

OPEN CHRISTIAN PRESS

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE AGE

*Exposing Modern Deceptions, Counterfeit Christianity, and the Church's Captivity to
the Spirit of the Age*

PART IV

INSTITUTIONS, POWER, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE MANAGED FUTURE

CHAPTER 21

Transhumanism, Technocratic Globalism, and the Counterfeit Future

Prof. Sixbert SANGWA

Open Christian University | Center for Faith and Work

[ORCID 0000-0001-8650-1444](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8650-1444) | ssangwa@openchristian.education

Edited by Prof. Dr. Placide Mutabazi

First Open Christian Press edition, 2026

Open Christian Press, an Open Christian University imprint

books.openchristian.education

CHAPTER PUBLICATION METADATA

Abstract

This chapter examines the convergence of transhumanist aspiration, human enhancement, integrated digital infrastructure, technocratic administration, and prophetic expectation around one decisive theological question: whether humanity will receive its future from the Creator through redemption, resurrection, judgment, and the kingdom of Jesus Christ, or attempt to manufacture that future through biological redesign, human-machine integration, predictive governance, and technological promises of life beyond death. Building upon the preceding chapters' analyses of scientism, created order, political religion, artificial intelligence, surveillance, and synthetic reality, it argues that transhumanism and technocratic globalism are distinct but potentially convergent projects that can form a counterfeit eschatology. Creation is then displaced by redesign, providence by prediction, wisdom by computation, healing by enhancement, sanctification by optimisation, resurrection by life extension or digital continuation, and the kingdom of God by managed global order. Through sustained exposition of [Genesis 11:1-9](#), [Daniel 7:1-28](#), [2 Thessalonians 2:1-12](#), [Revelation 13:11-18](#), and [Revelation 18:1-24](#), the chapter evaluates genetic intervention, embryo selection, neural interfaces, synthetic embodiment, longevity research, cryonics, whole-brain emulation, digital replicas, digital identity, programmable payments, automated eligibility, emergency governance, and global standard-setting. It presents the strongest humanitarian and administrative case for these developments, distinguishes therapy from enhancement, cooperation from ideological globalism, and documented capability from speculation, and refuses to identify any present technology as the mark of the beast. Particular attention is given to African opportunities and vulnerabilities, including digital inclusion, data dependency, foreign technological control, and unequal safeguards. The chapter concludes that no laboratory can forgive sin, no database can preserve the soul, and no global system can create righteousness. The Christian future is not posthuman self-transcendence but bodily resurrection, the blessed hope, the return of Jesus Christ, final judgment, and the new creation.

Keywords: transhumanism; posthumanism; human enhancement; technocracy; global governance; digital identity; programmable finance; biblical eschatology; resurrection; rapture readiness

Publication details

Book: *The Gospel According to the Age: Exposing Modern Deceptions, Counterfeit Christianity, and the Church's Captivity to the Spirit of the Age*

Chapter: Chapter 21: Transhumanism, Technocratic Globalism, and the Counterfeit Future

Author: Prof. Sixbert SANGWA

Book editor: Prof. Dr. Placide Mutabazi

Publisher: Open Christian Press, an Open Christian University imprint

Edition: First edition

Publication year: 2026

Language: English

Suggested citation

Sangwa, S. (2026). Transhumanism, technocratic globalism, and the counterfeit future. In P. Mutabazi (Ed.), *The Gospel according to the age: Exposing modern deceptions, counterfeit Christianity, and the church's captivity to the spirit of the age* (Chapter 21). Open Christian Press.

Rights and Scripture notice

Copyright © 2026 Sixbert Sangwa. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the publisher, except as permitted by applicable copyright law. Scripture quotations marked CSB have been taken from the Christian Standard Bible®, Copyright © 2017 by Holman Bible Publishers. Used by permission. Christian Standard Bible® and CSB® are federally registered trademarks of Holman Bible Publishers.

Publisher: books.openchristian.education | editor@openchristian.education

When the Gate Recognises Every Face but Knows No Soul

A gate stands at the entrance to the future. It recognises the traveller before the traveller speaks. It reads the face, verifies the fingerprint, checks the wallet, searches the health record, calculates the risk, confirms permission, and opens. The process is fast, efficient, and almost invisible. To the person who has waited hours in public offices, lost papers in a flood, been denied a bank account, or travelled far to prove identity, the gate may feel like mercy made practical.

Then one day the record is wrong.

The gate does not accuse. It simply refuses to open. No official appears. No neighbour can testify. No clerk can exercise compassion. The system reports that the person is unverified, ineligible, non-compliant, sanctioned, unsafe, or outside the permitted category. The traveller remains visible to the network and invisible as a person. Every feature is recognised except the face as the face of a neighbour made in the image of God.

Another door stands nearby. It leads into a laboratory. Inside, ageing is described as a technical defect, inherited disease as editable code, memory as an information pattern, the brain as an interface, and death as an engineering problem. Some work performed there is merciful. A gene therapy may restore blood production. A neural implant may help a paralysed person communicate. An artificial organ may extend life long enough for a mother to raise her child. The Christian should not despise such gifts. The physician who heals, the engineer who restores function, and the researcher who corrects a harmful mutation may be practising neighbour-love through disciplined knowledge.

Yet the language can change. Healing becomes enhancement. The patient becomes a platform. The child becomes a design opportunity. The body becomes obsolete hardware. Memory becomes transferable data. Mortality becomes a market failure. Humanity is invited not merely to treat disease but to redesign the creature, transcend embodiment, merge with machines, and enter a future in which biological inheritance, social participation, and perhaps life itself are administered through systems owned and governed by other human beings.

Chapter 20 ended with a decisive warning. Artificial intelligence may assist human responsibility, but it cannot bear the image of God, possess the Holy Spirit, repent, worship, love sacrificially, or raise the dead. The machine has learned to imitate a face and speak with a shepherd's cadence. The next temptation is to remake the human face in the image of the machine. Intelligence is detached from wisdom, identity from embodiment, life from creaturehood, and hope from resurrection.

The present chapter therefore asks a larger question than whether one technology is safe. It asks who owns the future.

The controlling claim is severe but carefully bounded. Transhumanism and technocratic globalism are not the same movement, and they should not be collapsed into a single conspiracy. Transhumanists disagree about politics, markets, religion, equality, freedom, and risk. Governments develop digital systems for different reasons. International organisations contain rival interests. Physicians seeking a cure are not thereby designing a posthuman species. Engineers building an accessible interface are not necessarily preparing political coercion. Systems can nevertheless converge without a secret committee. Shared assumptions, commercial incentives, public emergencies, competitive pressures, technical standards, and institutional dependence can join projects whose participants never share one room.

Where the projects converge, they can form a counterfeit eschatology. The body is redesigned rather than received. Providence is replaced by prediction. Wisdom is reduced to computation. Healing becomes optimisation. Sanctification is mimicked by performance enhancement. Communion is substituted with permanent connectivity. Resurrection is displaced by longevity, cryonics, emulation, or digital continuation. Judgment is administered through scores and eligibility rules. Unity is produced through interoperability. Peace is maintained through compliance. The kingdom of God is imitated by managed global order. The new creation is advertised as a posthuman civilisation constructed by those who possess the laboratories, models, networks, credentials, and payment rails (Burdett, 2015; Waters, 2006).

This future is counterfeit not because every tool is false, but because genuine goods are asked to perform a saving work they cannot perform. Medicine can relieve pain. It cannot reconcile the guilty to God. Technology can extend communication. It cannot create communion with the Father. Administration can distribute resources. It cannot produce righteousness. Longevity science may delay some diseases. It cannot conquer the judgment that follows death. A digital replica may repeat a dead person's phrases while the person stands before the living God.

The old serpent does not need to persuade humanity that every machine is divine. He only needs to persuade the creature that the Creator is unnecessary.

The Counterfeit Future and Its Vocabulary

Discernment begins by separating realities that public debate often merges.

Transhumanism is a family of philosophical, cultural, and technological projects that seeks to overcome or radically transform perceived human limitations through science and technology. Its most recognisable organisations anticipate the broadening of human potential through the reduction of ageing, cognitive limitation, involuntary suffering, and confinement to present biological and planetary conditions (Humanity+, 2009). The movement includes libertarian versions that emphasise individual choice, democratic versions that stress equal access, commercial versions organised around markets, medical versions focused on health and longevity, futurist versions anticipating radical transformation, and religious adaptations that attempt to combine enhancement with inherited doctrines. These forms disagree, but they share a willingness to treat the present human condition as provisional material rather than a received nature whose moral meaning must be honoured (Bostrom, 2005; Cole-Turner, 2011).

Transhumanism must not be confused with ordinary medicine. A wheelchair, pacemaker, cochlear implant, insulin pump, prosthetic limb, antibiotic, artificial joint, dialysis machine, or speech-assistance device can restore function, protect life, and enable participation. The biblical concern is not that humans use tools. Humanity was commissioned to cultivate creation. The concern arises when therapy becomes a philosophy of self-creation, when bodily givenness is treated as tyranny, or when technical ability is assigned authority to determine what a human being should become. This distinction extends the author's earlier warning that technological relief of suffering must not be confused with the promise of self-transcendence apart from God (Sangwa, 2024).

Posthumanism carries more than one meaning. Philosophical posthumanism often questions human exceptionalism, anthropocentrism, stable human nature, and sharp boundaries among humans, animals, machines, and environments. It can expose human pride and remind societies that people are ecologically dependent. Yet it can also weaken the moral category of humanity by dissolving the distinctive dignity of persons into networks of material relations. Technological posthumanism looks toward a future condition so transformed by enhancement, machine integration, or artificial embodiment that present humanity may no longer be the dominant or recognisable form of intelligent life. Transhumanism is commonly presented as the transition toward that condition.

Human enhancement refers to interventions intended not merely to treat disease or restore ordinary function but to increase physical, cognitive, emotional, reproductive, military, economic, or longevity capacities beyond a selected baseline. The therapy-enhancement distinction is morally important but not always simple. Vaccination strengthens resistance against disease. Education expands cognition. Glasses improve vision beyond what unaided eyes provide. A prosthesis may eventually outperform an ordinary limb. The existence of difficult boundaries does not prove that all boundaries are meaningless. Moral reasoning must ask about purpose, proportionality, risk, consent, justice, identity, social pressure, and the good toward which the intervention is directed.

Technocracy is the organisation of government and social administration around technical expertise, quantitative management, optimisation, prediction, professional systems, and data-driven decision-making. Competence is a good. A bridge should be designed by people who understand engineering, and an epidemic should be studied by people who understand epidemiology. Technocracy becomes morally dangerous when

technical expertise is treated as moral sovereignty, when political questions are disguised as neutral calculations, or when persons become variables in systems whose objectives they did not choose and cannot challenge. Experts can estimate outcomes. They cannot manufacture the final good by measurement alone.

Global governance refers to the institutions, agreements, standards, networks, and practices through which states and non-state actors coordinate across borders. It is not identical to world government. Viruses, cyberattacks, organised crime, trade, migration, financial instability, environmental damage, war, and humanitarian emergencies cross borders. Cooperation can serve neighbour-love. Ideological globalism begins where coordination acquires a comprehensive moral ambition, disputed anthropologies are presented as universal technical necessities, or access to finance, development, technology, and legitimacy becomes conditional upon conformity without meaningful local, national, democratic, or moral accountability.

A **counterfeit future** is a rival eschatological vision. It identifies the human problem, names the obstacle, promises deliverance, gathers disciples, establishes moral priorities, and portrays a final state of fulfilment. It becomes counterfeit when progress, unity, security, transcendence, or immortality are promised while repentance, divine judgment, bodily resurrection, and the reign of Jesus Christ are excluded.

These definitions restrain both panic and naivety. The Christian should neither condemn an assistive device as rebellion nor accept a posthuman manifesto as advanced medicine. The question is not whether an intervention is new. The question is whether it serves the creature under God or recruits the creature into self-invention against God.

From Babel to the Engineered Human

The dream of transcending human limitation did not begin with a computer. Ancient epics searched for immortality. Rulers claimed divine status. Alchemists pursued transformation and life extension. Philosophers imagined the cultivation of superior human types. Religious and esoteric traditions promised ascent through secret knowledge. The instruments changed, but the creature repeatedly attempted to cross the boundary between receiving life and authoring it.

The biblical grammar of this ambition appears with unusual clarity in [Genesis 11:1-9](#). Babel possessed a common language, an innovation in building materials, a city, a tower, a programme of self-made identity, and a fear of dispersion. None of these elements is sinful by itself. Language enables communion. Brickmaking is a technical skill. Cities can protect life. Cooperation can accomplish difficult goods. The moral centre lies in the declaration: humanity will build upward, make a name, resist the divine ordering of the earth, and secure unity on its own terms.

Babel was not condemned because humans built. It was condemned because technological coordination became the servant of organised autonomy. The tower was architecture, but also liturgy. The city embodied a confession: we will secure ourselves; we will define our name; we will establish our future; we will not receive our place from God.

The Enlightenment intensified confidence in human reason, progress, education, and the mastery of nature. These developments produced genuine goods, including advances in science, medicine, law, and literacy. They also strengthened the belief that humanity could mature beyond revelation and inherited moral limits. Condorcet imagined indefinite human perfectibility. Baconian mastery encouraged the use of knowledge for the relief of suffering, but modernity increasingly forgot that power needs a moral end received from beyond power itself. Natural science became technological civilisation. Nature was no longer only observed; it was reorganised.

Darwinian accounts of biological development did not themselves create transhumanism, but they supplied a narrative in which humanity could be interpreted as one temporary stage in an unfinished evolutionary process. Some later thinkers asked why blind evolution should retain authority over humanity's next form. If natural selection produced the present human, deliberate selection might produce the future human. Julian Huxley, who helped popularise the term *transhumanism*, envisioned humanity consciously transcending itself.

Contemporary movements differ from earlier eugenics, but the historical memory remains morally necessary (Bostrom, 2005; Kevles, 1985).

Eugenics demonstrates what happens when biological knowledge, social hierarchy, administrative power, and confidence in expertise converge. Its advocates did not all speak the language of cruelty. Many spoke of health, efficiency, social welfare, prevention, and responsibility. Yet the programme ranked lives, coerced reproduction, and treated some people as burdens upon the future. The lesson is not that every genetic therapy is eugenics. It is that benevolent vocabulary cannot make the measurement of human worth morally safe.

Scientific management and early technocratic movements added another stream. Society could be imagined as a system to be optimised. Work could be measured, behaviour classified, resources allocated, and disorder reduced through expert control. Cybernetics later described communication, feedback, and control across machines and living systems. Computing expanded the scale at which populations could be recorded, modelled, and administered. The citizen gradually acquired a second body made of records, scores, identifiers, transactions, risks, and permissions. Ellul's analysis of technological society remains instructive here: technique can cease to be a collection of tools and become the organising logic by which institutions define efficiency, necessity, and possibility (Ellul, 1964).

Twentieth-century futurism joined biological and computational dreams. The human organism could be enhanced, intelligence expanded, ageing treated, and consciousness perhaps transferred. Transhumanist organisations gave the vision explicit philosophical form. Silicon Valley culture then joined venture capital, data, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and an entrepreneurial hostility toward limits. Biohacking translated grand theory into personal experimentation. Wearables quantified sleep, movement, stress, fertility, and attention. The self became a dashboard.

None of this proves that one institution designed the whole trajectory. Intellectual history resembles a river system more than a railway line. Different streams converge because they share a question: must humanity receive its nature and future, or may it design both? The transhumanist answer is often explicit. The technocratic answer is practical. The first redesigns the person. The second constructs the systems through which redesigned persons and ordinary citizens will be recognised, ranked, and permitted to participate.

The counterfeit future therefore requires both a new human and a new gate. The laboratory modifies the body. The network modifies the conditions of belonging. The market prices the enhancement. The state regulates the identity. The platform supplies the interface. The expert defines the risk. The prophetic text is then either ignored as myth or exploited as a headline.

The church must look beneath the glamour. A tower can now be distributed across clouds, databases, laboratories, payment systems, standards bodies, and implanted devices. It may have no single roof. Its unity lies in a shared confession that enough knowledge, connectivity, and control can save humanity from creaturehood.

The Body as Created Gift and Resurrection Promise

The debate over enhancement cannot be settled until the body is understood.

A materialist account often treats the body as an arrangement of matter whose present design has no final moral authority. A dualist imagination may treat it as a temporary container for the real self. Consumer culture treats it as a project. Medicine may treat it as an object of intervention. Digital culture treats it as a source of data. Transhumanism may treat it as a platform awaiting an upgrade. Scripture begins elsewhere.

Human beings are embodied creatures made in the image and likeness of God ([Genesis 1:26-28](#)). The image is not a detachable substance located in intelligence, independence, productivity, beauty, health, memory, or technological capacity. Every attempt to ground dignity in a performance threshold eventually produces people who possess less dignity. The unborn child, person with profound cognitive disability, patient under anaesthesia, elderly believer with dementia, paralysed worker, and dying stranger remain human because God created humanity in His image and calls every life to account before Him (Kilner, 2015).

[Psalm 8:1-9](#) places human dignity between humility and vocation. Humanity is small beneath the heavens, yet crowned with glory and honour and entrusted with responsible dominion. This is neither self-contempt nor self-deification. The creature receives authority without becoming the Creator. Dominion is stewardship, not ownership without limit.

The body bears this creaturely meaning. It locates the person in kinship, sex, dependence, vulnerability, labour, worship, and mortality. It allows hands to serve, voices to confess, tears to fall, bread to be shared, and suffering to be carried together. The body is not morally perfect in its fallen condition. It is subject to disease, injury, disordered desire, ageing, and death. These are not goods to be romanticised. Jesus healed the sick, restored function, touched the unclean, fed the hungry, and raised the dead. Christian resistance to transhumanism must never become hostility to medicine.

The incarnation gives the body greater theological weight. The eternal Word did not rescue humanity by appearing as an abstract principle. He became flesh ([John 1:1-18](#)). He entered a womb, grew, hungered, tired, suffered, bled, died, and rose bodily. Redemption does not abolish embodiment. It restores it. The risen Christ is not a data pattern, memory archive, or symbolic continuation in the disciples' minds. The tomb was empty because the same Jesus who was crucified was raised in transformed bodily life.

[Romans 8:18-25](#) describes creation groaning for liberation from decay. The Christian does not deny corruption. He locates its remedy in God's redemptive act. The body awaits adoption in its fullness, namely, redemption. This hope differs from both resignation and self-engineering. The believer may receive treatment, rehabilitation, prosthesis, transplantation, or experimental care with gratitude. Yet the body is not finally redeemed by escaping it or redesigning it into another species. It is redeemed by God.

This truth also protects people with disabilities from transhumanist contempt disguised as compassion. Disability can involve suffering, exclusion, and need for treatment. It can also expose the arrogance of a society that values speed, autonomy, appearance, and economic productivity above presence, loyalty, patience, and love. The goal of medicine should not be to make every person resemble an idealised consumer or worker. It should be to serve the person before us. Assistive technology is good when it enlarges participation without implying that dignity depended upon the assistance.

The image of God is not a performance threshold. The body is not raw material. The child is not a product. The patient is not a dataset with skin. The elderly are not obsolete. The disabled are not failed prototypes of the enhanced. Creaturely dependence is not a technical error. It is part of the truth that no human being is self-originating, self-sustaining, or self-redeeming.

Healing, Enhancement, and the Disputed Boundary

A faithful Christian ethic must distinguish treatment from enhancement without pretending that every case is easy.

Therapy ordinarily aims to prevent disease, relieve suffering, restore lost function, or enable a person to participate more fully in ordinary human goods. Enhancement aims to increase capacities beyond a selected baseline or to redesign traits according to preference, competition, or aspiration. A gene therapy for sickle cell disease differs morally from editing embryos for preferred height. A neural interface that restores communication differs from an employer demanding implants to increase productivity. An artificial limb that enables walking differs from elective replacement of healthy limbs to gain competitive advantage.

The boundary can move. Glasses restore ordinary vision but can also include augmented displays. Stimulants treat attention disorders but may be used for competitive performance. A prosthesis may surpass ordinary strength. Anti-ageing research may treat diseases of ageing or pursue indefinite lifespan. The presence of grey areas should produce careful judgment, not moral surrender.

At least seven questions help clarify the difference.

First, **what good is being sought?** Relief from a serious disease is not morally identical to superiority over neighbours. Second, **what is being altered?** A reversible intervention in an adult differs from a heritable

modification affecting descendants. Third, **who consents?** Adults can assume some risks that embryos, children, workers, soldiers, prisoners, or economically dependent persons cannot freely assume. Fourth, **who bears the burden?** Benefits may go to wealthy consumers while risks are transferred to research participants, future children, or poorer populations. Fifth, **what social pressure follows?** A voluntary enhancement can become practically compulsory if schools, employers, militaries, or insurers reward users and penalise non-users. Sixth, **does the intervention honour the person's embodied identity?** Restoration differs from treating the whole person as defective material. Seventh, **before whom will the decision be judged?** Christian stewardship remains answerable to God even where regulation permits the act.

Capability cannot answer these questions. A technology tells us what can be attempted. It does not tell us what should be loved. The laboratory can describe mechanisms. It cannot establish the ultimate purpose of a human life.

The strongest defence of enhancement appeals to compassion and freedom. Disease, disability, ageing, and premature death cause real suffering. Humans have always used tools to overcome limits. Vaccines, surgery, sanitation, and anaesthesia were once extraordinary. Refusing a safe enhancement may appear cruel when the intervention could prevent pain, expand intelligence, or protect a child. Advocates also warn that a state powerful enough to forbid enhancement may become more oppressive than the technology itself (Agar, 2004; Bostrom, 2005).

These arguments deserve a serious answer. Christianity does not worship suffering. It does not require a patient to refuse healing in order to prove submission. Yet compassion is corrupted when it makes no distinction among means. Freedom is corrupted when the wealthy purchase advantages that restructure the baseline for everyone else. Parental love is corrupted when receiving a child becomes designing a competitor. Medicine is corrupted when it stops asking how to serve the sick and begins asking which forms of humanity deserve to exist.

The issue is not natural versus artificial. A poisonous mushroom is natural; a ventilator is artificial. The issue is faithful stewardship versus autonomous manufacture. Nature cannot be a complete moral guide after the fall, but neither is the body morally meaningless. Scripture and sound reason must govern the intervention.

Editing the Human Inheritance

Genome editing makes the distinction concrete.

Somatic genome editing changes cells in the treated person and is not intended to be inherited. It can be directed toward serious disease. In 2023, the United States Food and Drug Administration approved Casgevy, the first FDA-approved treatment using CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing, for certain patients with sickle cell disease. In July 2026, its indication was expanded to younger children in specified conditions (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2023, 2026). This is not a theoretical promise. It is regulated clinical medicine with profound potential and significant burdens.

The Christian response should begin with gratitude and moral seriousness. Sickle cell disease causes terrible suffering. Restoring healthy blood production in a living patient does not violate the image of God merely because genetic material is altered. The body already undergoes surgery, transplantation, and pharmacological change. Healing remains a legitimate good.

Germline or heritable editing is different. Changes to embryos, gametes, or cells that contribute to reproduction may pass to future generations. The persons most affected cannot consent. Errors may become inherited. Social choices about disease, disability, normality, and desirable traits enter the human lineage. The World Health Organization's governance framework and recommendations emphasise scientific, ethical, legal, and social oversight for somatic, germline, and heritable editing (World Health Organization, 2021a, 2021b). An international commission convened by the U.S. National Academies and the Royal Society concluded that substantial scientific and governance conditions would have to be met before any responsible clinical pathway could be considered (National Academy of Medicine et al., 2020). In 2025, leading gene and cell therapy

organisations called for a ten-year moratorium on clinical heritable human genome editing, citing unresolved risk and ethical concerns (American Society of Gene & Cell Therapy et al., 2025).

The warning comes not from technological illiteracy but from specialists closest to the field.

Embryo selection raises a related problem. Preimplantation genetic testing can identify some chromosomal abnormalities and serious single-gene conditions. Parents facing devastating inherited disease should be treated with compassion, not accusation. Yet in vitro fertilisation may involve the creation, freezing, ranking, non-transfer, or destruction of embryos. The moral question cannot be reduced to the intentions of adults. Embryonic human life is not an inventory from which the preferred product is selected.

Polygenic embryo screening extends the logic. Instead of testing for one clearly defined mutation, it uses statistical associations across many genetic variants to estimate relative probabilities for complex diseases or traits. Commercial services have emerged despite major limits in predictive power and little public deliberation. Researchers warn that small embryo numbers, population specificity, environmental influences, trade-offs among traits, and uncertainty weaken claims of control (Lázaro-Muñoz et al., 2021; Turley et al., 2021).

The ethical danger is larger than inaccurate prediction. The child may become an optimisation portfolio. The influential argument from procreative beneficence makes the logic explicit by claiming that parents have moral reason to select the child expected to have the best life on the available evidence (Savulescu, 2001). Parents can then be told that responsible love requires selecting the embryo with the preferred risk profile. Insurers may ask why preventable risk was accepted. Schools and employers may eventually reward predicted capacity. Wealthy families may purchase biological advantage, while poorer families are blamed for leaving reproduction to chance.

The old eugenics was often state-directed and coercive. A new eugenic pressure may be market-driven, parental, therapeutic, and distributed. It may not say, “The state forbids this birth.” It may ask, “Why would loving parents choose otherwise?” The coercion becomes cultural before it becomes legal. Major philosophical critiques differ in method, but each warns that genetic mastery can alter equality, responsibility, giftedness, or the meaning of human nature itself (Fukuyama, 2002; Habermas, 2003; Sandel, 2007).

Christian ethics refuses both fatalism and manufacture. Parents may seek treatment, counselling, and wise medical care. They may grieve. They may face decisions with no painless option. Churches must support them materially and spiritually. Yet love receives the child as neighbour before evaluating the child as project. It does not rank human worth by predicted intelligence, health, appearance, or productivity.

A society that edits disease must still ask what it believes disease means. A society that selects embryos must ask who is being selected out. A society that speaks of future generations must ask whether those generations will inherit only modified genes or also a civilisation that no longer knows how to welcome the weak.

Neural Interfaces and the Intimacy of Power

Brain-computer interfaces reveal both the beauty and danger of technological intervention.

Clinical research has enabled people with severe paralysis to communicate through neural signals. In 2023, two landmark studies demonstrated high-performance decoding of attempted speech into text, synthesised audio, and avatar movement in individual participants with paralysis (Metzger et al., 2023; Willett et al., 2023). In 2024, researchers reported an intracortical speech neuroprosthesis that achieved rapid calibration and conversational communication in a person with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, while another study documented years of at-home use of an implanted communication interface before disease progression reduced effectiveness (Card et al., 2024; Vansteensel et al., 2024).

These achievements should be described truthfully. They involved small numbers of participants, specialised surgery, intensive calibration, and experimental systems. They do not establish routine mind reading, memory downloading, or universal brain-machine fusion. Promotional language can run far ahead of clinical evidence.

Nevertheless, the moral frontier is real. Neurotechnology operates near perception, intention, emotion, communication, and identity. UNESCO's 2025 Recommendation on the Ethics of Neurotechnology recognises therapeutic and assistive benefits while warning about autonomy, mental privacy, integrity, identity, discrimination, inequality, freedom of thought, democratic risk, dual use, and the distinction between treatment and enhancement (UNESCO, 2025).

Neural data is not merely another consumer preference. A person's search history may reveal interests. Neural signals may reveal or infer aspects of attempted speech, attention, emotion, or intention. The more directly a system interacts with the nervous system, the less adequate ordinary click-through consent becomes.

The questions multiply. Who owns neural data? Can it be sold? May an employer monitor fatigue or attention? May a military command enhance aggression, suppress fear, or remotely update an implanted device? What happens when a manufacturer discontinues support? Who bears responsibility if a hacked implant causes harm? Can a person refuse an enhancement when colleagues using it become more productive? May insurers condition coverage on neurological monitoring? Can a court compel access to neural evidence?

These are not claims that current systems already perform every feared function. They are governance questions raised by the direction of capability. Ethical reflection must occur before dependence becomes irreversible.

A machine connected to the brain does not become part of the moral self in the same way the body is. Yet long-term integration can shape agency, habit, and identity. A prosthetic hand may feel incorporated into bodily experience. A neural interface may become the route through which a person speaks. Removing it may then feel like silencing rather than unplugging an external device. The moral duty of manufacturers and institutions becomes correspondingly greater.

The Christian response is neither panic nor surrender. Restorative neurotechnology can be an act of mercy. Enhancement that expands domination, erodes mental privacy, or converts the inner life into commercial property should be resisted. The mind is not sacred because it is inaccessible to technology. It is morally significant because the person belongs to God.

The most intimate sanctuary of human life must not become the last unregulated market.

Artificial Bodies and Synthetic Embodiment

The language of the cyborg can obscure ordinary realities. Human beings have long incorporated tools into bodily life. Eyeglasses, dental implants, artificial joints, pacemakers, insulin pumps, prosthetic limbs, exoskeletons, and artificial organs extend or restore function. Tissue engineering and regenerative medicine seek to repair damage. Wearable systems can support workers, patients, and people with disabilities.

These technologies do not erase humanity. The person using a prosthesis remains fully human before, during, and after its use. No percentage of mechanical assistance reduces the image of God. A person with an artificial heart valve is not less embodied. A paralysed believer using an exoskeleton is not moving toward apostasy.

The danger appears when the body is narrated as obsolete hardware and technology as the route toward a superior class. Enhancement markets can turn disability advocacy into a pretext for contempt toward unenhanced bodies. The restored patient becomes an advertisement for the upgraded consumer. A tool developed for need becomes a luxury for status. The moral centre shifts from participation to competitive superiority.

Synthetic embodiment also raises questions of replacement. If artificial organs, tissues, limbs, senses, and interfaces become increasingly capable, some will argue that biological dependence is an avoidable weakness. Yet dependence is not removed; it is transferred. The enhanced person depends upon manufacturers, energy, updates, networks, intellectual property, supply chains, and maintenance. The dream of independence produces a deeper infrastructure of dependence.

This is one of transhumanism's hidden contradictions. The individual is promised sovereignty through technology, but the technology is rarely self-made or self-governed. The more intimate the enhancement, the more power belongs to those who design, own, update, and regulate it.

The body may be upgraded while the person becomes permissioned.

Immortality Without Resurrection

The transhumanist promise reaches its theological centre when death is treated as a technical problem.

Ageing research is not inherently an enemy of faith. Ageing involves complex biological processes associated with disease, frailty, and loss. Contemporary geroscience studies genomic instability, telomere attrition, epigenetic change, loss of protein maintenance, impaired autophagy, altered nutrient sensing, mitochondrial dysfunction, cellular senescence, stem-cell exhaustion, chronic inflammation, disrupted communication, and other interconnected processes (López-Otín et al., 2023). Research on senolytics and related interventions seeks to reduce age-associated disease. Human trials remain early, and clear evidence for safely slowing human ageing as a whole is not yet established (de Magalhães, 2025; Khosla et al., 2025).

A medicine that delays dementia, restores tissue, or reduces frailty may serve life. The moral shift occurs when healthspan becomes an ideology of indefinite life, mortality becomes a failure of engineering, and wealthy consumers treat death as a problem from which superior access should exempt them.

Longevity industries often combine serious biomedical research with promotional prediction. Animal results are reported as previews of human immortality. Early biomarkers are treated as proof of rejuvenation. Corporate timelines assume that progress will continue without interruption. Yet a pathway that alters one mechanism of ageing may introduce another risk. Longer life can enlarge wisdom and relationship, but it can also enlarge inequality, stagnation, and the concentration of wealth and political power. A society divided between those who can purchase decades and those who die from preventable disease would not have conquered death. It would have commercialised delay.

Cryonics goes further. It preserves legally dead bodies or brains at low temperature in the hope that future technology will repair damage, reverse the cause of death, and restore the person. No human being has been revived after cryonic preservation. The practice rests upon speculative assumptions about future repair, identity, memory, and continuity (Dein, 2022). Its advocates may regard it as emergency medicine extended into the future. The Christian should understand the grief beneath the hope while refusing to confuse preserved tissue with promised life.

Mind uploading and **whole-brain emulation** imagine that sufficient mapping and simulation of neural structure could reproduce the functional organisation of a brain in another substrate. A technical roadmap can identify hypothetical steps without proving that the programme is achievable or that an emulation would be the same person rather than a copy (Sandberg & Bostrom, 2008). Even a perfect behavioural replica would not settle the philosophical question of personal continuity. It could speak in the first person, remember a childhood, and insist that it is conscious. Those outputs would not demonstrate that the original person survived the process.

The Christian doctrine of the person is not a crude equation of identity with information. Memory matters, but a person is not merely a retrievable archive. Behaviour matters, but imitation does not create numerical identity. Consciousness matters, but the human being is an embodied creature whose life is received from God. The resurrection is not God restoring a backup file. It is His sovereign raising and transformation of the person.

Digital immortality already exists in weaker forms. Social media accounts remain after death. Voice models reproduce speech. Memorial avatars can answer questions from archived messages. So-called griefbots or postmortem avatars may be designed from a deceased person's data. Scholars warn about consent, commercial manipulation, psychological dependency, dignity, and the interests of the bereaved (Hollanek & Nowaczyk-Basińska, 2024).

Such systems can preserve memories, but they cannot preserve the dead. A widow may hear a familiar voice generated from recordings. The comfort may be real, but the speaker is not her husband. The system predicts a response from data. It does not continue covenant, repent, forgive, worship, or await resurrection.

A digital replica may become more dangerous as it becomes more convincing. The bereaved can be kept inside a commercial relationship whose provider controls the voice of the dead. A child may be told that a deceased parent remains present in an application. The boundary between memorial and simulation can disappear. Grief, which requires truth about absence, may be prolonged through synthetic presence.

The theological error is not the preservation of photographs, letters, recordings, or stories. Scripture itself preserves testimony. The error is allowing representation to claim resurrection.

[Hebrews 9:27](#) places death under judgment, not technical suspension. [1 Corinthians 15:35-58](#) places hope in bodily resurrection through Christ, not indefinite maintenance of the present corruptible condition. [Philippians 3:20-21](#) promises transformation by the power of the returning Saviour. [1 Thessalonians 4:13-18](#) comforts grieving believers with the Lord's descent, the resurrection of the dead in Christ, the catching up of living believers, and permanent communion with Him.

The rapture hope is therefore the opposite of technological escape. The believer is not uploaded away from creaturehood. The dead are raised. The living are transformed. Christ acts. Grace, not capital, determines participation. No patent controls access. No corporation maintains the glorified body. No network outage interrupts communion with the Lord.

A person may live two hundred years and still die in sin. A brain may be frozen for a thousand years and remain unable to forgive itself. A replica may speak forever while its source stands before God. The final enemy is not defeated by storing information. It is defeated by the risen Christ.

Digital Identity and the Architecture of Permission

Transhumanism asks what humanity should become. Digital public infrastructure increasingly determines how present humanity is recognised.

Digital identity can serve genuine goods. People without legal documentation may struggle to open bank accounts, receive benefits, enrol in school, travel, inherit property, prove age, access health care, or exercise civil rights. The World Bank's Identification for Development principles emphasise inclusion, trust, accountability, privacy, security, and the use of identity systems to enhance people's lives (World Bank, 2021). The United Nations Development Programme defines digital public infrastructure as foundational systems enabling interaction among people, businesses, and governments, commonly including identity, payments, and data exchange (United Nations Development Programme, n.d.).

The moral question is not whether identity should be verified. It is whether identity becomes the single gate through which ordinary life must pass.

A paper credential can be lost, forged, or destroyed. A digital credential can be updated, remotely checked, and used across services. These capacities improve efficiency. They also create function creep. A system introduced for welfare may later be used for banking, taxation, health, licensing, travel, age verification, education, employment, voting administration, or online participation. Each added use makes exit more difficult.

Interoperability deepens both benefit and risk. When systems communicate, a person may prove one fact without submitting a new application. Yet the same architecture can join previously separate spheres. Financial, health, location, communication, employment, education, and identity data may be queried through shared rails. Errors spread. Exclusion in one domain becomes exclusion in another.

Europe's revised digital identity framework requires member states to provide at least one European Digital Identity Wallet by December 2026, with legal safeguards and user-control claims embedded in the design (European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2024). The regulation should be read accurately. It does not by itself establish a total surveillance system. It represents a major move toward reusable digital

credentials across public and private services. The moral judgment depends on implementation, voluntariness, data minimisation, unlinkability, oversight, remedy, and the continuing availability of non-digital alternatives.

The United Nations' Universal Digital Public Infrastructure Safeguards Framework recognises that foundational systems require protections for inclusion, privacy, security, accountability, autonomy, and remedy (United Nations Development Programme, 2024, 2025). The presence of safeguards is encouraging. It is also evidence that the risks are not imaginary.

The architecture of permission appears when recognition becomes conditional participation. A person does not merely use an identity to prove who she is. The system uses the identity to determine what she may do. Eligibility can be automated. Benefits can be conditional. Access can be revoked. Sanctions can be propagated. Appeals may be slow or inaccessible.

A human official can be corrupt, prejudiced, or inefficient. An automated gate can scale the official's error to millions and hide the decision behind technical language. The applicant is told that the system denied the request. Yet systems do not assume moral responsibility. People chose the data, rules, thresholds, objectives, and enforcement.

The danger becomes greater when practical anonymity disappears. Not every lawful action should require identity. Private reading, worship, association, charitable giving, movement, and speech can be chilled when every transaction is linked. A state may have legitimate reasons to investigate crime. It does not therefore acquire a moral right to observe every innocent citizen continuously.

The biblical concern is not that God should be unable to see us. [Psalm 139:1-24](#) celebrates divine knowledge because the One who knows is holy, wise, personal, and loving. Human institutions are none of these things perfectly. Total human visibility without divine holiness is not omniscience. It is exposure to fallible power.

Prof. Sangwa's earlier work describes the shift from identification to conditional access and warns that digital infrastructure can become a participation layer when identity, payments, data exchange, and automated eligibility converge (Sangwa, 2025a, 2026a). The warning should not be inflated into a claim that every current digital identity system is the mark of the beast. It should be sharpened into a governance demand: no person should lose the necessities of life because a machine cannot recognise a fingerprint, a database contains an error, a credential expires, or an institution refuses meaningful appeal.

The gate must remain answerable to the neighbour.

Programmable Finance and Economic Participation

Money has always carried rules. Banks enforce sanctions. Courts freeze assets. Welfare programmes restrict eligibility. Merchants refuse fraudulent payments. Central banks shape monetary conditions. Digital finance does not invent economic permission, but it can make permission faster, more granular, more interoperable, and less visible.

Central bank digital currency, or CBDC, is central bank money in digital form. Designs vary substantially. Some proposals concern wholesale settlement among financial institutions. Others concern retail payments by the public. In the Bank for International Settlements' 2024 survey, 85 of 93 participating central banks were exploring a retail CBDC, wholesale CBDC, or both, although stages and designs differed widely (Illes et al., 2025). Exploration is not issuance, and a pilot is not a universal system.

The word **programmable** also requires precision. Programmable money ordinarily means that restrictions are embedded in the monetary unit itself, determining where, when, or for what it may be spent. Conditional payments mean that a payment executes when agreed conditions are met, such as delivery of goods. The European Central Bank states that a digital euro would not be programmable money, while reporting experimentation with conditional-payment services (European Central Bank, 2025, 2026). A truthful critique must preserve that distinction.

Nevertheless, even non-programmable central bank money can operate within programmable platforms. Payment service providers, identity systems, tax systems, sanctions lists, smart contracts, fraud models, and benefit rules can condition transactions around the currency. The moral risk does not depend upon one technical label. It depends upon the full architecture of access and enforcement.

Digital payments can reduce costs, help migrants send remittances, support small businesses, improve aid delivery, and widen financial inclusion. Cash can be stolen. Informal workers can be excluded from credit. Cross-border settlement can be slow and expensive. Christians should not turn inconvenience into holiness.

Yet cash possesses moral qualities that are easy to underestimate. It can be transferred without asking a platform for permission. It can function during outages. It provides a measure of privacy. It allows a poor person to participate without owning a compatible device or maintaining a data profile. Removing cash before alternatives are genuinely inclusive can make citizenship dependent upon continuous technical recognition.

Economic systems become coercive when lawful participation can be suspended without due process. Automated taxation may improve compliance, but errors require human remedy. Sanctions may restrain wrongdoing, but collective punishment can harm innocents. Conditional benefits may protect public funds, but they can humiliate the poor or impose contested moral requirements. Anti-money-laundering controls may combat crime, but overbroad risk scoring can close accounts of lawful charities, migrants, religious organisations, or politically unpopular citizens.

[Revelation 13:11-18](#) describes a future order in which buying and selling are restricted in connection with the beast's mark, name, and number. The text does not say the mechanism will be a CBDC, bank card, biometric wallet, microchip, vaccine, or smartphone. It does reveal that economic participation can become an instrument of worshipful allegiance. Modern infrastructure helps readers understand that such restriction is administratively conceivable. It does not authorise them to declare present infrastructure the fulfilment.

The decisive sin in Revelation is not digital payment. It is allegiance to beastly authority against God. The infrastructure may be technical. The rebellion is spiritual.

Social Scoring and the Numerical Conscience

The desire to quantify trust extends beyond finance.

Credit scoring can help lenders estimate risk. Professional licensing can protect the public. Criminal records can alert institutions to danger. Reputation systems can reduce fraud in markets where strangers interact. No society functions without judgments about reliability.

The danger appears when many judgments are fused into a total social score, when the categories are opaque, when errors cannot be corrected, or when conformity to state or corporate priorities is treated as moral trustworthiness.

China's social credit arrangements are often described inaccurately as one universal score assigned to every citizen. The reality includes national blacklists, sectoral regulatory systems, local pilots, corporate scoring, court enforcement, and diverse administrative mechanisms rather than one simple national number (Lin & Milhaupt, 2023; Liu & Rona-Tas, 2024). Precision does not remove the concern. Studies show how quantification of trust can embed political priorities, disadvantage rural populations, intensify surveillance, and convert compliance into a broad category of citizenship.

The wider lesson is not confined to China. Insurance scores, fraud models, employment screening, platform reputation, predictive policing, credit ratings, risk flags, and content moderation already shape access across societies. Each system has a stated purpose. Their convergence can produce a numerical conscience: the person becomes the score generated about him.

A score cannot repent. It cannot hear context. It cannot distinguish a technical anomaly from moral rebellion unless humans have encoded the distinction. It cannot forgive. Its apparent objectivity can conceal contested values.

The Bible does not forbid records. It forbids false witness and partial judgment. [Isaiah 10:1-4](#) condemns unjust decrees that deprive the vulnerable. [James 2:1-13](#) exposes partiality. A Christian institution should therefore ask not only whether a score predicts efficiently but whether it judges justly, permits correction, protects the weak, and remains limited to its proper domain.

When the number becomes the person, the system has forgotten the soul.

Emergency Governance and the Expansion of Administrative Power

Emergencies reveal both the necessity and danger of concentrated power.

A pandemic can kill millions, overwhelm hospitals, interrupt trade, and deepen inequality. War displaces populations and destroys infrastructure. Cyberattacks can disable hospitals, payment systems, and energy networks. Climate-related disasters can devastate the poor. Financial contagion can spread across borders. No serious Christian ethic may dismiss such threats merely because institutions sometimes exploit fear.

Coordination is therefore necessary. The World Health Assembly adopted the WHO Pandemic Agreement on 20 May 2025 as a legally binding international instrument intended to strengthen prevention, preparedness, response, equity, and cooperation. Its Pathogen Access and Benefit Sharing annex remained under negotiation in July 2026 (World Health Organization, 2025a, 2026). Amendments to the International Health Regulations entered into force for most parties on 19 September 2025, strengthening the global framework for public-health emergencies (World Health Organization, 2025b). These facts should be neither hidden nor inflated. The instruments do not make the WHO a sovereign world government, and the WHO states that it cannot impose domestic lockdowns on countries. They do represent a significant architecture of coordinated obligations, reporting, standards, and emergency governance.

The United Nations' Pact for the Future and Global Digital Compact, adopted in September 2024, similarly address peace, development, digital cooperation, artificial intelligence, future generations, and the reform of global governance (United Nations, 2024). They are political commitments, not a secret world constitution. Yet common language can shape programmes, funding, procurement, professional expectations, and later legal negotiations.

The Christian task is to read actual documents. Slogans are not evidence. Institutional critics sin when they fabricate powers that a text does not grant. Institutional defenders sin when they treat every stated purpose as proof of harmlessness.

Emergency authority should be judged by necessity, proportionality, legality, duration, transparency, evidence, subsidiarity, non-discrimination, and meaningful appeal. The same criteria apply to health, security, climate, and financial measures. A temporary restriction may be morally justified. A temporary system may also become a permanent precedent.

The danger is not only malicious intent. Institutions develop interests. Budgets, careers, platforms, data systems, and legal authorities grow around emergency functions. A capability built for one crisis remains available for another. Public-private partnerships blur lines of responsibility. A government may rely upon corporate data, while the corporation relies upon public enforcement. Citizens may be unable to identify who made the decision.

Technocracy enters when moral disagreement is recoded as risk management. Questions about worship, movement, bodily autonomy, speech, family, work, and economic access can be presented as technical matters whose answer belongs only to experts. Expertise is needed to estimate consequences. It cannot decide by itself what sacrifices are just, which rights may be limited, whose suffering counts, or when a measure has become disproportionate.

[Romans 13:1-7](#) commands honour and ordinary submission to governing authorities as servants appointed to restrain evil. It does not grant rulers ownership of conscience. The apostles obeyed God rather than human commands when authorities forbade faithful witness ([Acts 5:17-32](#)). [Revelation 13:1-10](#) shows political authority becoming beastly when it blasphemes God, demands worship, and persecutes the saints.

The same institution can act lawfully in one matter and overreach in another. Christians should not transform every public-health measure into persecution, nor should they surrender the church's worship, doctrine, and conscience whenever a ruler invokes emergency.

The mature church prepares before the crisis. It understands law, builds relationships of care, maintains truthful communication, supports the poor, protects medical workers, develops local resilience, and knows which commands cannot be obeyed. Courage formed during peace is more reliable than outrage discovered under pressure.

Technocratic Globalism and the Managed Human Future

Global governance becomes technocratic globalism when administrative coordination acquires an increasingly comprehensive account of human flourishing and the technical capacity to enforce it across domains.

This can happen without abolishing nations. Sovereignty may remain formal while policy space narrows through treaties, standards, rankings, financing conditions, software dependencies, professional accreditation, procurement rules, and platform requirements. A national government may freely choose a framework because the practical costs of refusal are too high.

The process can serve good ends. Common aviation standards protect passengers. Accounting standards reduce confusion. Cybersecurity protocols protect infrastructure. Medical reporting can detect outbreaks. Anti-corruption rules can restrain theft. Cross-border payments can help families. Interoperable systems can reduce needless bureaucracy.

Yet standards are never purely technical. They define categories, acceptable evidence, risk, identity, compliance, and success. When those definitions concern the person, family, sex, health, religion, education, speech, or conscience, the standard carries a moral anthropology.

Ideological globalism does not begin when two nations cooperate. It begins when one account of the human person is embedded into systems that populations must use, while dissent is treated as technical backwardness, misinformation, risk, or exclusion from progress.

The rhetoric of peace and security requires special care. [1 Thessalonians 5:1-11](#) warns that the day of the Lord will come unexpectedly upon those who speak of peace and security. The text does not authorise Christians to condemn every peace treaty, security programme, or diplomatic effort. Peacemaking is blessed. The warning exposes confidence in human order that ignores divine judgment.

Technocratic globalism offers a particularly persuasive form of that confidence. It does not need to promise paradise in religious language. It promises resilience, optimisation, inclusion, health, sustainability, safety, and frictionless participation. Each good can become an idol when detached from the Creator. A system may reduce friction by removing the moral space in which conscience can refuse.

The final human is then not merely enhanced. He is interoperable. His identity is machine-readable, his risk continuously assessed, his wallet connected, his health monitored, his movement logged, his speech ranked, and his access updated. The system calls this personalisation. The person experiences it as permission.

No single contemporary institution possesses this total power. The point is not that the finished architecture already exists. The point is that its components are public, useful, expanding, and increasingly connected. The moral duty of the church is to evaluate convergence without declaring completion.

Prof. Sangwa's work on digital infrastructure, global governance, and technopolarity has repeatedly insisted upon this discipline: current systems may constitute stage-setting without constituting fulfilment; public cooperation may serve genuine goods while also constructing chokepoints vulnerable to coercion; and Scripture, not fear, must define the final prophetic identification (Sangwa, 2025a, 2026a, 2026b, 2026c). That approach governs the present chapter.

The world may be building infrastructure that a future lawless ruler could exploit. It is not therefore lawful to name a current ruler as the man of lawlessness or a current institution as Babylon. The difference between readiness and accusation is the difference between biblical watchfulness and false witness.

The Strongest Case for Enhancement and Technocratic Coordination

A serious critique must allow its opponents to speak in their strongest form.

The advocate of transhumanism may begin with a hospital ward. A child suffers from a lethal mutation. A parent loses speech to paralysis. A gifted mind is destroyed by dementia. A worker dies because an organ was unavailable. An elderly couple lose one another after decades of covenant love. The advocate asks: if technology can prevent such suffering, why should inherited biology be treated as sacred?

Human beings have always transcended natural limitations. Fire overcame cold. Agriculture reduced famine. Writing extended memory. Flight overcame gravity's practical restriction. Vaccination trained immunity. Surgery altered anatomy. Education enhanced cognition. Digital communication crossed distance. The difference between treatment and enhancement may therefore appear culturally constructed and unstable.

The advocate may also appeal to freedom. Adults should be permitted to improve their bodies and minds when risks are understood. Parents already shape children through nutrition, education, location, and inheritance. Genetic intervention could be another form of responsible care. Enhancement might increase creativity, moral reasoning, empathy, productivity, and resistance to disease. Longer healthy lives could preserve knowledge, deepen relationships, and reduce the burden of chronic illness.

The advocate of technocracy begins with administrative failure. Elections reward short-term promises. Corruption diverts resources. Rumour defeats evidence. Local systems exclude the undocumented. Paper records disappear. Benefits are stolen. Public agencies cannot coordinate. Experts and integrated digital systems can improve accuracy, speed, inclusion, transparency, and planning. Global problems require governance beyond one border.

The strongest case therefore combines compassion, liberty, equality, competence, and survival. It does not always hate humanity. It often wants to protect humanity from disease, ignorance, arbitrariness, and preventable death.

Christian criticism must acknowledge these goods. The church has sometimes romanticised suffering it did not personally carry. It has opposed medicine through ignorance, blamed disabled people for lacking faith, neglected scientific education, and defended incompetent administration as though disorder proved spirituality. Such failures make the transhumanist promise more attractive.

Yet the strongest case still cannot answer its own deepest questions.

Who defines improvement? A stronger memory may deepen learning or make trauma impossible to escape. Reduced fear may help a patient or create a reckless soldier. Increased attention may serve education or intensify labour extraction. Extended life may strengthen family or freeze political and economic power. Genetic selection may reduce disease or narrow human diversity according to class preference.

Freedom for the first adopter can become compulsion for the next generation. Once enhancement changes the competitive baseline, refusal has a cost. The worker without an implant may be less employable. The child not selected for predicted traits may be treated as the product of negligent parenting. The soldier who refuses modification may be called disloyal. The citizen who prefers offline identification may be classified as suspicious.

Equality also cuts both ways. Subsidised enhancement may be proposed to prevent class division, but public funding requires public criteria. The state then decides which bodies should be altered. Market provision gives wealthy people first access. Either path concentrates power.

Competence cannot replace legitimacy. An expert may know how to optimise a system while remaining unable to justify the objective. A model may predict who is likely to default without determining whether

denying credit is just. A health authority may estimate transmission without possessing unlimited jurisdiction over worship. A central bank may improve settlement without acquiring moral authority over every purchase. The strongest case succeeds in proving that suffering should be relieved, public systems should be competent, and cooperation can serve humanity. It does not prove that humanity may redefine itself without limit or that administration should become comprehensive.

Why Technical Capability Cannot Define the Human Good

Technology answers questions of means. Ethics asks what ends deserve pursuit. Theology asks who created the agent, what has gone wrong, how salvation comes, and toward what final future history moves.

A tool can be efficient and wicked. A system can be accurate and unjust. A medicine can work and still be used coercively. A prediction can be statistically sound and morally irrelevant. Technical success never abolishes moral judgment.

Three errors commonly hide this truth.

The first is **the naturalistic error**: because human beings are material systems, sufficiently advanced intervention may redesign the whole person. This reduces moral agency, covenant, worship, guilt, love, and hope to functions of matter. Mechanisms are real. They do not exhaust meaning.

The second is **the progress error**: because technology has solved previous problems, it will solve the human problem. Sanitation reduced disease; therefore engineering may conquer death. Communication crossed distance; therefore connection may create communion. Computation defeated certain games; therefore it may produce wisdom. The conclusion exceeds the evidence because the problems differ in kind.

The third is **the sovereignty error**: because humans design systems, humans control their consequences. Complex systems generate dependence, feedback, unintended incentives, and concentrated power. A technology created to liberate can become infrastructure that no individual can refuse.

Winner's classic question, whether artefacts have politics, remains relevant. Technologies can embody arrangements of authority and make some forms of social order easier than others (Winner, 1980). A bridge, database, payment rail, or neural device is not morally neutral merely because it contains no intention. Design distributes power.

Christian theology adds a more severe judgment. The designers are fallen. Intelligence does not remove pride. Education does not remove greed. Longevity does not remove sin. An enhanced sinner remains a sinner. A perfectly integrated society can coordinate rebellion more effectively than an unintegrated one.

This is why the central human problem cannot be solved by capability. Humanity does not merely lack sufficient information, lifespan, connectivity, or administrative precision. Humanity is alienated from God, enslaved to sin, and subject to judgment. The cross was necessary because optimisation could not save us.

The counterfeit future offers improvement without atonement. The gospel offers reconciliation through the blood of Christ.

Babel, the Beasts, the Man of Lawlessness, and Babylon

The Bible does not provide a technical blueprint for every future device. It provides a theology of power, deception, worship, economic coercion, judgment, and hope. Its symbols must be interpreted in context before they are attached to current events.

Babel: Unified Capacity Under Autonomous Desire

[Genesis 11:1-9](#) follows the flood and the renewed command to fill the earth. Humanity possesses one language and migrates to a plain in Shinar. The people develop a durable building technology, establish a city, construct a tower, seek a name, and resist dispersion.

The text does not condemn language, cities, engineering, or cooperation. Scripture later celebrates Jerusalem, skilled craftsmanship, wise administration, and international mission. The problem is covenantal direction. Humanity turns common capacity toward self-exaltation and resistance to God's order.

"Let us make a name for ourselves" is a rival doctrine of identity. The Creator gives names, callings, boundaries, and blessing. Babel manufactures a name through visibility and achievement. "Otherwise, we will be scattered" is a rival doctrine of security. God had commissioned humanity to fill the earth. Babel interprets obedience as danger and concentration as salvation.

God's descent exposes the irony. The tower intended to reach the heavens remains so small that the Lord comes down to see it. Divine judgment confuses language and disperses the project. Human unity is not an unconditional good. Unity can multiply mercy or magnify rebellion.

The contemporary application is not that global communication is sinful. Pentecost crosses languages through the Spirit and gathers people into Christ. The application is that interoperability, common standards, shared data, and planetary coordination must remain beneath God. A digital tower can be more dangerous than a brick tower when it makes rebellion frictionless.

Babel teaches four principles. Technology amplifies the worship already present. Centralisation can turn fear into control. A common language can conceal a common lie. God remains sovereign over systems that appear too large to challenge.

Daniel's Beasts: When Government Devours

[Daniel 7:1-28](#) presents four beasts rising from a turbulent sea. The imagery corresponds to kingdoms and rulers, but the forms are deliberately inhuman. Empire becomes beastly (Longman, 1999).

Human government is ordinarily a servant of order. The beast image shows government deformed by arrogance, violence, blasphemy, domination, and persecution. Political power ceases to protect human beings and begins to consume them. The horns represent kings or centres of authority. The little horn speaks arrogantly, persecutes the saints, seeks to alter times and law, and exercises power for a limited period.

Daniel's vision does not invite believers to label every disliked government a beast. It teaches that states can acquire beastly character when borrowed authority forgets its Owner. Modern technology can increase that capacity. Surveillance can locate dissenters. data integration can classify populations. financial systems can restrict participation. synthetic media can manufacture legitimacy. biotechnology can rank bodies. The moral issue remains political and spiritual: what does the ruler demand, whom does the system devour, and does authority remain beneath God?

The vision's centre is not the beast. It is the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man. Courts sit. Books are opened. Dominion is taken from the arrogant power. One like a son of man receives an everlasting kingdom, and the saints share in it. Human regimes appear permanent because subjects live inside their calendars. Daniel sees their allotted time from heaven.

Technocratic systems often derive authority from inevitability. Citizens are told that the future cannot be resisted because efficiency, security, competition, or crisis requires it. Daniel denies inevitability. No system owns tomorrow. Every database, empire, laboratory, currency, and ruler appears before the court of God.

The Man of Lawlessness: Deception Joined to Self-Exaltation

[2 Thessalonians 2:1-12](#) addresses confusion concerning the day of the Lord. Paul warns against panic produced by a spirit, spoken message, or letter falsely attributed to apostolic authority. Eschatological deception was already capable of using fabricated communication (Weima, 2014).

The passage describes rebellion, the revelation of the man of lawlessness, self-exaltation above every object of worship, a claim to divine status, the mystery of lawlessness already at work, restraint, satanic activity with false signs and wonders, and deception among those who refuse to love the truth. The lawless one is finally destroyed by the breath of the Lord's mouth and the appearance of His coming.

Several disciplines follow.

First, the man of lawlessness is a personal figure in a wider mystery already operating. Christians should recognise patterns of lawlessness without identifying every arrogant leader as the final figure.

Second, deception is moral before it is technological. People perish because they do not receive the love of the truth. An advanced media system can scale deception, but the heart's hostility to truth makes the deception welcome.

Third, signs do not authenticate themselves. A dramatic phenomenon, accurate prediction, artificial simulation, or apparently impossible event must be tested by doctrine, worship, fruit, and fidelity to Christ. Technology may imitate signs. Scripture also teaches real spiritual deception. Christians should not reduce every future sign to special effects, nor should they receive spectacle as proof of God.

Fourth, self-exaltation is the core. The lawless ruler does not merely administer efficiently. He claims worshipful supremacy. This matters when interpreting current infrastructure. Digital identity, artificial intelligence, or programmable payment may be used by many forms of government. They become prophetically decisive in the text when joined to rebellion, false worship, and the lawless ruler's authority.

Fifth, restraint means history is not out of control. Interpreters disagree about the restrainer's identity and the sequence of end-time events. This book maintains the pre-tribulation conviction that Christ will gather His church before the final period of divine wrath, while acknowledging sincere evangelical disagreement. No position permits date-setting or careless identification.

The passage ends with Christ's effortless victory. The most intimidating ruler in history is destroyed by the Lord's appearing. The church does not prepare by imitating lawlessness, spreading false reports, or cultivating fear. It prepares by loving the truth.

Revelation 13: Worship, Image, Mark, and Economic Restriction

[Revelation 13:11-18](#) presents a second beast who exercises the authority of the first, performs great signs, deceives earth-dwellers, directs them to make an image, gives breath or animation to the image, causes those who refuse worship to be killed, and imposes a mark connected to the first beast's name or number. Buying and selling are restricted (Beale, 1999; Osborne, 2002).

The passage joins five realities that contemporary discussion often separates: political authority, religious deception, visible or animated representation, worship, and economic enforcement. The mark is not an isolated technology. It belongs to an allegiance system.

The language of image and breath has generated speculation about robotics, artificial intelligence, holograms, synthetic media, and other technologies. These may make the scene easier to imagine, but the text does not identify the mechanism. Ancient readers understood animated idols, imperial images, cultic demand, and economic pressure without digital systems. Modern readers should not pretend that their preferred device is hidden in the Greek text.

The mark's placement on the right hand or forehead, its universal social reach, and its link to commerce communicate public allegiance and comprehensive enforcement. Interpretive traditions differ concerning symbolism and literal manifestation. The pastoral point is clear: a final order will demand loyalty that belongs to God and use social and economic power against those who refuse.

This means the mark cannot be reduced to accidental exposure. The author's earlier eschatological work rightly insists that it is tied to worshipful rebellion and the beast system, not merely to a bank card, phone, vaccine, wallet, identity number, or biometric credential used in ordinary life (Sangwa, 2026d). Fearful believers should not be told that they unknowingly lost salvation by using a lawful tool. Such teaching slanders the clarity and justice of God.

At the same time, the text forbids complacency. A society that normalises identity-gated access, integrated payment rails, automated sanctions, universal surveillance, and synthetic persuasion is developing capacities that could serve many rulers, including a future beastly one. Stage-setting is not fulfilment. Stage-setting is not irrelevant.

John calls for wisdom. Wisdom does not sleep, and wisdom does not hallucinate certainty.

Revelation 18: The Splendour and Judgment of Babylon

[Revelation 18:1-24](#) portrays Babylon as a luxurious, commercial, political, spiritually corrupt, deceptive, and violent order. Kings commit immorality with her. Merchants become rich through her excess. Cargo lists culminate in human lives. Her judgment arrives suddenly, and the economic world mourns the loss of its market (Beale, 1999; Osborne, 2002).

Babylon's power is not merely political. It is seductive. She offers splendour, access, trade, influence, and intoxication. Her spiritual corruption and economic abundance reinforce one another. The merchants do not mourn her victims. They mourn lost commerce.

The chapter's transhumanist relevance is not that every biotechnology firm is Babylon. It is that the body, genetic material, attention, identity, emotion, memory, grief, and mortality can become commodities in a commercial civilisation that knows the price of everything and the sacredness of nothing.

The cargo of the future may include biological data, neural signals, embryos, synthetic organs, behavioural predictions, digital replicas, and years of life. Markets can serve exchange. They become Babylonian when persons are converted into products and luxury becomes indifferent to suffering.

The command to come out of Babylon is not a call to leave every city or market. It is a call to refuse participation in her sins. Christians may work in technology, medicine, finance, government, and international institutions. They must not sell conscience for access, manipulate bodies for profit, deceive users, commodify the dead, or cooperate with false worship.

Babylon falls “in one hour” because apparent permanence is fragile before God. Complex systems can create an illusion of invulnerability. Revelation shows that the most integrated commercial order remains one judgment away from collapse.

Prophetic Discernment: Evidence Before Identification

The present age requires a disciplined vocabulary for claims. Without it, facts, fears, and fulfilments are mixed until the church cannot distinguish warning from proof.

Table 1

A Discipline for Contemporary and Prophetic Claims

Category	Meaning	Proper Christian response
Established fact	A development supported by reliable primary or high-quality evidence	State it accurately, cite it, and acknowledge limits
Current capability	A function demonstrated under defined conditions	Distinguish demonstration from scale, routine use, and universal availability
Institutional policy	An adopted law, standard, agreement, programme, or official design	Read the actual text, identify legal force, and trace implementation
Stated intention	A goal publicly announced by an institution or advocate	Report it as intention, not inevitable outcome
Reasonable inference	A conclusion that follows plausibly from multiple facts	Mark it as inference and consider alternatives
Plausible risk	A harmful use enabled by architecture, incentives, or precedent	Prepare safeguards without claiming the harm has already occurred
Speculative scenario	A possible future lacking sufficient evidence for prediction	Use cautiously for foresight, never as settled fact
Prophetic correlation	A resemblance between current conditions and a biblical pattern	Test contextually and refuse identification beyond the text
Definitive fulfilment	An event satisfying the biblical conditions of a prophecy	Claim only where Scripture and evidence warrant it

This discipline protects the church from two opposite failures.

Prophetic sleep dismisses convergence because no current system perfectly matches Revelation. It assumes that preparation is irrelevant until the final figure appears. It may celebrate every innovation, accept every credential, and surrender every safeguard in the name of progress.

Prophetic intoxication treats every headline as fulfilment. It identifies every logo as an occult symbol, every public figure as the Antichrist, every digital wallet as the mark, every treaty as world government, and every medical intervention as biological apostasy. It confuses emotional certainty with revelation.

Both are forms of captivity. The sleeping church is mastered by the system. The intoxicated church is mastered by the fear of the system.

The answer is sober watchfulness. [1 Thessalonians 5:4-11](#) calls believers children of light who remain awake, self-controlled, clothed with faith, love, and the hope of salvation. Watchfulness is moral preparedness, not addiction to breaking news.

A pastor who terrifies believers with unsupported prophetic claims should repent. The pulpit is not a theatre for speculation. A teacher who declares that ordinary use of a current technology constitutes irreversible apostasy has exceeded Scripture and may wound tender consciences. A ministry that profits from fear is practising the commercial logic it claims to expose.

Institutional leaders should also repent when they hide morally significant architecture behind technical jargon. “The algorithm decided” is not an ethical explanation. “The standard requires it” does not remove responsibility. “The market demands it” cannot absolve exploitation. “The emergency continues” cannot justify permanent exceptional power without evidence.

Table 2

The Mark of the Beast: What the Text Establishes and What It Does Not Permit Us to Claim

What Revelation establishes	What Scripture does not permit us to claim today
The mark belongs to the authority, name, or number of the beast	Every digital identity, biometric credential, payment card, QR code, implant, vaccine, or CBDC is the mark
It is connected to worship, allegiance, deception, and coercion	A person receives the mark accidentally through ordinary use of present tools
It is enforced through economic exclusion involving buying and selling	Any restriction on commerce is itself the final prophetic fulfilment
It operates within the final beast system and false-prophet ministry	A current leader, company, currency, or institution may be named the beast without the biblical conditions
Refusal requires costly faithfulness	Panic, false accusation, date-setting, and withdrawal from all technology are marks of faithfulness

The church must prepare for costly obedience without inventing the cost. It should teach believers that no economic access, employment, platform, professional licence, medical benefit, or civil status is worth denying Christ. It should also teach them not to call lawful participation idolatry where God has not done so.

In the last second before midnight, precision is not a luxury. False alarms can train the flock to ignore the true cry.

Africa Inside the Managed Future

Africa enters the counterfeit future from a position of both opportunity and vulnerability.

Digital transformation can address real needs. Mobile payments have helped households and small enterprises transact where conventional banking was limited. Digital identity can improve civil registration, reduce duplicate records, and widen access to services. Artificial intelligence can support agriculture,

education, health, language technologies, and public administration. The African Union's Digital Transformation Strategy for Africa 2020-2030 envisions an integrated and inclusive digital society and economy, while its Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy presents AI as a strategic asset for development, innovation, culture, and integration (African Union, 2020, 2024).

These aspirations should not be mocked. A rural woman denied inheritance because she lacks documentation does not experience paper bureaucracy as freedom. A refugee unable to prove identity is not protected by romantic calls to remain offline. A farmer who receives a faster payment, a deaf student who gains accessible instruction, and a patient whose disease is detected earlier may receive genuine benefit.

Yet inclusion can become dependence. Many African states rely upon foreign cloud infrastructure, vendors, capital, standards, models, and technical expertise. Data generated by African populations may be stored, analysed, or monetised elsewhere. Procurement contracts can outlast administrations. Systems may be built in languages and categories that poorly represent local realities. Weak regulatory capacity can leave citizens without effective remedy.

Birhane (2020) describes algorithmic colonisation as the imposition of external technological systems and values in ways that marginalise local knowledge and deepen dependence. The term should not become an excuse for rejecting every foreign partnership. It identifies a bargaining problem: who owns the infrastructure, who can audit it, who controls updates, who can leave the vendor, and who bears the harm when the system fails?

Digital exclusion also follows existing inequality. Rural residents may lack connectivity. Older people may struggle with interfaces. Women may possess fewer identity documents or devices. Refugees and displaced persons may have incomplete records. Disabled users may encounter inaccessible enrolment. Fingerprints can fail for manual labourers. Power outages can interrupt authentication. A system presented as universal may be least reliable for those who need it most.

The poor can be required to surrender more data than the rich. A wealthy citizen can pay privately, travel through alternatives, hire legal counsel, or move assets. A welfare recipient may have to submit biometrics, household records, location, family data, and continuous eligibility proofs to receive food. The humanitarian purpose may be sincere. The asymmetry remains.

Africa also faces reproductive and biological inequality. Advanced gene therapies are costly. Neural implants require specialised care. Longevity treatments may serve global consumers before basic maternal care, clean water, malaria prevention, cancer treatment, or palliative care reach ordinary communities. A continent could become a source of biological data and research participants while the benefits remain elsewhere.

This does not mean every clinical trial in Africa is exploitation. Ethical research can strengthen health systems and address neglected diseases. It means consent, benefit sharing, post-trial access, local scientific leadership, and independent oversight are essential.

Donor conditionality adds another layer. Development grants may support valuable services while importing data models, procurement requirements, or moral assumptions that local populations did not meaningfully debate. African sovereignty is not protected merely by replacing Western dependence with dependence upon another geopolitical bloc. A multipolar system can reproduce Babel in several languages. No empire becomes righteous by opposing a rival empire.

A Christian African ethic should therefore demand local capacity, lawful data sovereignty, transparent procurement, cybersecurity, independent oversight, accessible appeal, offline alternatives, disability inclusion, meaningful public participation, and protection of conscience. Churches, universities, and businesses should train technologists who can build rather than merely consume systems. They should also teach humility. Local ownership does not sanctify local tyranny.

Africa must not become the data mine, experimental population, cheap labour pool, market, or biometric testbed of another civilisation's posthuman dream. Nor should African leaders invoke decolonisation while constructing their own systems of unaccountable surveillance.

The Lord judges the foreign vendor and the local ruler by the same truth.

The Church Between Fear, Fascination, and Faithfulness

The church can become captive to the counterfeit future in opposite ways.

One congregation worships relevance. Every innovation is adopted because the church fears appearing old. Artificial intelligence generates sermons, biometric tools track attendance, automated messages imitate care, digital platforms mediate giving, and data dashboards define ministry success. None of these tools is automatically sinful. The danger appears when the church cannot imagine faithfulness without them, members become profiles, and shepherds no longer know the sheep.

Another congregation worships alarm. Every innovation is condemned as satanic. Pastors circulate unverified videos, assign prophetic meaning to company logos, identify public figures without evidence, and warn believers that salvation can be lost through a digital transaction. The congregation becomes expert in rumours and weak in Scripture. Fear provides the excitement once supplied by entertainment Christianity.

Both congregations are technology-centred. One stares at the machine with desire. The other stares at it with terror. Christ becomes peripheral.

The church's first responsibility is formation. Believers must know who God is, what a human being is, why the body matters, what death means, what resurrection promises, how government is limited, how evidence should be tested, and why no material benefit can justify false worship. A person with this formation can use technology without surrendering to it.

Pastors should teach the difference between prudence and paranoia. Prudence reads policies, asks technical questions, protects data, retains alternatives, and prepares for pressure. Paranoia assumes hidden intent wherever knowledge is incomplete. Prudence can say, "This system enables a risk." Paranoia says, "This risk proves the secret plan." Prudence strengthens courage. Paranoia makes the flock dependent upon the person who claims special insight.

Churches should also prepare materially. If economic participation becomes morally costly, believers will need more than sermons. They will need generous households, employment networks, food support, legal counsel, medical advocacy, safe communication, and congregations willing to bear one another's burdens. [Acts 2:42-47](#) and [Acts 4:32-37](#) describe a community whose fellowship had economic substance. The early church did not survive pressure through individual preparedness alone.

This solidarity must not become an isolated militia or conspiracy network. It should remain the ordinary body of Christ: truthful, peaceful, generous, hospitable, accountable, and open to the needy. Christians should use lawful rights, engage policy, serve institutions, and protect neighbours of every belief. They should also know that lawfulness and righteousness can diverge.

Christian scientists and engineers carry a serious calling. They should not abandon laboratories to those without a biblical anthropology. They should build accessible systems, reduce harm, expose overclaiming, refuse deceptive marketing, protect consent, and name limits. Whistleblowing may become necessary. Career loss may become possible. No professional advancement is worth becoming an engineer of dehumanisation.

Christian policymakers must resist the temptation to baptise control because they trust their own intentions. A good ruler should design for the possibility of a bad successor. Data collected by a benevolent government may be inherited by a hostile one. Emergency power granted to a trusted leader may be used by another. The righteous administrator builds limits into the system.

Christian families should teach children that their bodies are gifts, not consumer projects. They should resist both shame and vanity. A child should not learn that worth depends upon intelligence, beauty, athletic capacity, health, online visibility, or upgrade potential. Parents considering genetic or neurological interventions need counsel that combines medical competence, prayer, Scripture, and respect for the child as a neighbour.

Believers with disabilities must be heard as moral agents, not used as illustrations by either side. Some welcome interventions that restore function. Others warn that society treats their lives as problems to be eliminated. The church should protect both access to compassionate care and freedom from devaluation.

The task is not to keep every machine outside the sanctuary. It is to keep every machine beneath Christ.

A Christian Ethic of Technological Stewardship and Resistance

A Christian response must be practical enough to guide decisions before a crisis.

Receive Benefit Without Surrendering Judgment

Every good gift comes from God, even when delivered through human skill ([James 1:17](#)). Christians may receive medicine, prosthetics, digital services, secure payments, and public administration with gratitude. Gratitude is not uncritical trust. The same tool can serve different ends.

Keep the Person Above the Profile

No automated representation should become final where essential rights, livelihood, health, liberty, worship, or family life are at stake. Systems should provide reasons, correction, and human appeal. A model can assist judgment. It should not replace accountable judgment.

Protect Informed Consent

Consent must be voluntary, specific, understandable, and revocable where possible. Children, embryos, workers, soldiers, prisoners, patients in crisis, and economically dependent persons require stronger protection. A signature does not prove freedom when refusal carries severe penalty.

Defend the Unenhanced

No person should be treated as negligent, inferior, or socially burdensome for refusing an elective enhancement. Employment, education, insurance, military service, and public participation should not make intimate modification practically compulsory.

Preserve Bodily and Mental Integrity

The body belongs to God. Neural data, genetic data, and biological samples require special protection. They should not be treated as ordinary commercial exhaust. The inner life must not become a marketplace for behavioural extraction.

Build for the Abused Case, Not Only the Ideal User

Designers often imagine a competent user, trustworthy institution, secure network, and benevolent government. Christian prudence asks what happens to the refugee, dissenter, abused spouse, undocumented child, elderly person, disabled user, mistaken identity, hacked account, and citizen under a hostile successor.

Require Proportionality and Sunset

Emergency measures should be no broader or longer than necessary. Extraordinary powers require review and expiry. Data collected for one purpose should not silently migrate to another.

Preserve Alternatives

Where possible, retain cash, offline access, human service channels, non-biometric options, and local resilience. An alternative is not inefficiency when it protects freedom and continuity during failure.

Practise Subsidiarity

Decisions should remain as close as reasonably possible to the people affected, while higher authorities assist where lower levels cannot act. Global coordination should not erase national accountability, and national systems should not erase local knowledge.

Refuse False Worship and Dehumanising Demands

The Christian boundary is not inconvenience but obedience. When a system requires denial of Christ, participation in idolatry, false testimony, unjust harm, or the treatment of persons as disposable, refusal becomes necessary. [Revelation 12:11](#) joins faithful testimony with willingness to lose life rather than surrender allegiance.

Build the Economy of the Body of Christ

Churches should cultivate mutual aid, vocational support, ethical enterprise, care for the elderly, support for disabled members, and assistance for those punished for conscience. Resistance without community becomes heroic rhetoric. Christian solidarity makes costly obedience possible.

Watch for Christ, Not Merely the System

Eschatological readiness is not measured by the number of acronyms a believer can explain. The wise virgins were ready for the Bridegroom ([Matthew 25:1-13](#)). The believer must know the gospel, walk in holiness, forgive enemies, speak truth, love the brethren, resist greed, and keep a clean conscience. A person may correctly identify every technology and remain unready because the heart belongs to the age.

Table 3

From Counterfeit Promise to Christian Faithfulness

Counterfeit promise	Christian confession	Faithful practice
Redesign will perfect humanity	Humanity requires redemption in Christ	Use therapy with gratitude; reject self-deification
Data will produce wisdom	Wisdom begins with the fear of the Lord	Keep human and scriptural judgment above prediction
Connectivity will create communion	Communion is reconciliation with God and His people	Preserve embodied fellowship and covenant responsibility
Surveillance will secure society	Security without righteousness becomes control	Limit collection, require accountability, protect conscience
Enhancement will establish equality	Dignity rests in the image of God	Protect the disabled, poor, unenhanced, and future generations
Longevity will conquer death	Christ has conquered death through resurrection	Receive treatment without making mortal survival an idol
Global coordination will save history	The kingdom belongs to the returning King	Cooperate for common goods while refusing ideological supremacy

The True Future Is Not Posthuman

The Christian future is more glorious than transhumanism because it addresses the whole human problem.

Transhumanism seeks longer life. Christ gives eternal life. Transhumanism seeks enhanced intelligence. Christ gives wisdom and conformity to His holiness. Transhumanism seeks liberation from the body. Christ raises the body. Technocracy seeks peace through administration. Christ establishes peace through righteous rule. Digital systems seek complete visibility. God knows His people perfectly and keeps them without reducing them to data. Global governance seeks unity through standards. Christ creates one body through His blood and Spirit.

[1 Corinthians 15:20-28](#) identifies Christ as the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep. Death came through Adam; resurrection comes through Christ. The final victory is not indefinite delay. The last enemy is destroyed.

The resurrection body is not a repaired version of present weakness produced through accumulated upgrades. It is imperishable, glorious, powerful, and spiritual in the Pauline sense of a body animated and

transformed by the Holy Spirit ([1 Corinthians 15:42-49](#)). Continuity and transformation belong together. God does not discard the creature. He raises the person (Wright, 2003).

The rapture hope makes this personal. [1 Thessalonians 4:13-18](#) does not tell grieving believers that the dead survive as data. It announces that the Lord Himself will descend, the dead in Christ will rise, living believers will be caught up with them, and all will be with the Lord forever. The agent is Christ. The result is communion. The ground is promise.

This book maintains that this gathering precedes the final period of divine wrath. That conviction does not excuse the church from suffering now. Believers have always faced tribulation in the general sense of persecution, loss, and pressure. Readiness for a pre-tribulation rapture is not a doctrine of comfort without courage. It is a doctrine of hope that frees the church to obey without clinging to the present order.

The visible return of Christ follows as public judgment and kingdom victory. [Revelation 19:11-21](#) presents the Faithful and True King defeating the beast and false prophet. He does not negotiate with Babylon's market or require its infrastructure. His Word is sufficient to overthrow the system that appeared universal.

[Revelation 21:1-5](#) then presents the future no laboratory can manufacture: new heavens and a new earth, the dwelling of God with humanity, death abolished, grief and pain removed, and all things made new. The city descends from God. Babel attempted to ascend. The new Jerusalem is gift.

The contrast is exact. Babel says, "Let us build upward." The gospel says God came down in Christ. Transhumanism says, "Let us become more than human." The gospel says the Son became truly human to redeem humanity. Technocracy says, "Let us manage the future." The gospel says the future belongs to the Lamb. Digital immortality says, "Let the copy continue." Christ says, "I am the resurrection and the life" ([John 11:25-26](#)).

The new creation is not a repaired Babel. It is the world reconciled beneath the throne of God and the Lamb.

A Final Word to Those Building, Governing, Suffering, and Waiting

To the scientist and physician: your work can be an act of mercy. Study carefully. Tell the truth about evidence. Distinguish treatment from promotion. Do not allow the desperation of patients to become a market for exaggerated hope. Remember that the person before you is not a defective mechanism but a neighbour made in God's image.

To the engineer and developer: architecture is moral. The rule you encode may deny food, speech, movement, employment, or care to someone you will never meet. Build appeal, restraint, transparency, and human oversight into the system. Refuse to hide behind the product when the product harms.

To the policymaker and international official: cooperation can save lives, but borrowed authority remains accountable. Do not turn emergency into habit, expertise into sovereignty, or global coordination into a route around public consent. Design every power as though your opponent may inherit it.

To the central banker, payment architect, and digital identity designer: financial inclusion and secure identity are serious goods. So are privacy, cash, due process, non-digital alternatives, and freedom of conscience. Do not create a society in which innocent participation depends upon uninterrupted machine approval.

To the parent facing genetic disease: your grief is not a theoretical case. Seek wise medical counsel, prayer, and truthful support. The church should stand beside you without careless accusation. Yet remember that the child is never merely a risk profile. Love does not require the manufacture of perfection.

To the person with a disability: you are not an argument, burden, failed design, or incomplete human. You may pursue treatment and assistive technology without shame. You may also question a society that values you only when technology makes you resemble its ideal. Your dignity was given before any device and remains if every device fails.

To the wealthy person pursuing longevity: examine the altar. Medicine can preserve life, but fear of death can become slavery. You may spend a fortune extending days while neglecting the judgment beyond them. The question is not whether your biomarkers improve. It is whether you are reconciled to God.

To the young person fascinated by becoming posthuman: your desire for transcendence reveals that consumer life is too small for the soul. Do not accept the lie that eternity can be coded. You were made not for endless upgrades but for God. The deepest future is not escape from humanity but union with Christ and resurrection in His likeness.

To the pastor who has frightened the flock with unsupported claims: repent. You may not use prophecy to build dependence upon your platform. Admit errors publicly. Restore peace to wounded consciences. Teach the whole counsel of God, not a stream of alarming correlations.

To the pastor who remains silent because access, funding, accreditation, or political favour might be lost: repent. Shepherds must protect the flock when systems threaten dignity, conscience, family, truth, or worship. Prudence is not cowardice.

To the believer paralysed by fear: Christ has not surrendered the future. You are not kept by perfect understanding of technology but by the power of God through faith. Verify claims. Use lawful tools wisely. Refuse idolatry. Remain in fellowship. Do not let the beast occupy more of your imagination than the Lamb.

To the believer who trusts institutions uncritically: remember that every human authority is fallen. Read the terms. Ask who owns the data. Protect alternatives. Do not call every warning misinformation merely because it inconveniences progress.

To the believer who trusts every counter-narrative: suspicion is not discernment. A forwarded message is not evidence. A dramatic video is not prophecy. False witness remains sin when directed against powerful institutions.

To the leader willing to exchange truth for access: the gate you protect will not open before the judgment seat. No platform, passport, credential, office, grant, or payment rail can authorise you into the kingdom of God.

To the unconverted reader seeking immortality: the desire not to die is not foolish. Death is an enemy. Your mistake is seeking victory without the Victor. Jesus Christ, the eternal Son, became flesh, bore sin under judgment, died, and rose bodily. He commands all people to repent and promises forgiveness and eternal life to those who believe. You do not need a better version of the old self. You need new birth.

The invitation remains open. The future is not owned by those who can afford enhancement. It is inherited by grace.

Conclusion: When Every Counterfeit Future Falls

Humanity has always tried to build upward. The materials have changed from brick to code, from monuments to models, from imperial roads to digital rails, from alchemy to gene editing, and from carved images to synthetic presence. The confession remains familiar: we will make a name, secure the city, overcome the limit, and manage the future without submitting to the God who gave us life.

This chapter has not argued that medicine is rebellion, that international cooperation is Babylon, that digital identity is the mark, or that every emerging technology has one hidden designer. It has argued that good tools can be drawn into a rival eschatology when humanity transfers hope, authority, definition, and control from the Creator to systems built by fallen creatures.

No laboratory can forgive sin. No algorithm can produce wisdom. No database can preserve the soul. No currency can purchase resurrection. No surveillance system can secure righteousness. No global institution can establish the kingdom of God. No machine can overthrow death.

Babel rises, but God descends. The beasts rage, but the court sits. The man of lawlessness exalts himself, but the Lord destroys him by the appearance of His coming. Babylon appears wealthy, but her judgment arrives. The mark controls commerce for an allotted time, but the Lamb owns the book of life.

The church must therefore refuse two kneelings. It must not kneel before the machine as saviour, and it must not kneel before fear as prophet. It must use technology without becoming machine-shaped, cooperate without surrendering truth, receive medicine without worshipping longevity, honour government without granting it the conscience, and watch prophecy without manufacturing fulfilments.

We are in the last second before midnight. This does not mean a date has been calculated. It means the Bridegroom's return is imminent, mortal life is brief, deception is bright, and obedience cannot be postponed. The lamp must contain more than information about the beast. It must burn with faith in Christ, love for the saints, holiness of life, courage under pressure, mercy toward the vulnerable, and hope in the resurrection.

The final horizon is not Antichrist. It is Jesus Christ. He is not a projection of human aspiration. He is the eternal Son. He took flesh, bore sin, rose bodily, ascended, reigns, and will return. He will gather His church, judge evil, raise the dead, and make all things new. The future belongs neither to the enhanced, the connected, the credentialed, the wealthy, nor the administratively approved. It belongs to the Lamb and to those whose names are written in His book.

The book's diagnosis has now reached the edge of the promised future. The final chapter must turn from exposure to recovery. If the age offers another truth, another humanity, another gospel, another church, and another future, how shall the people of God live? Chapter 22 will gather the argument into a programme of biblical restoration: Scripture recovered as final authority, Christ restored to the centre, doctrine guarded, churches reformed, shepherds made accountable, households strengthened, believers disciplined, the vulnerable protected, witness renewed, holiness pursued, and lamps prepared for the midnight cry.

"Look, I am coming soon!" ([Revelation 22:7](#)).

The proper answer is not speculation.

It is obedience.

References

- African Union. (2020). *The digital transformation strategy for Africa (2020-2030)*. <https://au.int/en/documents/20200518/digital-transformation-strategy-africa-2020-2030>
- African Union. (2024). *Continental artificial intelligence strategy*. <https://au.int/en/documents/20240809/continental-artificial-intelligence-strategy>
- Agar, N. (2004). *Liberal eugenics: In defence of human enhancement*. Blackwell.
- American Society of Gene & Cell Therapy, International Society for Cell & Gene Therapy, & Alliance for Regenerative Medicine. (2025). *International call for a 10-year moratorium on heritable human genome editing*. <https://www.asgct.org/advocacy/policy-statements/international-call-for-a-10-year-moratorium-on-heritable-human-genome-editing-a-multi-stakeholder-initiative-to-ensure-safe-and-responsible-use-of-genetic-technologies-may-2025>
- Beale, G. K. (1999). *The book of Revelation: A commentary on the Greek text*. Eerdmans.
- Birhane, A. (2020). Algorithmic colonization of Africa. *SCRIPTed*, 17(2), 389-409. <https://doi.org/10.2966/scrip.170220.389>
- Bostrom, N. (2005). A history of transhumanist thought. *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, 14(1), 1-25. <https://nickbostrom.com/papers/a-history-of-transhumanist-thought/>
- Burdett, M. S. (2015). *Eschatology and the technological future*. Routledge.
- Card, N. S., Wairagkar, M., Iacobacci, C., Hou, X., Singer-Clark, T., Willett, F. R., Kunz, E. M., Fan, C., Vahdati Nia, M., Vaskov, A. K., Brandman, D. M., Hochberg, L. R., Stavisky, S. D., Shenoy, K. V., & Henderson, J. M. (2024). An accurate and rapidly calibrating speech neuroprosthesis. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 391, 609-618. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2314132>
- Cole-Turner, R. (Ed.). (2011). *Transhumanism and transcendence: Christian hope in an age of technological enhancement*. Georgetown University Press.
- de Magalhães, J. P. (2025). Senolytics under scrutiny in the quest to slow aging. *Nature Biotechnology*, 43, 1413-1415. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-025-02740-7>
- Dein, S. (2022). Cryonics: Science or religion. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 61, 3164-3176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-020-01166-6>
- Ellul, J. (1964). *The technological society* (J. Wilkinson, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- European Central Bank. (2025, September 26). *ECB presents findings from digital euro innovation platform and announces second round of experimentation*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2025/html/ecb.pr250926_1~99b4b5b526.en.html
- European Central Bank. (2026). *FAQs on the digital euro*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/euro/digital_euro/faqs/html/ecb.faq_digital_euro.en.html
- European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1183 establishing the European Digital Identity Framework. *Official Journal of the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1183/oj/eng>
- Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our posthuman future: Consequences of the biotechnology revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Habermas, J. (2003). *The future of human nature*. Polity.
- Hollanek, T., & Nowaczyk-Basińska, K. (2024). Griefbots, deadbots, postmortem avatars: On responsible applications of generative AI in the digital afterlife industry. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00744-w>
- Humanity+. (2009). *The Transhumanist Declaration*. <https://www.humanityplus.org/the-transhumanist-declaration>
- Illes, A., Kosse, A., & Wierts, P. (2025). *Advancing in tandem: Results of the 2024 BIS survey on central bank digital currencies and crypto* (BIS Papers No. 159). Bank for International Settlements. <https://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap159.htm>
- Kevles, D. J. (1985). *In the name of eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity*. Knopf.
- Kilner, J. F. (2015). *Dignity and destiny: Humanity in the image of God*. Eerdmans.
- Khosla, S., Monroe, D. G., & Farr, J. N. (2025). Towards a personalized approach in senolytic trials. *Nature Aging*, 5, 1926-1929. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43587-025-00964-5>
- Lázaro-Muñoz, G., Pereira, S., Carmi, S., & Lencz, T. (2021). Screening embryos for polygenic conditions and traits: Ethical considerations for an emerging technology. *Genetics in Medicine*, 23, 432-434. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41436-020-01019-3>
- Lin, L. Y.-H., & Milhaupt, C. J. (2023). China's corporate social credit system: The dawn of surveillance state capitalism? *The China Quarterly*, 256, 835-853. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S030574102300067X>
- Liu, C., & Rona-Tas, A. (2024). Trusting by numbers: An analysis of a Chinese social credit system governance infrastructure. *Critical Sociology*, 51(6), 1247-1265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205241246528>
- Longman, T., III. (1999). *Daniel*. Zondervan.
- López-Otín, C., Blasco, M. A., Partridge, L., Serrano, M., & Kroemer, G. (2023). Hallmarks of aging: An expanding universe. *Cell*, 186(2), 243-278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001>
- Metzger, S. L., Littlejohn, K. T., Silva, A. B., Moses, D. A., Seaton, M. P., Wang, R., Dougherty, M. E., Liu, J. R., Wu, P., Berger, M. A., Zhuravleva, I., Tu-Chan, A., Ganguly, K., Anumanchipalli, G. K., & Chang, E. F. (2023). A high-performance neuroprosthesis for speech decoding and avatar control. *Nature*, 620, 1037-1046. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06443-4>
- National Academy of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, & Royal Society. (2020). *Heritable human genome editing*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25665>
- Osborne, G. R. (2002). *Revelation*. Baker Academic.

- Sandel, M. J. (2007). *The case against perfection: Ethics in the age of genetic engineering*. Belknap Press.
- Sandberg, A., & Bostrom, N. (2008). *Whole brain emulation: A roadmap* (Technical Report 2008-3). Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:a6880196-34c7-47a0-80f1-74d32ab98788>
- Sangwa, S. (2024, March 17). *Is transhumanism tempting fate or fulfilling destiny?* Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/transhumanism-vs-Christianity>
- Sangwa, S. (2025a). Global digital identity systems: Interdisciplinary insights into surveillance, governance, and prophetic implications. *Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17610738>
- Sangwa, S. (2026a, June 28). *Could digital public infrastructure become the backbone of conditional participation?* Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/is-digital-public-infrastructure-becoming-the-backbone-of-conditional-participation>
- Sangwa, S. (2026b, July 6). *Multipolar Babel: BRICS, Global South governance, and the biblical test of new-order promises*. Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/multipolar-babel-brics-global-south-governance-and-the-biblical-test-of-new-order-promises>
- Sangwa, S. (2026c). Religious legitimization and the governance of artificial intelligence: A Scripture-first critique. *Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.65655/openchristianpress.122>
- Sangwa, S. (2026d). *The midnight cry and the blessed hope: Rapture, tribulation, second coming, millennium, and eternity in biblical patterns, prophetic timelines, indicative times, and watchful readiness*. Open Christian Press.
- Savulescu, J. (2001). Procreative beneficence: Why we should select the best children. *Bioethics*, 15(5-6), 413-426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8519.00251>
- Turley, P., Meyer, M. N., Wang, N., Cesarini, D., Hammonds, E., Martin, A. R., Neale, B. M., Rehm, H. L., Wilkins-Haug, L., Benjamin, D. J., Hyman, S. E., Laibson, D., & Visscher, P. M. (2021). Problems with using polygenic scores to select embryos. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 385, 78-86. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSr2105065>
- UNESCO. (2025). *Recommendation on the ethics of neurotechnology*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-ethics-neurotechnology>
- United Nations. (2024). *Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations*. <https://www.un.org/en/summit-of-the-future/pact-for-the-future>
- United Nations Development Programme. (n.d.). *Digital public infrastructure*. <https://www.undp.org/digital/digital-public-infrastructure>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2024). *Universal digital public infrastructure safeguards framework*. <https://www.dpi-safeguards.org/framework>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2025). *Putting safeguards into action: DPI Safeguards Accelerator and learning exchange*. <https://www.undp.org/digital/blog/putting-safeguards-action-50-5-and-dpi-safeguards-initiative-launch-accelerator-countries>
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2023, December 8). *FDA approves first gene therapies to treat patients with sickle cell disease*. <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-gene-therapies-treat-patients-sickle-cell-disease>
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2026, July 1). *FDA approves first gene therapy for young children with sickle cell disease*. <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-gene-therapy-young-children-sickle-cell-disease>
- Vansteensel, M. J., Leinders, S., Branco, M. P., Freudenburg, Z. V., Pels, E. G. M., Aarnoutse, E. J., & Ramsey, N. F. (2024). Longevity of a brain-computer interface for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 391, 619-626. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2314598>
- Waters, B. (2006). *From human to posthuman: Christian theology and technology in a postmodern world*. Ashgate.
- Weima, J. A. D. (2014). *1-2 Thessalonians*. Baker Academic.
- Willett, F. R., Kunz, E. M., Fan, C., Avansino, D. T., Wilson, G. H., Choi, E. Y., Kamdar, F., Glasser, M. F., Hochberg, L. R., Druckmann, S., Shenoy, K. V., & Henderson, J. M. (2023). A high-performance speech neuroprosthesis. *Nature*, 620, 1031-1036. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06377-x>
- Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121-136.
- World Bank. (2021). *Principles on identification for sustainable development: Toward the digital age* (2nd ed.). <https://id4d.worldbank.org/research>
- World Health Organization. (2021a). *Human genome editing: A framework for governance*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030060>
- World Health Organization. (2021b). *Human genome editing: Recommendations*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030381>
- World Health Organization. (2025a, May 20). *World Health Assembly adopts historic Pandemic Agreement*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/20-05-2025-world-health-assembly-adopts-historic-pandemic-agreement-to-make-the-world-more-equitable-and-safer-from-future-pandemics>
- World Health Organization. (2025b, September 19). *Amended International Health Regulations enter into force*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/19-09-2025-amended-international-health-regulations-enter-into-force>
- World Health Organization. (2026, July 20). *WHO Member States continue negotiations on the Pathogen Access and Benefit Sharing annex*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/20-07-2026-who-member-states-continue-negotiations-on-the-pathogen-access-and-benefit-sharing-annex>

Wright, N. T. (2003). *The resurrection of the Son of God*. Fortress Press.