02.2022).
- Iwasiński, Ł. *Esencjalistyczna koncepcja człowieka u młodego Karola Marksa (w świetle interpretacji Leszka Kołakowskiego)*. *Edukacja Filozoficzna, Rekonstrukcje, Interpretacje*, 59 (2015).
- Kiereś, H. (2003). *Błąd antropologiczny w sztuce*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (eds.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Krąpiec, M.A. (1999). *Człowiek bytem osobowym*. [In:] F. Adamski (ed.), *Personalistyczna filozofia wychowania*. Kraków: UJ.
- Krąpiec M.A. (2003). *Osoba ludzka i błędy w jej rozumieniu*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (eds.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin” TN KUL.
- Kremień, W. (2008). *Filozofia edukacji*. Radom: ITE–PIB.
- Matacz, M. *11 nowych rzeczy, których dowiedzieliśmy się o ludzkim ciele w 2021 r.*, <https://www.medonet.pl/zdrowie/zdrowie-dla-kazdego,11-nowych-rzeczy--ktorych-dowiedzielismy-sie-o-ludzkim-ciele-w-2021-r-,artykul,83828595.html> (28.12.2021)
- Moralny wymiar kultury*, https://teologia-moralna.wyklady.org/wyklad/922_moralny-wymiar-kultury.html (28.12.2021).
- Mruszczyk, M. (2010). *Człowiek w „antropologii adekwatnej” Karola Wojtyły*. Katowice: UŚ.
- Nowak, M. (2005). *Filozofia człowieka podstawą filozofii wychowania*. [In:] F. Adamski (ed.), *Wychowanie personalistyczne*. Kraków: WAM.
- Ostrowska, U. (2017). *Fenomen pracy ludzkiej z perspektywy aksjologicznej*. [In:] R. Gerlach, R. Tomaszewska-Lipiec (eds.), *Wokół podstawowych zagadnień pedagogiki pracy*. Bydgoszcz: UKW.
- Pieja, W. *Aktualność nauczania Jana Pawła II na temat błędu antropologicznego*. *Polonia Sacra*, 2(60). (2020).
- Plopa, M. (ed.). (2009). *Człowiek u progu trzeciego tysiąclecia*, vol. 3, *Zagrożenia i wyzwania*. Kraków: Impuls.
- Ponikiewski J., *Na giełdzie akcje człowieka spadają*, in: http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/F/FE/jp_nagieldzie.html (2.06.2010).
- Sareło, Z. (1998). *Postmodernizm w pigułce*. Poznań: Pallotinum.
- Sareło Z. (ed.). (1996). *Moralność i etyka w ponowoczesności*. Warszawa: ATK.

- Scheler, M. (1987). *Pisma z antropologii filozoficznej i teorii wiedzy*, translated by. S. Czerniak, A. Węgrzecki. Warszawa: PWN.
- Skrzypulec, B., Soniewicka M., *Transhumanizm to nowa forma wiary, gdzie nie ma miejsca na ludzką wolność* [ROZMOWA], 24 marca 2018, <https://klubjagiellonski.pl/2018/03/24/transhumanizm-nowa-forma-wiary-gdzie-nie-ma-miejsca-na-ludzka-wolnosc-rozmowa/> (24.02.2022).
- Szymański, K. *Transhumanizm*. Kultura i Wartości, 13 (2015).
- Śliwerski, B. (2012). *Pedagogika ogólna. Podstawowe prawidłowości*. Kraków: Impuls.
- Śliwerski, B. (2001). *Współczesne teorie i nurty wychowania*. Kraków: Impuls.
- Tomaszewska, R. (2021). *Człowiek i praca. Perspektywa transhumanizmu*. Bydgoszcz: UKW.
- Wojciechowski, J. (ed.). (2009). *Nowoczesność/ponowoczesność. Fenomen i wyzwanie*. Warszawa: UKSW.
- Wojtyła, K. (1985). *Osoba i czyn*. Lublin: KUL.
- Wołk, Z., *Aparat pojęciowy pedagogiki pracy. Niejednoznaczności i trudności definicyjne*, Szkoła – Zawód – Praca, 2 (2011).