

## *From the Editors*

We live in a world where political and legal decisions about the future of humanity are constantly being made. It is not just about the future of individuals or the size of the communities they live in, as in the case of abortion laws. It is about the future of humans as a species, which is addressed by concepts such as human enhancement and posthumanism. The question arises: are there any anthropological constants that should be absolutely forbidden to violate? This is related to the more general question of the anthropology on which these decisions are based. According to the biblical concept, man is the most perfect creature, and therefore changes that are not of a moral and intellectual nature resulting from man's own internal efforts, or – on a physical level – therapeutic, can only worsen the human condition. According to the concept of evolutionism, man is a constantly changing product of blind forces of nature, which is already mature enough to take responsibility for evolution into its own hands and consciously decide on an improvement of the species that in the long run may also mean its replacement by a new, more perfect post-human species. Anthropological choice inevitably raises the question of what criteria should be used to assess what constitutes improvement and what, on the contrary, constitutes degradation or even destruction of the human species. Furthermore, who should have the right to make decisions in this area: scientists, experts, politicians, lawyers or ordinary citizens as voters? Note that this is not about decisions concerning the human condition of the decision-makers, but of

people who do not yet exist and whom they may allow to come into the world, but only as beings modified by them. This would radically change the nature of human relationships, making them asymmetrical: some people would be designers and producers of other people, who would be reduced to the level of mere products. How would this affect the understanding of individual autonomy and moral responsibility? How do we know that these future people, if they had the opportunity to choose the condition in which they would come into the world, would choose the modified one?

We present the latest issue of our Review, in which we address precisely these issues at the intersection of law, politics, and ethics in the face of the challenges posed by new technologies. In it, you will find an extremely comprehensive text by Brian Scharnecchia, presenting an overview of the basic features of human enhancement and an attempt to apply ethical principles derived from Catholic social teaching to the legal and political controversies surrounding genetic and physical human enhancement technologies, as well as the patentability of fragments of human DNA. This text is accompanied by an article by Bogdan Szlachta presenting the history of human enhancement policy. Szlachta presents the diversity of research perspectives adopted by scientists and politicians in relation to their different understandings of the state and human nature. The erosion of deontic ethics is an important dimension of contemporary problems related to the possible adoption of public policies aimed at “enhancing” humans, as well as the establishment of legal norms and state programs defining the principles of research conducted by scientists. The author argues that human enhancement technologies that support but do not replace integral human nature contribute to human ecology, while those that tempt us to transcend the limits of human nature contribute to the emergence of a new type of eugenics. Tamás Nyirkos, in his text entitled “Historical Periodization, the End of History, and the Future of Transhumanism,” explores the structural analogy between eschatological speculations and the large-scale historical predictions of transhumanist philosophies. He bases his argument on the premise that all significant philosophies of history are necessarily theological, adding that such narratives are also necessarily teleological and contain the thesis of the end of history. Examining different types of the latter, the author argues that the future of transhumanism is closest to the type of “agitated monotony” described by Alexis de Tocqueville, which also correlates with a lack of novelty in both the structure of the predictions and their content, which is most evident in the case of social and political issues, which transhumanist authors seem to treat as nothing more than an extrapolation of current trends into the future. Ligia

Castaldi, in her text entitled “*Beatriz v. El Salvador: A Loss for Eugenic & Health Grounds for Abortion in International Human Rights Law*,” addresses the issue of health and eugenic arguments in the international debate on abortion.

Dariusz Kowalczyk discusses the relationship between natural intelligence, especially human intelligence, and artificial intelligence. In this context, the author refers to transhumanism and the resulting concepts of “improving” humans, contrasting them with the Christian vision of humans created in the image of God. In the central part of the text, he analyses the concepts of human, animal, and artificial intelligence, emphasizing the key role of intentionality, freedom, and the relational dimension in distinguishing human intelligence from artificial intelligence.

Małgorzata Pawlus analyses the issue of large families in Poland in the first two decades of the 21st century based on information obtained from the last three national censuses (2002, 2011, and 2021). She shows the evolution of the large family model, highlighting, among other things, changes in parents’ education, income, and risk of poverty.

The above texts are supplemented by articles by Tomasz Grzegorz Grosse, “Geoculture – a Cultural Perspective on Geopolitics,” Maria Grazia Pettersson, “When a Church becomes a Mosque: The former Kapernaumkirche in Hamburg,” Aniela Dylus, “On the identity of the university: between dignity and commercialisation,” John M. Czarnetzky’s “American Legal Education: The Catholic Solution,” Przemysław Piotrowski’s “Tory traditionalism and Christian heritage. Maurice Cowling’s polemics with Friedrich Hayek, John Keynes, and Roger Scruton,” and the book reviews of: Joanna Kulska and Anna M. Solorz (eds), *Fraternity as an Overlooked Element in Global Politics*, Routledge 2025 (Maria Szymborska); Theresa Farnan, Susan Selner-Wright, Robert L. Fastiggi (eds), *Gender Ideology and Pastoral Practice. A Handbook for Catholic Clergy, Counsellors, and Ministerial Leaders*, En Route 2024 (Dominik Tylka); Michał Gierycz, Piotr Mazurkiewicz (eds), *Faces of the rule of law in Europe*, Ruprecht 2024 (Michał Kmiec).

We hope that these texts will inspire your scholarly reflection and contribute to a deeper debate, especially on the future of humankind as a species.

Rev. Professor Piotr Mazurkiewicz, Ph.D.