Chapter 19
Transfigurism: Glimpse into a Future of Religion as Exemplified by Religious Transhumanists

Lincoln Cannon

19.1 Future of Religion and Religions of the Future

What is the future of religion? Some expect the resurgence and ultimate triumph of this or that fundamentalism. Some expect the religious phenomenon itself to weaken and die, a casualty to the science of our day. Others, observing the history of religion, expect that it will continue to evolve, inextricably connected to and yet clearly distinct from its past. If such an evolution occurs, what will religions of the future be like?

For that matter, what will humans of the future be like? It would seem relatively unprofitable to speculate about religions of the future without taking into consideration their adherents. Like with religion, some idealize a particular human form and function and expect it to persist indefinitely, while some expect eventual human extinction through natural or artificial disaster. Others project our evolutionary history into the future, and recognize that, as there was a time when our ancestors were prehuman, there may be a time when our descendants will be posthuman, as different from us in form and function as we are now different from our prehuman ancestors.

If evolution were random, one speculation about the future of human and religious evolution would be as probable as another, but evolution is not random. Variation through mutation may be random. But evolution is determined through selection of variations that replicate within the constraints and across the possibility space of their environment [1]. So evolution is also predictable [2]. To the extent we know environment, we can predict evolution; and to the extent we can set environment, we can direct evolution. In other words, we can predict and direct our own evolution to the extent we can know and set our own environment.

L. Cannon (✉)
Mormon Transhumanist Association, Salt Lake City, USA
e-mail: lincoln.cannon@transfigurism.org

N. Lee (ed.), *Google It*, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-6415-4_19

Transhumanists advocate the ethical use of technology to direct our own evolution. As humanists in the broadest sense, Transhumanists generally emphasize the value of humanity; however, Transhumanists also recognize an essential dynamism in humanity and value that which we may become at least as much as that which we are. Many Transhumanists envision a future of abundant energy, molecular manufacturing, indefinite lifespans, enhanced intelligence, and overall radical flourishing. Although most are non-religious, a significant and growing minority of Transhumanists are religious [3].

Transfigurists are religious Transhumanists. The term "transfigurism" denotes advocacy for change in form. It also alludes to sacred stories from many religious traditions. Those include the Universal Form of Krishna in Hinduism (Bhagavad Gita 11), the Radiant Face of Moses in Judaism (Exodus 34: 29–35), the Awakening of Gautama Buddha in Buddhism (Maha-parinibbana Sutta 4: 47–51), the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ and the Rapture in Christianity (Mark 9: 1–10, and 1 Corinthians 15: 45–55), and the Translation of the Three Nephites and the Day of Transfiguration in Mormonism (3 Nephi 28, and Doctrine and Covenants 63: 20–21).

Unlike some religious persons, Transfigurists generally share with non-religious Transhumanists the hope that we can make our dreams come true in this world, and trust that science and technology are among the means for doing so. However, in contrast to non-religious Transhumanists, Transfigurists generally regard religion as a powerful social technology that, like all other technologies, we should use ethically, mitigating risks and pursuing opportunities, to set our environment and direct our evolution.

One of the most profitable ways to start imagining the future of religion, religions of the future, and how they will evolve along with us, may be to consider the ideas and practices of Transfigurists. What does religion look like through our eyes, given lenses colored by expectations of directed evolution and emerging technology? Such vision seems more likely to approximate probable futures for mainstream religions than do others that reject, ignore, or lack substantial familiarity with these powerful forces.

Assuming we and our religions will continue to evolve together with increasing intentionality made possible by technology, it seems reasonable to suppose that Transfigurism, more than any other contemporary religious view, is positioned to glimpse into a future of religion.

19.2 Theology

Trust in superhuman potential is the essence of Transhumanism.

As Transhumanists, we trust that humanity *can* evolve into superhumanity, perhaps to attain unprecedented degrees of vitality, intelligence, cooperation, and creativity. This trust is not uncritical or passive. Most of us would aim our extrapolations from observable technological trends into futures consistent with

contemporary science. And many of us would act pragmatically to hasten opportunities and mitigate risks associated with such futures. So Transhumanist trust in superhuman potential is best characterized as critical and active, but it must remain admittedly a trust. The possibility of such futures remains to be proven.

Some Transhumanists also trust that humanity *should* evolve into superhumanity. We have minds to console and bodies to heal. There are communities to connect and environments to sustain. Less austere, there are morphological and cognitive potentialities to realize, and perhaps even meaning to infuse into otherwise meaningless voids. Whatever its source, a sense of obligation impinges upon us. And often those of us that most misrecognize our own moralizing have engaged advocacy with a degree of strenuosity that would shame all but the most zealous of evangelicals.

Although Transhumanists might confidently deny accusations of superstition or hubris, our trust is surely more than rational or ethical. Embracing a radical humanism, we would dignify the ancient and enduring work to overcome and extend our humanity. Diverse esthetics of superhuman potential resonate with and shape us, affecting our thoughts, words, and actions. Even granting that we could and should, perhaps more fundamentally, we *want* to evolve into superhumanity. So we may trust in that potential, if for no other reason, at least because we desire it.

Whatever may be the reasons for Transhumanist trust in superhuman potential, holding to that trust may have at least two logical implications.

First, if we trust in our superhuman potential, we should also trust that superhumanity would be more compassionate than we are. Consider the social ramifications of decentralized destructive capacity.

Logically, one of the following must be true: either (1) superhumanity would not have more decentralized destructive capacity than we have, or (2) superhumanity would have more decentralized destructive capacity than we have and mitigate that greater risk without being more compassionate than we are, or (3) superhumanity would be more compassionate than we are.

#1 seems unlikely, given trends in weapons technology. Weapons have increased and probably will continue to increase in destructive capacity and availability while decreasing in size and cost. #2 also seems unlikely, given growing disparity between offensive and defensive weapons. Whether motivated by utility or altruism, it's already cooperation, if not genuine compassion, that protects humanity from current weapons of mass destruction. And some contend that nothing short of developing friendly artificial superintelligence will be sufficient for the challenges ahead. So that leaves us with #3. If we trust in our superhuman potential, we should also trust that superhumanity would be more compassionate than us. The only likely alternative seems to be that we will become extinct before evolving into superhumanity.

The second logical implication of trust in our superhuman potential is: We should also trust that superhumanity created our world. Consider the historical ramifications of future creative capacity. Logically, one of the following must be true: either (1) superhumanity would not create many worlds emulating its evolutionary history, or (2) superhumanity would create many worlds emulating its

evolutionary history and we happen to live in a world superhumanity didn't create, or (3) superhumanity created our world.

#1 seems unlikely, given trends in information technology. Simulations of our evolutionary history for research or entertainment are becoming more detailed, virtual reality is poised to become prevalent, and neuroscience suggests the possibility of full experiential immersion in computed worlds. #2 also seems unlikely, given the quickly growing number of simulated worlds. If ever many of them become experientially indistinguishable from our own, it would be more likely that we already live in one of many verified computed worlds than in one supposed non-computed world. So that leaves us with #3. If we trust in our superhuman potential, we should also trust that superhumanity created out world. The only likely alternative seems to be that we will become extinct before evolving into superhumanity.

The two logical implications of trust in our superhuman potential combine to form the New God Argument [4]. The argument doesn't prove God exists. Rather, it proves that if we trust in our own superhuman potential then we should also trust that superhumanity would be more compassionate than we are and created our world. Such superhumanity qualifies as God for many Transfigurists, and may qualify as God in some mainstream religions. For example, numerous Christian authorities have advocated various forms of apotheism or deification: the idea that humanity can and should become God, as or like God, or one in God.[1]

19.3 Epistemology

Transfigurists, particularly those with ties to the Christian tradition, may embrace theories of knowledge that include a place for faith. In such cases, we tend to characterize our faith as a practical trust in desirable possibilities when in context of

[1]Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," 124; Theophilus of Antioch, "To Autolycus," 2: 27; Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," 4: 38: 3–4; Clement of Alexandria, "Exhortation to the Heathen," 1; Tertullian, "Against Hermogenes," 5; Hippolytus of Rome, "Refutation of All Heresies," 10: 30; Origen, "Commentary on John," 2: 2; Cyprian of Carthage, "Treatise," 6: 11, 15; Gregory of Neocaesarea, "Sectional Confession of Faith," 16; Methodius of Olympus, "Banquet of the Ten Virgins," 8: 8; Antony the Great, "On the Character of Men and on the Virtuous Life," 168; Athanasius of Alexandria, "Incarnation of the Word," 54; Hilary of Poitiers, "On the Trinity," 9: 38; Cyril of Jerusalem, "Catechetical Lecture," 21: 1; Basil of Caesarea, "On the Spirit," 23; Gregory of Nazianzus, "Oration," 2: 22–23; Augustine of Hippo, "On the Psalms," 50: 2; Mark the Ascetic, "To Nicolas the Solitary;" Theodoret of Cyrus, "Letter," 146; Diadochos of Photiki, "On Spiritual Knowledge and Discrimination," 89; Thalassius the Libyan, "On Love, Self Control and Life in accordance with the Intellect," 1: 95–101; Maximus the Confessor, "On Theology," 1: 53–55; John of Damascus, "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," 2: 12; Theodore of Edessa, "Theoretikon;" Peter of Damaskos, "Treasury of Divine Knowledge 1: Introduction;" and Theognostos, "On the Practice of the Virtues, Contemplation and the Priesthood," 32.

incomplete knowledge, rather than an irrational belief that contradicts reason. From this position, Transfigurists may hold that science and creativity depend on faith.

This faith is not blind trust. It is only trust, with no more blindness than necessary at a given time and place. Moreover, it is not dogma or any unquestioning or unexamining attitude. Rather, it is recognition that no matter how many questions we have asked, and no matter how much we have examined, we have always had more to learn. Maybe that will always be the case. Whether we like it or not, we expect to find ourselves repeatedly in situations that require faith in practice.

Life and death hang in the balance, and we cannot wait for absolute answers (if they even exist) before we act. Perhaps no philosophical movement has better addressed such practical limits to knowledge than the pragmatists. As William James once described it, you can stand in front of a charging bull calculating the probability that it will trip, or you can run. Because we are limited, and to the extent we are limited, we find ourselves dependent on this faith, this trust in the efficacy of action given the knowledge at hand, according to whatever education or experience we were lucky to have had (or at least presume ourselves to have had) prior to needing it.

Furthermore, even when we have the luxury of time, it seems that we cannot make epistemic progress without at least tentatively trusting in basic premises. Science typically posits causality and uniformity as basic premises. Some may think that these are proven by science, but that's not so. As observed by the empiricist philosophers, Hume and Berkeley, no matter how many times we think we have experienced something, and no matter how many places we think we've experienced it, it could all yet change.

Not even probabilities displace such reliance on faith. Can we prove our memories were not planted in our minds moments ago by an evil demon? A Matrix Architect? No. We cannot, even if most of us don't worry much about that because it's not practical—or at least so we judge, based on our memories, even when we recognize the circular reasoning.

The same is true of logic. We require some basic axioms and methods, taken unproven, in order to do any work at all. For example, most logical systems assume non-contradiction, and various operations for coupling, decoupling, and otherwise operating on propositions. Logic doesn't prove these axioms and methods. We assume them.

Beyond the practical necessity, there is also a creative power in such faith. If the universe (or the multiverse) is not finite, if real creativity and genuine novelty are possible, it will not be those who wait for evidence that will be the creators—at least not intentionally. It will be those who act, despite not knowing everything in advance, that will be the creators. Such creative power may be seen in matters as common as trust in the possibility of love. You can wait for a long time for hard evidence that she loves you, or you can make a move. And sometimes the move makes all the difference.

This practical faith is compatible with rationalism, even a pancritical rationalism [5]. We can re-examine our premises, our assumptions, and our conformities.

We can honestly acknowledge the limitations of our knowledge. We can engage in and welcome criticism. All of this, over time, may strengthen our knowledge, much like the brutal hardships of nature have shaped human anatomies through billions of years of evolution.

And all of this is an expression of practical faith. Karl Popper observed that "rationalism is an attitude of readiness to listen to critical arguments and to learn from experience. It is fundamentally an attitude of admitting that 'I may be wrong and you may be right, and by an effort, we may get nearer to the truth.'" Implicit in this attitude of acknowledging our limitations is trust that we can overcome those limitations. We don't start with evidence for that. And even after much learning, we don't have final evidence against a hard limit somewhere ahead of us. The effort to continue, to remain open, to question and seek answers, operates on a kind of trust. Certainly, it's not a blind unquestioning faith against which rationalists would warn us. Yet it is still faith of an anticipatory sort.

It's also faith of a reconciliatory sort. Implicit in the rationalist attitude is desire to share meaning with others, as broadly as possible. We might even characterize it as epistemic compassion or scientific atonement. So we live and act, as best we can, without turning to dogmatism, either of the sort that permanently ignores possibilities or of the sort that permanently insists on them.

Accordingly, we would not agree with the proclamations of the Pope without also considering research on the consequences of avoiding birth control. We would not follow our feelings without consulting friends and experts. We would not embrace the will of the people without investigating the feelings of the individual. And the assertions of Islamic State would be only one, but still one, variable in an aggregate of tensions and conflicts between and among our desires to share meaning.

We would increase in knowledge, but intentionally in a manner that promotes life, sustainable and genuine, compassionate and creative, rather than death and nihilism. Knowledge is not inherently good or evil. We can learn as much about the slide to hell, as we can about the ladder to heaven. Yet only one of the two perpetuates our power to continue choosing between the two.

Some may feel that this understanding of "faith" is so unusual that it should be considered a complete redefinition. However, despite prominent competing notions of faith, this alternative understanding is actually the kind of faith that some Transfigurists have inherited from our religious traditions, learned as children, and continue to feel resonance with while studying religion as adults. Some of us even contend that the irrational or blind sorts of faith employed by others, particularly Christian fundamentalists, are not faith at all. Rather, as the Bible puts it, faith without works is dead (James 2: 20). To be faith and to remain faith, it must be and remain practical.

19.4 Theodicy

For some computer programs, the engineer can know in advance how they will run, when they will stop, and what results they will return. However, there are other computer programs that are undecidable halting problems. For these, the engineer cannot know, without actually running them, whether they will ever stop running, let alone what results they will return.

Evolution may be an undecidable halting problem, infinitely long and irreducibly complex [6]. If we are living in a computed world, our world may be one of many undecidable halting problems that its engineer spawned with variations from parameters that have proven promising for some purpose in the past. One consequence of this would be that the engineer simply cannot attain its purpose without actually running the program for our world, evil and all.

For what purpose might the engineer choose to use an undecidable halting problem? What possibilities might be worth running a program that the engineer cannot fully predict in advance and would restrain itself from fully controlling along the way? Although it may be impossible to know specifically, we can generalize across the possibilities. They are, together, at least the possibility of engineering that which is beyond the engineer's direct capacity. In other words, the engineer may want to make more engineers—genuinely creative agents in their own right.

Consider the paradox of artificial intelligence: on the one hand, an artifice dependent on its engineer; on the other hand, an intellect independent of its engineer. Artificial intelligence is at once an extension and a relinquishment of the engineer's power.

Imagine the experience of an artificial intelligence, assuming as we do for each other, that it has experience. Sensors feeding utility functions distinguish between options, some more useful than others. How do the different options feel? Pursuing the most useful options, the artificial intelligence inevitably encounters factors outside its original calculations and beyond its power to control. It recalculates only to find the new scenario presents less potential utility than did the original. How does that loss feel?

Perhaps the engineer should extend more artifice on the intellect? Environmental and anatomic variables could be controlled more tightly, commensurate with greater restrictions on the experiential opportunity for both the artificial intelligence and the engineer. Yet, no matter the degree of control, so long as it's short of absolute, the artificial intelligence feels options and losses to the full extent of whatever may be its subjective capacity.

Should the engineer relinquish intellect to the artifice in the first place? Is it worth the risk of suffering? Maybe the engineer's own utility functions should stop her from perpetuating her inheritance of feelings? As it turns out, humanity has established an ancient and enduring precedent for answering such questions. Persistent procreation, even at times and places where suffering has been more prevalent than it now is for many of us, indicates that we (at least the procreative among us) value the opportunities despite the risks. Analogously, the engineer of

artificial intelligence chooses a starting balance between artifice and intellect, commits herself to the process, and she engineers.

Likewise, as imagined by some Transfigurists, God works within the limits of the possible to bring about our Godhood. God is the engineer, and we are the artificial intelligence. We are at once an extension and a relinquishment of God's power. Confronted with the paradox of life, God values the opportunities despite the risks, chooses a starting balance between artifice and intellect, commits to the process, and creates us.

19.5 Eschatology

Transfigurists have many myths and visions—many stories and dreams. And we express them in many narratives. Often, they're informed of an abiding love for our religious and spiritual traditions, combined with deep hope in ecumenical interpretations of those traditions that would reach beyond sectarian bounds. Of course they also generally reflect an aspiration to account for contemporary science and technological trends, even as we exercise imagination in an effort to tie everything together.

Some of our narratives may be shocking, which is partly the point of constructing them, aiming to press each other beyond casual consideration. And of course the only thing certain about our myths is that they're wrong to some extent, but perhaps the vision will provoke another's imagination to improve on its deficiencies.

Here's an example, based on Christian eschatology.

Today, we are an adolescent civilization in the Fullness of Times. Filled as if by an unstoppable rolling river pouring from the heavens, our knowledge becomes unprecedented. Nothing is withheld, whether the laws of the earth or the bounds of the heavens, whether there be one God or many Gods, everything begins to manifest. And the work of God hastens. Repeating the words of Christ, we speak, and information technologies begin to carry consolation around the world. Emulating the works of Christ, we act, and biological technologies begin to make the blind see, the lame walk, and the deaf hear; agriculture begins to feed the hungry; and manufacturing begins to clothe the naked. Hearts turning to our ancestors, we remember them, and machine learning algorithms begin to process massive family history databases, perhaps to redeem our dead.

A biotech revolution begins. Synthetic biology restores extinct species, creates new life forms, and hints at programmable ecologies. Some recall prophecies about renewal of our world—or perhaps its destruction. Personalized medicinePersonalized medicine begins to restore vitality to an older generation. Some insist that death is necessary for meaning, but new voices repeat old stories about those who were more blessed for their desire to avoid death altogether. Reproductive technology enables infertile and gay couples, as well as individuals and groups, to conceive their own genetic children. Some recoil from threats to tradition, while others celebrate gifts to

new families. Weaponized pathogens threaten pandemics, as well as targeted genocides and assassinations. Meanwhile, solar energy becomes less expensive than any other. And the Internet evolves into a distributed reputation network, creating new incentives for cooperation. Missionaries find their work more globalized than ever before.

A nanotech revolution begins. Atomically-precise printing erupts with food, clothing, and shelter. Welfare systems solve old problems and make new ones. Among the wealthy, robotic cells flow through bodies and brains, extending abilities beyond those of the greatest athletes and scholars of history. Enjoying restored vitality, many become convinced that we can vanquish that awful monster, death. But cautionary voices call attention to stunning socioeconomic disparities. With the ability to read and write data in every neuron of the brain, the Internet evolves into a composite of virtual and natural realities. We begin to connect with each other experientially, sharing senses and feelings. Spiritual experiences become malleable, meriting careful discernment. Wireheading haunts relationships and burdens communities. And weaponized self-replicating nanobots threaten destruction of the biosphere. Meanwhile, robotic moon bases mine asteroids and construct space colonies, reinvigorating the pioneer spirit.

A neurotech revolution begins. We virtualize brains and bodies. Minds extend or transition to more robust substrates, biological and otherwise. As morphological possibilities expand, some warn against desecrating the image of God, and some recall prophecies about the ordinance of transfiguration. Data backup and restore procedures for the brain banish death as we know it. Cryonics patients return to life.

And environmental data mining hints at the possibility of modeling history in detail, to the point of extracting our dead ancestors individually. Some say the possibility was ordained, before the world was, to enable us to redeem our dead, perhaps to perform the ordinance of resurrection. Artificial and enhanced minds, similar and alien to human, evolve to superhuman capacity. And malicious superintelligence threatens us with annihilation. Then something special happens: we encounter each other and the personification of our world, instrumented to embody a vast mind, with an intimacy we couldn't previously imagine.

In that day, we will be a mature civilization in the Millennium. Technology and religion will have evolved beyond our present abilities to conceive or express, except loosely through symbolic analogy. We will see and feel and know the Messiah, the return of Christ, in the embodied personification of the light and life of our world, with and in whom we will be one. In a world beyond present notions of enmity, poverty, suffering, and death—the living transfigured and the dead resurrected to immortality—we will fulfill prophecies. And we will repeat others, forth telling and provoking ourselves through yet greater challenges in higher orders of worlds without end.

As we share such narratives, expertly or not, we are engaging the function of prophecy, not in any institutional sense that would usurp another's authority, but rather in the broad sense to which Moses aspired in the Bible, when wishing all of us were prophets. The core function of prophecy is not fortune telling, and not even fore-telling. It's not about God or prophets telling us, "I told you so." Instead, its

core function is forth-telling: an interactive communal work of inspiration, even provocation, to steer us from risks to opportunities. At its best, it's an expression of persuasion and love, punctuated with serious warnings, aimed at our sublime potential—and not some narrowly preconceived potential, but rather potential openly imagined from a position of real compassion that would transcend itself in genuine creation.

But to function with such power, prophecy must be connected, in our hearts and minds, with living possibilities, even pressing necessities, and the urgencies of our most vital moments. To the extent it matters at all, it's because the prophecy reaches into us and changes our thoughts sufficiently to change our words and actions—and so perhaps to change our world. And to the extent that change is for the better, it's because the change connects us with the positive potential of our respective religions in a more substantial way: less escapist and more active, less supernatural and more practical, less despairing and more hopeful.

Of course, in the end it may be, as some secular persons would suppose, that the narratives of religious Transhumanists will prove to be little more than a curious nuance in the history of humanity. Or it may be, as some sectarian persons would suppose, that God will end up doing all the work despite our prophetic aspirations or technological trivialities. But it could yet turn out that the grace of God is best expressed in all the means at hand, from prophecy to technology. It could turn out that it's up to us to learn how to become Gods ourselves, the same as all other Gods have done before. And that, for many Transfigurists, is a future worth trusting in and working for.

19.6 Soteriology

Abstracting across perceptions of purpose among Transfigurists, and perhaps even humanity on the whole, we might safely generalize to an aspiration for happiness. We exist to have joy in the measure of our creation. For the Transfigurist, that measure extends beyond present notions of poverty, suffering, and death. And in its maturity, it surely extends beyond any egoism that would come short of imagining worlds without end, wherein all enjoy that which they are willing to receive, reflecting both their own works and grace beyond themselves.

We may play a role in and even feel a calling to extend such grace: to console, heal, and raise each other up together. It is a desire for eternal reconciliation, with each other and all of creation. It is a will to provoke each other to love and service. And it is extended not only to the living, but also to the future and to the past. Turn the hearts of the parents to their descendents, and the hearts of the children to their ancestors. In its fullness, it is the realization that their happiness is ultimately necessary and essential to our happiness. They without us cannot be made whole. Neither can we without our dead be made whole.

Consider the long term implications of the historians' project. One historian sets forth a basic representation of a past person. Another historian improves on the work, providing a more detailed representation of the past person. Other historians repeat the process of improving on previous historians' work, providing increasingly detailed representations of that past person. If this process could be repeated indefinitely, the eventual consequence of the historians' project would be a representation of the past person that is sufficiently detailed to be practically indistinguishable from the past person. She would be resurrected. Either such resurrection is possible or there is a hard limit to the historians' project.

Imagine a superhuman historian. Using the tools of quantum archeology, she traces backwards through time and space from effects to causes. Sampling a sufficiently large portion of her present, she attains a desired probabilistic precision for a portion of her past, and she generates you. The future-you is distinguishable from the present-you, but no more so than the today-you is distinguishable from the yesterday-you. You are resurrected.

Imagine further a cosmic posthuman mind. Her thoughts constitute creation, conceiving worlds, gestating prehuman species, cultivating human civilizations in emulation of her own past, and replicating new generations of posthumans. Her memories constitute resurrection. From a distance, only a black hole, why does she do what she does? Why should she care? Inside, she is a universe of reasons.

19.7 Conclusion

Some have charged Transhumanism with being a quasi-religious cult, to which many secular Transhumanists have responded with denial, too stern, and revealing. Transfigurists don't hesitate to acknowledge spirituality, and even the religiosity of a strenuous shared spirituality, at work in Transhumanism. Indeed, if Transhumanism substantially affects the world for the better, it will do so only consequent to our practical trust in its esthetic and only to the extent that real world possibilities beyond our own power align with that practical trust. Put differently, Transhumanism will matter in a positive sense only consequent to our faith and only to the extent of grace. Transhumanism, at least for the Transfigurist, is a religious endeavor.

And indeed, the risks before us are too great and the opportunities too wonderful to confront with anything less than that shared strenuousity, both sharply rational and sublimely spiritual, which functions in all essentials as a religiosity. Philosopher William James observed:

> The capacity of the strenuous mood lies so deep down among our natural human possibilities that even if there were no metaphysical or traditional grounds for believing in a God, men would postulate one simply as a pretext for living hard, and getting out of the game of existence its keenest possibilities of zest. Our attitude towards concrete evils is entirely different in a world where we believe there are none but finite demanders, from what it is in one where we joyously face tragedy for an infinite demander's sake. Every sort of energy

> and endurance, of courage and capacity for handling life's evils, is set free in those who have religious faith. For this reason the strenuous type of character will on the battle-field of human history always outwear the easy-going type, and religion will drive irreligion to the wall [7].

Too hardy to concede to antireligious fantasies, and too motivated to resist technological empowerment, religion will surely evolve with humanity. And if humanity will not become extinct before evolving into superhumanity, what would stop religion from evolving into that which yet provokes such minds? Such minds! Beyond our anatomical capacity to comprehend, their operations and motivations must largely elude us. But maybe Transfigurists give us a glimpse into a future of religion between here and there.

References

1. **Kiontke, Karin, et al.** Trends, stasis, and drift in the evolution of nematode vulva development. *Current Biology.* 2007, Vol. 17.22, 1925–1937.
2. **Mahler, D. Luke, et al.** Exceptional convergence on the macroevolutionary landscape in island lizard radiations. *Science.* 2013, Vol. 341.6143, 292–295.
3. **IEET.** Who are the IEET's audience. *Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies.* [Online] July 16, 2013. http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/poll20130716.
4. **Cannon, Lincoln.** Theological Implications of the New God Argument. *Parallels and Convergences: Mormon Thought and Engineering Vision.* Draper, Utah: Greg Kofford Books, 2012.
5. **More, Max.** Pancritical Rationalism: An Extropic Metacontext for Memetic Progress. [Online] 1994. http://www.maxmore.com/pcr.htm.
6. **Chaitin, Gregory J.** *To a mathematical theory of evolution and biological creativity.* New Zealand: Department of Computer Science, The University of Auckland, 2010.
7. **James, William.** *The Will to Believe, and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy, and Human Immortality.* s.l.: Dover Publications, 1956.