

## INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND TRANSHUMANISM. UNESCO AND EVOLUTIONARY HUMANISM

Mihail UNGHEANU

Researcher, PhD, Centrul European de Studii în Probleme Etnice (CESPE), (Romania)

E-mail: [mihail\\_li@yahoo.com](mailto:mihail_li@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** *The last century has seen the implementation of totalitarian and despotic regimes all over the world, Eastern Europe, the former czarist empire, and China being some good examples in this sense. The lure of utopia has led to the imposition of regimes and ideologies that caused an infinite amount of pain and suffering without delivering the promised goods. Although Marxism and Communism (albeit not only them but also Fascism, Nazism, and a few others) as such are materialistic and atheistic, they function like a religion and have enchanted the minds and hearts of many. The present-day world is not dis-encharmed and the sacred banned from it. It has shifted. This enchantment has produced other totalitarian and despotic ideologies that are rooted deep in the past. Their expression are new kinds of religion. An example thereof can be seen in Julian Huxley's evolutionary humanism and the blueprint for UNESCO, which must build the condition for unifying the world mind and allow man to be the steward or lord of the evolution.*

**Keywords:** enchantment, religion, tyranny, totalitarianism, social engineering.

### 1. Introduction

It is usually assumed that the present-day world is fully secularized and that religion has left the place, being replaced by a so-called rational and pragmatic mankind that dispenses with religion. As some authors have shown, the myth of disenchantment of modernity is exactly that: a myth or worse a fairy-tale, the mythology of the age without myth and enchantment. In the nineteenth century, one could find occultists, magicians, and scientists in the same room. A good example of this is Marie Curie and her husband who regularly visited a medium and were convinced that there is much more to reality than what the scientific quantitative approach affirms (Josephson-Storm 2017: 1-3). That such prominent scientists would take part in such activities as occultism seems a scandal from a certain point of view that assumes a certain perspective on modernity, the supposed age of adulthood of mankind. The standard model of understanding modern world is the one expressed by Max Weber in his formula *die Entzauberung der Welt*, a formula that still blinds and binds us today. Modernization is considered to be the same as the apparition of instrumental reason, the gradual alienation of humanity from its natural environment, and the production of a bureaucratic and technological world devoid of mystery, wonder, or meaning. It is equated with secularization as the process of elimination of the supernatural out from society and the world. There are some religious revivals too, but science and magic are still considered to be opposites. Still the basic attitude – *die Gesinnung* – in those two endeavors is the same: imposing man's will upon the forces that are operating in nature and using them for man's own ends. Universal mechanism – the clockwork mechanism is not very far away from magic, even in its contemporary form, which is inspired by cybernetics, information technologies, or organizational sciences. According to Josephson-Storm, the birth and development of the social sciences took place in special environments where one could partake in theosophy, spiritualism, magic, and that representatives of those sciences did have contact with the so-called occult. Max Müller, Max Weber, and Marcel Mauss are some names that met European esotericism. One should not forget another great name of philosophy that had contact with the occult and has strongly influenced modern and contemporary life, directly and indirectly through Karl Marx, G.W. Hegel and his philosophy of the self-actualization of the Absolute Spirit, a paradigm that can be found in the Hermetic tradition, in Jakob Boehme and others – Nicolai von Kusa or John Scotus Erigena and their not-so-Christian theologies. Modernity is associated thus with the myth or religion of progress, being at the same time the expression of a break with the past, with the affirmation of novelty, a kind of periodization, but also a kind of localization since some countries were identified as the wellspring of it. For France, Britain was the source of modernity and for what is now Germany, France was the model.

Modernity is a qualifier applied to different things ranging from artistic and philosophical currents, peculiar historical ruptures, sociological processes, urbanization, industrialization, and different types of rationalization (Josephson-Storm, 2017: 8). The critique of modernity accomplished by the Frankfurter School is based on the classical model, although some conclusions that people like Marcuse make are right, especially when it is about the instrumental and technological reason as a new force of oppression. The

oppressive and negative role of the technical system was described by Jacques Ellul, even if he does not share the same views with the members of the Frankfurt School. The critique of the Frankfurt Schools can be summed up as follows: through science and technique mankind objectives nature and the same process applies to man too, man becoming an object of the same instrumental reason. One should not take for granted the opposition between myth and reason, reason and religion, and so on. The concepts of science and religion that are now universally used were born in Europe and so in contradistinction to another notion, that of superstition (Josephson-Storm, 2017: 14). This concept was meant to devalue certain beliefs or certain forms of knowledge. In the end, superstition began to mean something that was not scientific. Though magic/superstition was denied and marginalized through the years, it still came through in the new age of modernity and rational science. It didn't evaporate as expected by some circles. Religion becomes superstition in the eyes of some representatives of the official science, replacing magic in the role of superstition. If organized religion fades, it does not mean that people won't turn to other forms of enchantment like the beliefs in spiritualism, for example, or to forms of belief imported from elsewhere, like India. Fear of disenchantment and despiritualization led to the rise of spiritualism and other occult movements and from there, the birth of religious studies (Josephson-Storm, 2017: 19). The preoccupation with the paranormal, or even with cryptids, movies and TV series about or with witches, superheroes, vampires, parallel worlds, aliens, beliefs in psychic powers, in ghost, demonic possession, etc. prove the persistence of a magical and mythical background for so-called secularized culture, at least in the United States. Belief in the paranormal is practically a kind of norm, while not believing in it is restricted to a minority (Josephson-Storm, 2017: 25-26). The groups that do not go well along with the belief in the paranormal are defined in religious terms, for example, Evangelical Christians. Meanwhile, they tend to believe that ghosts, apparitions, and aliens are caused by the demons or witches. A form of disenchantment lets another form of enchantment in. Belief in the supernatural can lead to disenchantment (Josephson-Storm, 2017: 29), more precisely when one believes a variant of monotheism/deism. Disenchantment, as Josephson-Storm, shows can be found in some fairy-tales from the British islands, fairytales that lament the departure of the folk of the fairies. Such a view is expressed even by other people who assert this as a matter of fact. One can wager to affirm that the steel cage of modernity is the product of another kind of enchantment, whose effect on human reality will be described here.

## **2. Modern world is enchanted**

The history of the modern world hides many surprises. The standard interpretation of modernity is not a true depiction of historical reality. The sacred did not disappear from the world. The world is still sacralized, but the sacred has changed its object and changed its kind. It no longer pertains to the transcendent divinity of Christianity or the Neoplatonic One – although this element is still present. It pertains to other objects and finds its expressions in different types of religion, which do not seek to build or express a relationship to the transcendent cause of reality. A religion is not necessarily built around an experience of God, or gods, but it can center around progress or man, or a political form, and so on. As Jacques Ellul observed the present-day world is full of sacred, full of different sorts of religions such as communism, Maoism, Ecologism, Revolutionism, Emancipation, etc. The political enemy is sacred, the wars are religious – ideological, and revolution is identified by some groups with a godly act (Ellul, 2004: 83). Social movements are sacralized, and so-called victims are sacralized (immigrants, minorities, and in a certain way nature itself). Nature and the cosmos lost their sacred aura, which has been transferred to other domains, but mythical thought has not vanished. Myth belongs to mankind as such, even if its contents differ from an age to another. Myth, symbol and metaphor are coextensive to human thought.

The present-day world is caught in the power of the myth despite imagining itself as the age of reason and pragmatism. Myths are continuously produced and the ones that are now invading the consciousness of mankind are different from the older ones one is accustomed to finding in different ancient mythologies. Such modern expressions of mythical thought are the myth of development, underdevelopment, progress, revolution, etc. And last, but not least, there are two values that enjoy religious significance, namely science and technology. Mankind is caught in the myth of development (under-development), of self-management, of man as the maker of his own history, of growth or degrowth nowadays, of revolution, of building one world governed by an unelected corps of people – technocracy, and of transhumanism and post-humanism. Some of those can be seen as a subset of the belief in emancipation, as the ends of the process of progress/evolution. If the Christian message is no longer heard, this is because mankind has not reached the peak of rationality and maturity as the Enlightenment would like to make the world think. The rise of instrumental reason and technology is supposed to have chased away the magic and the enchantment from the world and reduced everything to mechanism – be it in sense

of classical physics or in a modern sense, which had reduced man and life to information processing machines. Contrary to his view, modern society presents another image. Society has not been emancipated from the enchantment of different types of religions and metaphysics. These religions might be new or relatively new and not always acknowledged as such. One of those is the religion of technology or the industrial religion as Saint-Simon would express it. Christianity is now confronted by a multiplicity of religions, of beliefs that makes it much more difficult to be heard. The message of the Christian faith, as Ellul puts it, refers to the Truth, but today man has many truths at his disposal, many myths and theories that pretend to offer truth or many truths.

One of those is the religion of technology and technocracy. Not science and rationality are the main obstacles of Christianity, but other belief systems – even secular religions and their disguises. Central to these new religions is in different guises the belief of the self-deification of man by means of technology and social engineering, an idea that permeates and in-forms our lives, even if we like it or not. The spiritual and mental structures that make the infrastructure of such intellectual constructions is the belief in the progress and evolution of the human race. Transhumanism is an expression therefor and it can be seen as official orientation of the world institutions like the United Nations and its agencies like UNESCO whose underlying purpose is to promote the instauration of a world order that leads to a stage of development of humanity that Teilhard de Chardin named the Omega point. Julian Huxley's book on the role and function of UNESCO proves this point.

A good example of technocracy and messianism can be found in the work of Julian Huxley. His booklet on UNESCO offers an insight into the ideas that undergird such institutions. Such a view is expressed by Julian Huxley in his booklet on the role and purpose of UNESCO and in his conviction that humanity is the peak product of comic evolution/progress and that man is the stewardship of this process, which man can direct. This organization is bound by two sets of aims. One is international, that is UNESCO exists to serve the ends of the UN, ends which pertain to the whole of humanity. These ends have been established not by the people, though but by a number of thinkers and politicians, which think they are the saviors of the planet. The other aim is to promote all aspects of education, culture, etc. Peace has to be built and the condition of achieving it is to establish it on the intellectual and moral solidarity of man (Huxley, 1947: 5). Assuring peace and the dignity of man cannot be built solely on political and economic arrangements. The preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO authored by the former British prime minister Atlee has engraved this idea, whose realization demands the total unanimity of the people in the quest for a better world, and their lasting and sincere support to the process of creating a world peace. The objective of the organization is "advancing through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the people of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind, for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its charter proclaims" (Huxley, 1947: 5). The end of advancing this mutual and global understanding of all people depends on the use of all means of mass communication, propaganda, and indoctrination. Since creating unanimity and universal consent are necessary maintaining, increasing, and diffusing knowledge is also in play. Those are the means to achieve the desired result. Culture, knowledge, education, and science are objects of interest and activity of the organization since they represent key areas of human life and through them ideas and conviction can be imprinted in the hearts and soul of the individuals. To this task comes the one concerning information and its spreading through mass communication – the press, TV, cinema, radio, and nowadays the internet. One could say that censorship should be added to this list.

Huxley insists to accept a qualitative dimension to knowledge and not only a quantitative one. Therefore, science has to be taken in its broadest sense, referring to all human intellectual endeavors, knowledge and learning, from mathematics to theology, physics, sociology, philosophy and so on. Their practical applications, too. Arts and culture come to the purvey of UNESCO since both of are expressions of the individual and society. UNESCO has to concern itself with culture in a second sense, of cultivating the mind and in the sense of the material and material apparatus of the entire mankind. Cultural backwardness is not desirable from the point of evolutionary humanism, because this would be a hindrance to the progress of mankind, a hindrance to the agenda UNESCO is designed to contribute to. It would limit the progress of the world's inhabitants; they wouldn't be accessible to the tentacles of UNESCO and its social engineers. It encompasses everything, humanity as a whole, not just individual aspects of life – the duty of advancing the common welfare of humanity. This advancement depends on the correct application of science to human life -social, biological, psychological, etc. The same process must take place in the realm of spiritual and emotional satisfaction. The right application of arts is demanded in the realm of spiritual and emotional satisfaction and UNESCO has to play an important role in it.

The main end of UNESCO is to accomplish a comprehensive study of all higher activities of humanity, to promote them and their usages in a coordinated manner, under a certain set of aims (Huxley, 1947: 27). Just studying is not enough, you must apply, as Bruce Lee put it. Not only UNESCO has to study all these problems in a comprehensive manner and in a correlated, holistic way, it has also the role of guidance in promoting all its policies from theory to practice and guiding individuals and governing bodies to the right application. This agency of the United Nations is a very peculiar and important, even when one thinks that it deals only with education, a process that characterizes only mankind (Huxley, 1947: 29). Applying art in a wide manner to the sphere of human activities, spreading it further to bring balance in the life individuals, is a task incumbent to this world-wide organization. Technological progress, industry, and concern with day-to-day problems and with earning daily bread have disrupted the life of individuals, affecting their spiritual and cultural life in a negative way. This must be changed and equilibrium must be restored. Art plays an important role in this, but not only art. A kind of ascetic discipline is needed. To stimulate and elevate the quality of life of the people another task has to be fulfilled, namely the act of disciplining the mind to produce mystical states and other results, which are purported expressions of spiritual satisfaction; applying psychological techniques to government and preventing the abuse of democracy is another area for UNESCO (Huxley, 1947: 28).

From all the aforementioned ideas, one can rightfully conclude that UNESCO is hence to be understood as a completely technocratic organization, and a totalitarian one at that. Efficiency is a requirement to engineer world peace and the elevation of the quality of life. And technology is not limited to material realm. There is technique to write a poem, to think clearly and correctly – logic, to meditate, to interrogate, to organize things, etc. To be effective, UNESCO has to find out the causes that create problems and troubles in people's lives. Researching the causes and mechanisms of the issues people face in their material and spiritual lives, discovering the causes that prevent progress, or that distort the doings oriented to is a necessary prerequisite and a tool for the social engineer. UNESCO must promote the efficiency of this technical process, as he dubbed it (Huxley, 1947: 28). Invading the life of the people and of the private sphere or even the body is a consequence of this technocratic program.

The approach should be holistic, and the research has to correlate science and art to each other in their application and to a general scale of values, so as to be able to discover the general direction of evolution. Education has a special role in this process because there would be no advancement of the pool of knowledge that makes up the social tradition that furthers the progress of humanity. Education should be lifelong and not only to give individuals the capacity to earn a livelihood or to ascend socially. Only through it can society and mankind become aware of their destiny and role as a trustee of evolution and thereby enabling themselves to improve and steer evolution/progress. Education is a tool for furthering the process of achieving world unity, and as such is for utmost importance for UNESCO. It fulfills an instrumental role. Promoting literacy is a step toward this goal just as helping underdeveloped lands, but all of this is not for the sake of those countries and culture. The aim is to create the general framework of mind and also functionaries of world unity and progress – technicians, statesmen, teachers, etc. A study of the distribution of intelligence is needed to determine the grade of special aptitudes in diverse people, which all have a genetic basis. A study of temperament is also a provision because temperament plays can derail people from attaining what they wish or what they want to achieve. Researching how to rescue people from their temperament that might hamper them in accomplishing themselves falls also in the area that UNESCO endeavor to study. By saving people from their own temperament, the technocrats can help them to do something useful for the world. Understanding psychoanalytical techniques and the human psyche is necessary to attain some tools or mechanisms that will allow regulation and intervention in the cognitive operations relating to representations and affects. This would make the world happier and more efficient

As to science, it is not to be interpreted in a positivistic, empirical way. Science, in the sense of applying of all aspect of organized knowledge of phenomena, will be applied to man and society. Science, as already stated, is not to be confined to the hard sciences, but will include other aspects – even revelation, myth, rationality, and experiment. All this brought together would lead to an increased knowledge and control over society and man, a knowledge apparently almost as good as in the standard hard sciences, although the difference between those two branches would remain. As already stated, in this approach eugenics plays a role, even if it was and still is a borderline subject (Huxley, 1947: 37). This variant of eugenics has to be truly scientific, according to him. The elevation of the quality of life of mankind depends on it. A change of mind and of heart is needed to approach this subject-matter. Technological and industrial development has done many things but has led many people to abandon spiritual and aesthetic values, to abandon preoccupation with beauty, and has created an uglier world. Therefore, UNESCO has to concern

itself with instilling a new framework of mind to counterbalance this tendency. Art should be applied in this sense, to create the much-needed balance.

Such a giant enterprise can't go further without having an ideological frame, a worldview that guides it, and establishes its aims, regulations and the policies necessary for the desired activity. It is "a working hypothesis concerning human existence." UNESCO can't proceed in a piecemeal manner. This worldview is not to be grounded on existing theologies and religions, or political-economic doctrines be they Marxism, capitalism, semi-planned economy, etc. That would be sectarian and a denial of UNESCO's universality and would incur hostility from many groups. Neither spiritualism, rationalism elan vital theories or cyclical theories of history are admitted. It is a proponent of equality and human dignity, and it should not accept that the state is higher than the individual (at least in theory). The basis of this worldview and of UNESCO is humanism, but not any kind of it. It is a new kind dubbed evolutionary humanism. It must be scientific in his structure.

"It cannot, however, be materialistic, but must embrace the spiritual and and mental as well the material aspects of existence and must attempt to do so on a truly monistic, unitary philosophic basis." (Huxley, 1947: 7)

### 3. Evolution and progress

The evolutionary aspect is essential to understand the philosophy of UNESCO and the UN. Evolutionary biology offers a new way to understand the universe. Julian Huxley and Aldous Huxley are the sons of Thomas Huxley, Darwin's bulldog after all. Darwinism proves, according to him, the existence of progress *im Weltall*. Evolution is taken to encompass all historical processes that cause change and development in the cosmos and it takes place in three main areas: the inorganic, the biological, and the realm of mankind. Evolution is brought about in society by the use of speech and conceptual thought.

Another name for it is cumulative tradition, the ground of social heredity. This is how societies change and develop. Evolution here is under the stewardship of mankind. Consciousness and conscious decisions modify it. Conscious selection is at this level the main mechanism of evolution. The evolutionary process consists in for the most part in changes in the form of society, in producing tools and machines, in using old inborn potentialities. (Huxley, 1947: 9): this is a conflict between ideas and values, worldviews, and so on. From this has sprung the modern state. Along this process comes an increased control over the environment and the power to cause changes in it due to technological and scientific developments. A by-product is that the grade of dependency on the environment and whims of nature has decreased and the independence from it has increased. Under this condition, the way man perceives himself has transformed and had acquired a greater degree of individuality appears and greater mental powers, a trend towards fuller knowledge. Mankind has reached a peak of the evolutionary process, when it can inject value s in it. This conception of Huxley is not as new as it seems. The British author acknowledges its similarity with Hegelianism and Marxism, though he criticizes both conceptions for lacking a foundation in biology. One problem evolutionary humanism has to solve is, of course, overpopulation. Huxley and UNESCO show their Malthusian or Neo-Malthusian bent; world peace must be achieved, too – the most important task that humankind has to fulfill.

Another step toward the next stage of evolution comes into play. The social organization must be conceived anew. The state has to act accordingly and due its due diligence toward evolution. Taking control of the evolution needs a proper social organization. Otherwise, mankind won't be able to accomplish its goals or to attain "the highest degree of individuality and wealth for the common man". Progress entail going beyond the existing possibilities in society and mankind, overcoming what is (Huxley, 1947: 15). Society and the individual can be reconciled, and they are not in opposition. For attaining the purpose of UNESCO a harmonious relationship between these two has to be build – another task that falls under the purvey of UNESCO. Both Fascism and Communism, but also individualism as it existed in the US should be avoided. Despite his misgiving of individualism, Huxley affirms that the well-developed individual is the highest outcome of evolution, but his development is conditioned by the surrounding society. Thus, UNESCO has to work in the context of society and it should direct its attention toward agencies and organizations, which work this shared end – educational systems, research organizations, art centers, the press (and the internet, today).

There is more than one way to describe the purpose of an organization. Attaining world peace and taking the evolution in one's hands, entails a peculiar and difficult process. It is an act of imposing a unitary view all over the globe referring to the aims of society and human existence. „Unifying the word-mind" (Huxley 1947, 2010: 17). According to him, evolution is a feature of the universe and life. Biology has helped detect such a direction in the whole creation, not only in the realm of human life. The evolution

in this domain he calls progress (Huxley, 1947: 12). The salient features of this process are an increase in the complexity of organization, in the realm of biology/human life an increase of the control over and independence towards the environment and an increase of mental capacities (in the supposed later stage of this development). Another trait is the fact that it opens the door for further progress, always. It is a self-propelling activity. But surprise-surprise, just the Kantian revolution puts the man at the center of knowing, this process leads to man as its sole inheritor (to date). Being the highest form of organism it is not, as Huxley says, anthropomorphic vanity, of course. And humankind is what might be called in Heideggerian terms “the Shepherd of Being” since Huxley thinks of him also as the sole trustee of this process, although this tendency goes in the direction of trying to become the lord of creation and of what can be accomplished in the future. Therefore, UNESCO and ONU for the matter must work on this background. The twin concepts of progress and evolution are central for both these institutions. From the evolutionary process/progress, the tendencies that are good and promote the desired results can be read, and so are the ones that are wrong from this point of view. Conquering nature, the increase in control over it seems to be central to this endeavor. Otherwise, there would be no further advancement – progress. Though acquiring control over nature is necessary, it should not represent a value in itself. Nevertheless, the applications that stems from conquering nature are essential for humanity to fulfil its role as this steward/lord of evolution. This is true in regard to complex social organization. He recognizes that knowledge may do some good things in one area of life, and not so good in others. Thus, there should be a global organization that oversees this kind of activity meant to promote evolution. The tasks of UNESCO are therefore manifold, including balancing the different activities and the outcomes that they produce. There should be a firm grip on medicine (application of medical science), studies of agricultural productivity – soil erosion, mechanization, social welfare, and building birth-control facilities. UNESCO has to prove its approach against the touchstone of evolutionary progress. And one conflict or antagonism that is the main focus of attention for UNESCO is the one between internationalism and nationalism, between national sovereignty and world sovereignty (Huxley, 1947: 13). Human evolution (progress) is going ahead faster than in other areas of biology and has led to the creation of a pool of idea that is self-perpetuating.

This is an important factor in the existence of mankind. UNESCO has to take it into account. This pool of common ideas and knowledge can evolve and develop. Thus, social organization is the key factor in human progress and the means to build a frame and scaffold for it. It is useful for either limiting the unwanted tendencies that dwell within or for furthering the promising ones. This makes possible for man to take control and direct evolution. As such, the different pools of knowledge and tradition created by humanity have to be unified, because the multitude of these pools, which might be hostile to each other or in competition, makes it impossible to attain the degree of efficiency of a unified one (Huxley, 1947: 13). Overcoming this differences and conflicts demands political unification. In this wise, the English thinker hopes to show the necessity of building a central world government, to which UNESCO has to its bidding. UNESCO must participate in the act of bringing about the world political unity, albeit it does not lie in its competence to realize it. By means of policies of UNESCO the foundations thereof could be laid down - mutual understanding between people, brainwashing, etc. Nationalism And particularities isolates people, therefore, it is opposed to the endeavor of UNESCO and of the UN. It is a hindrance in the way of evolution.

The whole enterprise is obviously a technocratic one, based on scientism and technology. The betterment of human welfare, the elevation of the quality of life is to be done using science. Differences of opinion in this regard are not really allowed. Global and international campaigns should be organized in this sense, to convince them of the necessity of doing so and of the necessity of controlling and policing the evolution. Just as people have learned to distinguish between the good uses of knowledge and technique and wrong ones (nuclear bombs, for instance), they have to accept to distinguish between the different components of evolution and that there is a need for an authority that should govern it. Huxley, like someone who divinizes science and progress still held to the idea that technology is neutral and you can distinguish between good and wrong /bad uses of science/technology. But just as the same movement in martial arts can be both a block/deflection and a hit, this distinction can't be maintained. Modern technique is not neutral as Jacques Ellul, among others has shown, but represents a huge spiritual challenge for humanity. Similar views were penned by Nicolae Berdyaev who announced that man has entered a new era. Under the layer of machine and economic power, there was something else. The coming to be of a new anthropological regime, namely the one of “organization”. This regime affects all the areas and dimensions of life. Technique is not something pertaining only to the material. It affects our relationship with the world, with society, with ourselves, and so on. It is an ontological mutation that takes place in mankind. According to the Russian thinker through technology man becomes cosmurge (it

creates “worlds”). Mankind replaces its natural and social world with a world based on organization – which according to Baptiste Rappin is the end toward which management and organizational sciences tend. Technology builds a second nature – on organization, a world - that creates a rupture within the existing communities, a world devoid of and opaque to symbolization, without any organic and symbolic coherence. It creates a barrier between man and nature and it engages in a limitless process. It disorganizes mankind in its inner life and tends to make man a machine. World War I has shown what a society organized around progress and technology shall bring about. Technique is not only material – a way to produce artifacts, but intellectual and spiritual, too. There is strategy, logistics, management, PR techniques, Human Relations, and so on. And technique aims at reproducing something with the lowest effort and best results, effective results (Cérézuelle, 2021: 236-237). It is an infinite quest for efficiency and power. The totalitarian and despotic structuration of society is not political, but social – thinkers as Bernard Charbonneau and Jacques Ellul have found out even before the second world war. The essence of totalitarianism and violence lies not in ideologies that are explicitly totalitarian but in the profound changes caused in the social and mental structures cause by technological progress and industrialization and in the mindset associated with those. The progression and the expansion of the state and the progress of technology all lead to the same place, to a society organized along the efficiency demand and looking like an army in a war and like an industrial plant.

#### **4. World unity and stewardship of evolution. Eugenics**

This political unification must bring about a unity of mind. The so-called one pool of scientific knowledge has to entail a common, unitary point of view a set of common aims (Huxley, 1947: 47). “Unifying the world mind requires this”. To do this, UNESCO must provide help and programs to all poor countries, not to help those cultures per se – they are tribal and nationalistic – but to achieve the needed level of scientific advancement, which will foster the global unity of thought. A unitary scale of values has to prevail all over the world and has to be imposed. A world of one scientific ideology is the main purpose of UNESCO, which is part of a giant mechanism meant to instill uniformity and thought and feeling all over the globe, eradicating free thought and cultural multitude. This is one of the main functions of UNESCO and the results that would come/are coming from it, even though he affirms the need for preserving the plurality of cultures. Educational systems and social mechanisms must be put in place to achieve this brainwashing and uniformization, instilling the only correct way of thinking that should allow man to become the Lord of evolution.

Directing evolution and annihilating national and ethnic differences nation is a means to an end. This end is transhumanism/post-humanism, although the purpose of UNESCO is not formulated in these terms. “Directed evolution” is an umbrella term, too. Under the facade can be found older ideas of eugenics that Huxley promotes. The eugenicist point of view is unmistakably stated: “There remains the second type of inequality. This has quite the implications; for, whereas variety is in itself desirable, the existence of weaklings, fools, and moral deficient cannot but be bad. It is also much harder to reconcile politically with the current democratic of equality.” (Huxley, 1947: 20). The English author proposes an amendment to the principle of equality of opportunity, which reads like equality of opportunity within the limits set by the aptitude one has. He continues by stating it as a fact that a large amount of the population does not possess the ability to make use of higher education. Many young men are weak, and, for example, cannot pass the test to get into the army, and many other people are neither intelligent nor scrupulous enough to be entrusted with political responsibility and power. These defects are seen as being probably cause by civilization itself, and he acknowledges that this would be a burden that society probably won’t be able to get rid of. Democracy, social and political systems generally speaking, have to adapt to the truths of biology, in this case, to this kind of inequality. This is a major and urgent task which the world has to carry out. Thus, general education of the public and much new research has to be done and UNESCO has to be in both of these activities (Huxley, 1947: 21). What does UNESCO have to do?

“It means that it should encourage all studies and all methods which can be used to ensure that men find the right jobs and are kept away from the wrong jobs – to ensure that individuals find outlets satisfying to their temperament, and work appropriate to their talents, while at the same time ensuring society is not overburden with people in positions for which they are inadequate or, still worse which they are likely to abuse.” (Huxley, 1947: 21)

There are two kinds of eugenics with different implications. Preserving variety is a good thing, just as the inequality of mere difference, but inequality of level or standard would not be desirable. Eugenics should be concerned with rising the quality of life to a desirable level. Even if he admits that the problem posed by the existing “weaklings” and defective human beings might be intractable, UNESCO

must try to examine all the facets of this problem and to inform the public about them in hopes in making the unthinkable thinkable and acceptable. Since the reach of UNESCO is global, including all aspects of human and social life, its working philosophy must be a unitary, monistic one, a kind of humanism informed by science. The working philosophy of UNESCO is not neutral, though he states that its philosophy cannot be sectarian. Its approach, as already mentioned, is scientific and evolutionary. This is essential to it. UNESCO has to pay attention to the social mechanism of the cumulative tradition of mankind, which he considers to be the basis of social heredity. Through social heredity society and man changes and develops. UNESCO has to be at the forefront of getting control of human evolution and its governing. What is this evolution of humanity that is the essential background of UNESCO (and other institutions)? Is it to achieve as much progress possible in the shortest span of time (Huxley, 1947: 12)?

If the afore-mentioned institution does work in different regions of the world to promote its vision of the world, not to help other nations and people for their sake per se. The actions and programs of UNESCO, and, thus, of the United Nations are not those of a benevolent and neutral actor, but of an interested party that seeks dominance. An actor who seeks to impose his own ideology and vision of the world. Ethnic, cultural, or national particularities are a hindrance for the institutions that would impose one global government. The name of this utopian, control-oriented religion/subsets of religions can be that used by Huxley, namely, evolutionary humanism (it includes the faith in progress, technocracy, and scientism). This is another form of process theology, not unlike Hegel's or Teilhard de Chardin's, that considers evolution as a process that produces a deified human being. For Julian Huxley, the existence of man attests, in fact, the existence of a direction of evolution, a kind of teleology, a trend toward the apparition of mind in the cosmos. The universe would necessarily produce mind/minds – humans and other rational beings. The universe contains the trend towards intelligence, toward sentience. The possession of mind and awareness makes man an agent of evolution. This contradicts the conviction that existence is ultimately meaningless. Julian Huxley's spirituality is a good example of such a religion – a pantheistic one – that tries to unite the uniqueness of man with its denial. It is a religion and spirituality that is opposed to theistic religions, which speak of a transcendent and personal God, outside space and time, distinct from the universe he created. Even in this interpretation of existence, man is called to be the shepherd thereof (Huxley, 1992: 78).

### **5. Emancipation, technology, and progress**

This new spirituality or religion is supposed to free man from constraints and elevate him over nature and history, to produce the so-called emancipation. This conception is a technocratic one, bound with the idea of knowledge as power. It is a religion bound to the idea of technique, with the search for efficiency. Faith in progress is faith in man and his accomplishment, that is idolatry. It also produces a sacralization of history – history is the place of the self-revelation of the Absolute Spirit that acquires self-knowledge and actualization in man (Hegel's view but also Hermetic theological point of view). History, evolution, the whole universe are caught in the movement of betterment – of amelioration. Progress can be defined as such: „Mouvement nécessaire vers le mieux ou marche générale vers la perfection finale” (Taguieff, 2004 : 11)

To believe in progress means: „Croire au Progrès, c'est se mettre en position de croire à la réalisation graduelle, dans l'histoire, des idéaux de liberté, d'égalité ou de justice. De croire aussi à la marche progressive de l'humanité vers la satisfaction de tous ses besoins, condition supposée de l'accès au bonheur.” (Taguieff, 2004: 120-121)

Modern societies, political systems, and modern/contemporary understanding of mankind are based on the ideology of progress. Modernity is, as mentioned, considered to be the era of rationality and maturity, an era that had left behind the age of religion and metaphysics, of myth. History is made by man and goes in a definite, positive direction. At a political and social level, some voices that claim the right to build society from the beginning anew and demand that society and man should be governed along scientific principles. A new myth is born, the myth of technocratic governance, which has its roots in some philosophical works of the past. This new myth depends on the birth of the rational and empirical sciences and the application of mathematics to physics, as Galileo did. From the point of view of the history of mankind, the past and its legacy are devaluated. Technological progress is a sign interpreted as a sign of progress in general and the conviction that society can be organized along with scientific methods comes to light. Henri de Saint-Simon was or is one of the fathers of this horrid conception, which he based in the study of hydraulics. He can be seen as the father of the conception of organizing society along networks, long before Norbert Wiener and the invention of cybernetics.



## 6. Conclusion

Despite the claims of increased rationality, attaining freedom, and going forward toward a better, and superior state of being, the ideology of progress, the religion of technology, and modern utopian thinking have led to a society plagued by false consciousness and self-righteous, believing that it has set itself free of the past, religion and myth. Instead, the new historical development has carried out a new enchantment of history and of time, producing a kind of secular or atheistic mysticism, the cults of Freedom, Equality, and Reason, an ideology of suspicion and pragmatism, a sacralization of technique, etc. The final state of perfection is, according to some variants of this all-pervasive mode of thinking, God stripped of the personal form (Taguieff, 2002: 121), or self-deification of man/society. The supposed limitless growth of reason, science, and technology humankind would lead inevitably to the creation of Heaven on Earth, to a state of bliss wherein all wars have ceased, wherein poverty is gone, and so on. Science and commerce, the reorganization of society, the reeducation of man, and the elimination of hindrances (for example, people and cultures that think otherwise) were deemed to accomplish all of these. According to the theory, such a state of bliss would be attended by following some utility principle, making good use of new policies and technologies, which would create a maximum of well-being and/or happiness for the greatest number of people (and this by letting everyone expressing and following his or her own interests). This utopic ideal was achievable by democratization, etc. Pierre-Andre Taguieff observes that from all of those ideas unforeseen consequences followed, and that in spite of their claims regarding the betterment of human condition, horrific results came to pass. Totalitarian social and political structures and ideologies were born. And from them sprang new imperatives that people have to accept otherwise they would be treated as non-people, get stripped of rights, and dignity etc. Imperatives such as being open, open-minded and the unending and unlimited claims to rights without any claims for duties are some of the practical consequences caused by this religion (Taguieff, 2002: 124). The corollary of all these conviction and ideas was that the past must be destroyed, overcome and the people have to be reeducated. The dissenters were branded as enemy of progress, of the people, reactionaries and so on. The results of governing societies according to utopian views and to the religion of progress – at least in Eastern Europe and China are known to all. The ideology of progress and the trust its supporters put in the process of historical process had led to the development of radical views of human existence which call for the abolition of all limits that are restraining it. Life should become easy; the individuality of each human being should be lived without any restraints (Taguieff, 2002: 15). Progress, utopia, and hedonism go hand in hand, and, of course, scientism. This radical ideology of Enlightenment and can be found alive in the ideology of trans- and post-humanism. In a certain sense, the ideology of progress is an ideology of hope, the best antidote to despair or *Weltschmerz*. As such the ideology of progress is characterized by a hedonistic point of view (Taguieff, 2004: 68), hedonism that permeates also the modern conceptions of natural right as opposed to the classical views thereof (Strauss, 1950). The idea of evolutionary humanism and the technological system within which humanity is does not go toward emancipation but to tyranny and the destruction of liberty and freedom of thought, etc.

## References

1. Blovin, M. (2023). *Saint-Simon, ingénieur-prêcheur de l'industrialisme. Bleu comme un orange* [online] available at: <https://www.piecesetmainoeuvre.com/documents/saint-simon-l-ingenieur-precheur-de-l-industrialisme-bleue-comme-une-orange>
2. Blovin, M. (2015). *Ludd contre Marx*. [online] available at <https://www.piecesetmainoeuvre.com/documents/ludd-contre-marx>
3. Blovin, M. (2016). *Ludd contre les américains*. [online] available at <https://www.piecesetmainoeuvre.com/documents/ludd-contre-les-americains>
4. Brzezinski, Z. (1972). *Between Two Ages. The role of America in the technotronic Age*. Westport: Greenwood Press Publishers.
5. Bourg, D. (2001). Les origines religieuses de l'idée du progrès, in Dominique Bourg et al., *Peut-on encore croire au progrès?* Paris: PUF, Paris.
6. Cérézuelle, D. (2021). *La technique et la chair*. Paris: éditions l'Échappes,
7. Ellul, J. (2004). *L'espérance oubliée*. Paris: La table ronde.
8. Huxley, J. (2010). *UNESCO. Its Purpose and Philosophy*. London: Euston Grove Press.
9. Huxley, J. (1992). *Evolutionary Humanism*. Amherst: Prometheus Books.
10. Josephson-Storm, J. (2017). *The Myth of Disenchantment*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
11. Strauss, L. (1957). *Natural Law and History*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
12. Taguieff, P-A. (2004). *Le sens du progrès. Une approche historique et philosophique*. Paris: Flammarion.