



Theoretical Article

The (Im)Possible (New) Humanism In the Age of the Anthropocene/Noosphere

Boris Filipov Manov*^a

^[a] Department of Philosophy and political sciences, South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria.

Abstract

The article, based on the premise that a transition to a new geological era is taking place – the noosphere/anthropocene, one of the main characteristics of which is a comprehensive change in the “nature” of Man, justifies the view that this process is also related to the formulation of a new comprehensive worldview, which, depending on the understanding, presentation and protection of human nature in the new conditions, could be defined and perceived as a new anthropocenic humanism. The main thesis is that: anthropocenic humanism is impossible both with the uncritical perception of technological optimism - it inevitably leads to the destruction of the natural/divine nature of man, and with its uncritical denial, because the technological transformation of man and nature is objectively inevitable; It would be possible, when forming a new approach to the modern anthropocene transition, to implement its “reasonable”, protecting human in technical/technological modification of human nature - preserving it within the limits of naturally necessary and useful “improvement”, and limiting/preventing modeling through technological design of a more or less artificial man. In conclusion, the position is put forward that: the possibility or impossibility of the formation and existence of anthropocenic humanism are inextricably linked, are the result of the solution to the question of the ontological status of man - will he retain, albeit modified, his human nature or not. If yes – despite many conditions, such humanism would be possible, if not – it would be impossible.

Keywords: Anthropocene; human nature; humanism; anthropocenic humanism

Table of Contents

Initial theses

The Noosphere/Anthropocene

Significance



The “Traditional” Understanding of Humanism
The (Possible) New Humanism
First Step - A “New” Understanding of Humanism
Humanism and the Anthropocene. Anthropocenic Humanism
Conclusion
References

Psychological Thought, 2026, Vol. 19(1), 19-34, <https://doi.org/10.37708/psyct.v19i1.1196>
Received: 2026-02-10. Accepted: 2026-04-38. Published (VoR): 2026-05-31.
Handling Editor: Natasha Angelova, South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria.
Corresponding author at: South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria.
E-mail: bmanov@swu.bg



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

“In fact ... it is not clear that we are the best form of intelligence that exists”
and while it is obvious that “from a human perspective,
it is all about people, there may come a
time when words like 'humanist' will be perceived as racist terms”.

Geoffrey Hinton

Hinton, D., (2024)

Instead of a traditional “**Introduction**”, I will begin this article with the following quote from the letter “On Humanism”, in which Martin Heidegger “writes” to his contemporary Jean Beaufre:

You ask: “In what way can the meaning of the word humanism be restored?”
Your question not only implies that you want to understand the word “humanism”, but it also contains the admission that this word has lost its meaning... The word “humanum” points to humanitas, to the essence of man... The world-historical moment itself prompts the awakening of a memory that thinks not only of man, but of the “nature” of man, not only of nature, but more fundamentally of the dimension in which the essence of man, determined by being itself, is at home ([Heidegger 1993, p. 156, 157-158](#)).

It seems to me that although Heidegger expressed these thoughts almost 80 years ago, one can hardly find a more accurate representation of the fundamentality of the “existential” crossroads at which man finds himself in the middle of the third decade of the 21st century,



because firstly, it is about the fate of man, and secondly, along with this - about the fate of “humanism”, therefore is it possible (and necessary) in the new geo-epoch?

Initial theses

The present study is based on two initial theses:

First, it is based on the view that for about a hundred years humanity has been entering a new, not only civilizational, but also geological epoch, following the Holocene – Noosphere/Anthropocene.

On this basis – the second initial thesis is the adoption of the position that it is necessary to pose the question of humanism in a new way, expressing the essence of the new geo-epoch.

The Noosphere/Anthropocene

General Characteristics

The starting point of the defense of the formulated first thesis is the adoption of the position that it is a single (unified) process, which is interpreted through the prism of intertwining scientific (and also philosophical and cultural) concepts, among which the leading ones are the “noosphere” of [Vladimir Vernadsky \(2020\)](#) and [Pierre Teilhard de Chardin \(1994\)](#) and the “anthropocene” of Eugene Stormer and Paul Crutzen (Crutzen & Stormer, 2000). Without going into details, due to the extreme complexity and debateability of the topic, from the point of view of the following presentation I will bring to the fore the following main emphases. Although the two concepts proceed from different “empirical” and natural science premises, they reach similar basic theses and practical projections, with the concept of the noosphere being historically earlier. They are based on and develop the idea of the evolution of what exists – the cosmos, the earth, the inanimate and animate terrestrial nature and man.

The basic theoretical propositions of the concept of the noosphere were expressed in the 1930s and 1940s in the works of the Russian scientist (geo-bio-chemist) [Vladimir Vernadsky \(2020\)](#) and the French theologian and naturalist [Pierre Teilhard de Chardin \(1994\)](#). Its development continues at the modern stage, it is developing and enriched, taking into account the processes taking place in the society of the 21st century and its closer and even more distant future – the end of the present and the beginning of the next century.

The idea of a noosphere (sphere of reason) was created in the 1920s mainly by Vernadsky and de Chardin and became the center of their concepts. The thesis that the noosphere is the highest stage in the cosmo- and biogenesis of the Earth, in which it “acquires” a new “shell” – that of reason, which represents a kind of “thinking layer” located above the biosphere (from

the Greek language – “noo” – mind, “sphere” – sphere, shell) is meaningful ([Vernadsky, 2020](#)).

The concept of the Anthropocene, although used by J. [Stormer](#) (biologist and ecologist) as early as the 1960s, gained popularity only at the beginning of this century after he and P. [Crutzen](#) (chemist - Nobel laureate) published the article “The Anthropocene” in the *Global Change Newsletter* in 2000, and both defended and developed their idea in their subsequent publications such as “The human epoch” in *Nature*, 2011, and in practical actions - [Crutzen](#) became a member of a working group to adopt a decision to establish the Anthropocene as a new geological epoch ([Crutzen & Storer, 2000](#)).

According to [Stormer and Crutzen \(2000\)](#), the Anthropocene is the geoePOCH following the last officially recognized one - the Holocene. The names of both come from the Greek language: Holocene - (hilos, entirely or whole) and (kainos/new), meaning “entirely new/recent”, Anthropocene - anthropos, man and kainos, new – “age of man”. It is accepted that the Holocene began about 12 thousand years ago, continues to the present day and is associated with the spread and establishment of the human species (*Homo sapiens*) over the entire Earth's surface.

It is important to point out that Crutzen and Stoermer see their idea of the Anthropocene as related to the term “nosphere,” a world of thought, coined by “the Russian geologist V. I. Vernadsky, the French Jesuit P. Teilhard de Chardin, and E. Le Roy” and “to mark the increasing role played by human intellect and technology” accept that it is “more than appropriate to emphasize the central role of humanity in geology and ecology,” proposing to use the term “Anthropocene,” as a “real functioning noosphere” for “the current geological epoch” ([Crutzen & Stoermer, 2000](#), pp. 17-18).

Significance

The significance of the concept of the Noosphere/Anthropocene, both in general scientific and philosophical terms, and in relation to the problem of the nature of humanism in it, is unconditional, because it not only draws attention to an objective, albeit in its initial stage, process that is radically changing the way the geo, bio and sociosphere of planet Earth exist, but also because it brings to the forefront the need to rethink and form a new approach to embracing the ongoing changes, since the current approach is a result and expression of the “normal” knowledge for the Holocene and is not only untenable for, but also harmful to, humans in the new era. This is particularly important for at least two reasons: a) because (and, as I will show, it applies equally to the understanding of humanism in the new age) that, as Clive Hamilton points out, the discussion of the Anthropocene takes place within its “canonical narrative”, which is “tortured by readings through old disciplinary lenses that fail to

account for the true implications of humanity's transition of the planet into a new age" ([Hamilton, 2016](#)), and b) because "a full understanding of the transformation that is taking place" is not only related to, but also requires the combined efforts of "interdisciplinary scholarship," since "as the term Anthropocene invites us to do, we are in the driver's seat" ([Krutzer & Stormer, 2011](#)).

As P. Sloterdijk points out, it is here that the greatest potential of the concept lies, because it "under the guise of scientific neutrality conveys a message with almost incomparable moral-political urgency" ([Ivanov, 2025](#)), which is why it goes beyond the scope of specific scientific knowledge and acquires a broad interdisciplinary, socio-cultural and philosophical character.

Humanism

A brief presentation of the "topic" of the Noosphere/Anthropocene is an "empirical" basis for the formulation and development of the second thesis of the study, that the increasingly widespread affirmation of the new geological epoch requires overcoming the dominant traditional Holocene cognitive and practical model and the formation of a new paradigm in general and a new understanding of humanism in particular.

The "Traditional" Understanding of Humanism

Since the topic of the traditional, i.e. the dominant presentation of humanism is extremely broad and "popular", I will skip both outlining its characteristics and listing publications in which it is presented and defended, and I will bring out what, in my opinion, is the most important, expressing the limitations of this understanding, which predetermines its helplessness in attempts to "attach" the idea of humanism to the understanding of turbulent processes in the modern world.

Perhaps the most important point is the consideration/limitation of humanism only as a manifestation of the "spirituality" of man (only in cognitive terms) - a worldview, an ideological paradigm, a way of thinking, an ideology, an intellectual position, a value attitude, etc. ([Todorov, 2023](#)) whereby, as such, it is associated mainly, in a number of cases and only, with the "modern" era - the time from the Renaissance and the Enlightenment to the middle/end of the 20th century ([Slavova, 2015](#); [Todorov, 2023](#)). It is believed that the word humanism itself "found a place in the dictionary of science at the beginning of the 19th century", originating from the "Latin *humanitas*" - humanity and the term being used as a synonym for "humanism" ([NBU, n.d.](#)).

The other essential point is that humanism seeks to outline some essence of man, built on irrevocable characteristics, among which the primary place is given to "free will" and the ability to create based on it, viewing every human individual as equal to all others and

possessing “unconditional (regardless of his merits and achievements) dignity”, protected by a system of inalienable (“natural”) rights, created not by God, “but are entirely human work”. That is why the individual can create the world in which to live and choose “what direction to give his life” and accordingly “bear responsibility for his actions” ([Todorov, 2023](#)).

Thus, modern (Renaissance, Enlightenment) humanism creates a “model” of man, who is not simply an “image and likeness”, but is also able to be “equal” in his essence to the “Creator”, which, however, if we refer to a thought that is little brought to the forefront, in the otherwise repeatedly cited foundational work for “Renaissance humanism” – “Discourse on the Dignity of Man” (1486) by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, can be not only a blessing, but also a curse, because in this way he (man) can “both rise to the level of an angel and fall to the level of an animal” ([Pico della Mirandola, 2015, pp. 6-7](#)).

It is precisely in this ambivalence that the “drama” of “traditional” humanism and the humanistic ideal lies, which, by giving unlimited freedom to man “to create and do”, leads to the inevitable arrival of the era of the Noosphere/Anthropocene, in which he becomes a “God” who makes this ideal a reality - creates a new “perfect” - healthy, harmonious, beautiful, happy, immortal man, but at the same time - to become a “fallen God” - to destroy not only the world around him, but, which is especially important because it is highly “anti-“human” - and himself. An ambivalence that predetermines both the comprehensive development of science, technology and the “-isms” associated with them, including formulating the idea of “the end of man” and “the end of humanism”, as well as attempts to protect and save authentic “good” humanism - E. Levinas, Tsv. Todorov, L. Ferri, Y. Habermas and many others, proposing a new ideal and an opponent – for example, the different “techno-worldviews” ([Todorov, 2023, pp. 168-185](#)).

The (Possible) New Humanism

First Step - A “New” Understanding of Humanism

As a starting point, one can accept the thesis of the need to reformulate the “nature” of humanism/humanity, namely its/their consideration not only as a “spiritual” but also as an “existential”/ontological phenomenon - i.e. as objectively inherent and presupposing the becoming of humanity of man, its prerequisite and characteristic.

As mentioned, “traditional” humanism is based on the idea of the existence of a primordial essence/nature of man, built up of irrevocable characteristics that are “described” by and towards the achievement and preservation of which the “true” humanistic concept should strive - theory, ideology, life position, etc., which in turn, as M. Heidegger points out, presents “humanism” as a fundamentally erroneous view of man, in which the striving to find some

kind of his stable “essence” undermines the foundations of every “humanistic” effort to perceive man as a free and self-determining being ([Heidegger, 1993, pp. 136, 156](#)), and is a prerequisite for the hopeless situation in which all representatives of this humanism find themselves, faced with the fact of the establishment of a new geo-epoch and remaining within its framework (theoretical “glasses”), searching for and offering “theories” to save this abstract human nature/essence as humanisms of the “(new) love/for the other”, of “sociality”, “post”, “techno” – etc. “humanisms”. In reality, both in phylo- and ontogenetic terms, the only ontological characteristic, not possessed by other living beings, “essence/nature” of man is that he “becomes” a man, that he is a “possibility”, which under the influence of a complex of factors becomes a “reality”, “the animal fits into nature, remains in it, the man – comes out of it” ([Heidegger, 1993, pp. 139-140](#); [Sloterdijk, 2006, p. 29](#)). Man, as Sartre wrote, “or, in Heidegger’s words, human reality” is a being “whose existence precedes essence”, which means that “man first exists, meets, appears in the world, and only then is he defined” ([Sartre, 2021](#)), and the “definition” itself is the process of “becoming” the “humanity” of man, of self-hominization/self-humanization (“man (homo) becomes human (humanus)” ([Heidegger, 1993, p. 134](#)). In general terms, the following aspects of the hominization/humanization of the “pre- essential” man can be deduced as basic.

The starting premise is the biological basis – the living being, which as a unity of body and soul/psyche ([Aristotle, 2018](#)) is an opportunity, the existing, to self-hominize, self-humanize– i.e. to become/to be a “human/homo”, and becoming human is related, implies a next step– the becoming human requires a new level of hominization/humanization, a new degree of psychosomatic unity, etc., and this process of “upgrading” is possible and takes place in the presence and preservation of the existential/ontological “identity” of the biological basis – the living being – both in the phylo- and onto-genetic “genealogy” of the “becoming” human.

The other aspects in the genealogy of the humanization of man are inseparably linked to the biological and are deeply interconnected with each other, which is why it is difficult to place them in any hierarchical order. We are talking about the role of sociality, education and technique in the becoming of man.

Sociality expresses the fact that man as a biological being exists and develops in and through his membership in a group/groups of other human beings. In the group, the man/human individual carries out interaction/communication, in the process of which his and the other members of the group’s hominization/humanization becomes possible. This process, which can also be defined as socialization, includes the creation, transmission and reproduction in everyday communication (mainly through language, and later through writing) and interaction of a wide, specific for each specific stage, “circle” of “practices” - skills, habits, customs, norms, values – “traditions” in social groups/communities/society, the



unifying focus of which is the gradual re/formation and re/affirmation of the idea/practice of respecting and preserving the value/dignity of each member of the community. A focus that is built upon – expanded, enriched in the history of anthropogenesis, and which gives Aristotle reason to define man as a “zoon politikón” – a social living being, the “nature” of which presupposes and requires him to live in a political/social community, because outside of it there exist “either animals or gods” ([Aristotle, 1995](#)).

The process of hominization/humanization becomes possible with the decisive impact of education, which is a specific manifestation/aspect of socialization. If socialization is to a large extent a “spontaneous” onto-socializing process, then education is a socially-intentional, purposeful implementation of the construction of man as a generic-social being. It is based on the “specialists – sages, intellectuals, scientists, etc.” systematized cognitive and evaluative concepts - theories and ideologies, which, transformed in an appropriate way, are usually, but not only, “taught” in a specialized institution - school, by specially prepared “teachers”. Education is a unity of two relatively independent, but deeply interconnected, mutually presupposing activities - training and upbringing, aimed at the formation, mainly in adolescents, members of the community, of desired and approved knowledge, skills, competencies, ideas, will aimed at active participation in the life of society.

An extremely important characteristic of education is that it is a key moment in the emergence of humanism, because through/in education, the “epistemology” of humanism is carried out - its realization as a systematized value-cognitive aspect/side of the hominization/humanization of man. That is why, in this “hypostasis” (in this essence), humanism is a relatively late stage in the humanization of man as a generic being - it appears in the era of pre-Socratic antiquity - the time of the traveling teachers of wisdom - the sophists (“Man is the measure of all things...”, Protagoras), and mainly later in Ancient Rome, having as its most famous, “conceptual” representative Marcus Tullius Cicero, who brings out education as the main factor for the humanization of man, for the transformation of homo into humanitas, because humanity is not given to people by nature, but “is cultivated through education” ([Heidegger, 1993, p. 135](#)). It is this cognitive aspect of humanism that becomes leading in its future existence, is defined as “classical” and gives reason to Martin Heidegger to define humanism as “a specific Roman phenomenon that arises from the encounter of Roman civilization with the culture of late Greek civilization. The so-called Renaissance in Italy from the 14th to 15th centuries is *renascentia romanitas* (revival of the Roman, Latin)” ([Heidegger, 1993, p. 135](#)). The technique (Ortega y Gasset, Jaspers, Heidegger, Nera) is inextricably linked to man, another face/hypostasis of man in three planes:

First, as a skill, mastery – the hominization, humanization is a reproducible process of man's acquisition of ever more perfect and more (new) skills, etc., including those generated by new and more perfect tools/means for mastering the world/being ([Jaspers, 1991](#); [Heidegger, 1949](#)).

Second, as tools, devices, etc. – humanization as ever greater opportunities for mastering and changing the world, as creating a human world for man, changed according to the requirements and “measures” of the changing, “fantasizing” man ([Ortega-y-Gaset, 2014](#)), corresponding to what was achieved in a given specific historical era – from the first pruned branch, i.e. a stick and a cave covered with branches to nuclear engines and weapons, megacities with living conditions in them and permanent space stations, etc.

Third, biological/physical and psychological/mental improvement of human psychosomatics – from the first healers and shamans, “assembling” broken limbs and “chasing out” evil spirits that “possessed” man to modern medical, bio- and genetic technologies, psychiatric and psychological drugs and therapies, artificial intelligence, etc.

Thus, technology transforms man from a “natural” (animal bio-being) into an artificial self-created “creation” of its humanization, which reaches its peak in the Holocene bio- and socio-evolution of man in the ongoing transition to the Anthropocene era.

Humanism and the Anthropocene. Anthropocenic Humanism

Based on the above, it can be assumed that the “new” understanding of humanism presents it as a mutually presupposing and mutually interpenetrating unity of hominizating being and spirituality, that the process of becoming, of self-creation - self-hominization, self-humanization, of man is presented as a historically corpuscular and continuous bio-socio-technological process of gradual, corresponding to what has been specifically achieved for each specific period, detachment (liberation) from/overcoming the primary connection with the natural/biological and transformation from an “object” in the existence of the existing into a “subject”, knowing and creating, freeing himself, free “agent” of his humanity and the humanity of the world in which he exists - lives and governs, which means that each era has a new/its own humanism, determined by its ontological nature and characteristics. Thus, the understanding of “humanism” is expanded not only beyond the “traditional”, reducing it to the “classical/Renaissance”, but also beyond Heidegger's (and Sartre's) thesis about its ancient Greco-Roman origin, and also implies consideration in the “perspective” of the coming new geo-epoch, in which, as already indicated, the question comes to the fore: is humanism possible (and necessary) in this epoch?

The approaches to solving this question are different, as, despite the fact that “in the philosophy of recent decades, the concept of “humanism” has a number of uses unrelated to



cultural and historical periodizations” ([NBU, n.d.](#)), the predominant approach can be considered to be one that takes into account the fact that humanity is facing a (comprehensive) change and therefore (there should/should be) such a change in the worldview (paradigm/ideology), which “makes sense” of human existence in the conditions of this change. Within this approach, numerous variants have been/are being implemented – “supportive” – for example, various concepts of post/transhumanism, etc., “rejective” – for example, dayism, which Y. Harari presented as an alternative to the only humanism in his opinion – the “classical” European humanism imposed on the world in the last 300 years ([Harari, 2018](#)), “trash” humanism, presenting the problem as “a conversation about the alabala-humanisms of people’s attempt to imagine a world in which they are no longer masters”, all of which, however, as F. Nera rightly noted, remain within the framework of classical Renaissance-Enlightenment humanism ([Nera, 2016](#)).

The outlined “new” understanding of humanism also allows for the search for a “new” answer to the question posed through the prism, in an “ontological” plan, of the presentation of the “nature” of man in (the transition to) a new geological era, and in an “epistemological/spiritual” plan, of what would be (would not be) a humanism corresponding to this “nature.” Here, two perspectives are possible, independent of whether we “like” humanism or not, whether we “want” to be “humanists” and “save” it with one theory or another, or because we “don’t like it” for some reason – for example, that it is a manifestation of the “imperialist nature” of European capitalism ([Harari, 2018](#)), - to reject it, to throw it into the “dustbin of history”:

a) the geo-epoch of the Noosphere/Anthropocene occurs as a total, spontaneously occurring and imposed change – the Holocene man becomes “something else”, disappears as a biological being and “natural” spirituality, – then there will clearly be no need and possibility for humanism to exist (both in ontological and epistemological aspects), because in the transition to the creation and affirmation of machine intelligence, the human/humanistic perspective will be interrupt and, perhaps/probably, a posthuman civilization - machine-space or some other will arise, which means that any “post”, “trans” and other “humanisms” are irrelevant to this perspective, and therefore impossible and non-working intellectual ideological products of modern adherents of “traditional” humanism.

b) the geoeepoch of the Noosphere/Anthropocene occurs as an inevitable, but “manageable” and controlled change, associated with profound changes in the existence of man, human civilization and the biosphere as a whole. If until now human activity in relation to man himself has been connected with and led to the “correction” of man’s natural humanity, then Anthropocene intervention, like intervention in all spheres of social and natural/cosmic

existence, is directed towards and aims to create a new, initially “improved”, and in the future “perfect”, human humanity corresponding to the new geological era, including the creation of a completely artificial “human-like”/machine being, in which natural/Holocene man, for the first time in history, encounters not a “means”, but a “competing entity” in the form of a “non-biological intellect” (Todorova, 2024).

A perspective that is not “in the realm of fiction”, but is a reality that is not only “knocking on the door”, but is already “in the home” of humanity, and in which increasingly comprehensive and deep interconnected interventions of modeling and of the “body” - the state of health (extension and improvement of life), creation of a “new” body, “planning” of new generations are carried out in the psychosomatic unity of the natural man; and of the “soul” - modification of the natural states of the psyche - emotional and cognitive, achievement of “satisfaction/happiness”, “extension” of the mental and creative capabilities of man with a tendency to “merge” with artificial intelligence and as a complex result - even excluding the creation of an independent fully machine intelligence/robot or other similar “being”, transformation of the “natural” man into a “cyborg”.

No matter how difficult it is to accept the reality of this process, the new biogeoeopch presupposes and will require corresponding profound changes in the essence of man, in his physiology and psyche (body and soul). The new man, the becoming Anthropocene man, is already and will increasingly be a manifestation of the developing “noosphere”, of the “noo” processes and phenomena associated with it, of the “imperceptibly”, but increasingly comprehensively and irreversibly created by him new humanity - biological, social and educational, communication and technological. This means that the objectively possible perspective for the preservation of the “human” in the Anthropocene man is related only to the “mastering/regulation” of the Anthropocene modeling of man within the limits of the naturally necessary and useful “improvement”, preventing modeling through technological design of a more or less artificial “man” and achieving eventual limited “cyborgization” – a permanent “stop” of this process is unrealistic and impossible. Only on this basis can it be assumed that there would be an Anthropocene man, humanity, humanismh – both on an ontological and epistemological level. In the ontological – continuation of the biogenesis/onto and phylogenesis of man as an individual and a genus; in epistemological terms – the creation of a new, corresponding anthropocenic comprehensive worldview (paradigm/ideology), which, depending on the understanding, presentation and defense of human nature in the new conditions, could be defined and perceived as a new anthropocenic humanism. This humanism, taking into account and perceiving the fact of the inevitability of the increasingly intensively occurring geo-bio-socio-techno transformation, should not simply

preserve, transform or deny, but dialectically “overcome” the Holocene and, above all, the classical Renaissance-Enlightenment humanism in the following main directions:

First, searching for and finding a new stage/model of self-knowledge of man and society and as a subsequent/accompanying result - of their self-development.

Secondly, in this plan - building a new value system of humanity, expressing the essence of the noosphere/anthropocene nature of society and man, the main thing in which should be:

1) the formulation, perception and imposition of the idea according to which a “reversal” of the relationship between fortuity/chance and choice should be carried out and the rethinking (definition of) the boundaries of what is morally permissible in giving priority to the freedom of "choice" within the framework of building the anthropocene humanity of man;

2) reformatting the humanistic/anthropological view of equality and autonomy of all humans in the direction that they are pre/determined not only by the naturalness of human nature, but also by the fact that it is inextricably linked, contains as its no less “natural” component the technical and technological, and that in the process of the evolution of the geo-biosphere, society and man, with its entry into the new geological epoch of the Noosphere/Anthropocene, they become not only an inseparable, but also a dominant side in the nature of man, which implies that they will transform the essence and mechanisms of autonomy/freedom and equality between Anthropocene human beings/humans.

3) Outlining the permissible limits of scientific and technological intervention in the modification of man, but not as a reactionary-retrograde/archaic-conservative opposition/denial of the evolution of man, but as revealing the fact that unrestricted (relying on the blind regulation of the “element of the market/evolution”) and exponentially growing and accelerating technologization leads unambiguously to self-denial and self-destruction of man and human society, that it is necessary not to allow the transformation of scientific and technological progress into eugenics, which creates designer human “products”, “things” with predetermined specific “natures”, but to realize it as a striving to preserve, albeit in a new form, the intrinsic value of every human being, having the opportunity to build himself as an equal and equally responsible “person”, having the same anthropological nature as all humans.

Conclusion

In conclusion of the ideas developed in this presentation, it can be said, like Jürgen Habermas ([Habermas, 2004](#)), that they probably still have the features of a “thought experiment” rather than a reality directly facing modern man, but this “experiment” brings to the fore the seriousness of the problem and the difficulties – objective and subjective for its

comprehension and, what is even more complicated – its solution, and that it provides sufficient grounds to derive the position that:

1) the possibility or impossibility of the formation and existence of an anthropocentric humanism are inextricably linked, are the result of the attitude towards, the solution of the question of, the ontological status of man – will he retain, albeit modified, his human nature or not. If yes – despite many conditions, such a humanism would be possible, if not – it would be impossible.

2) However, there is a big question here – will current humans come to terms with the second perspective, will they want to be “natural” humans or not, since the situation of crossing the border of humanity and adopting the position “What’s the point, what’s important is that a person is well!!” is becoming increasingly possible? That is why at the current stage, while it is still relatively early/not too late, it should become clear that it is not only an ontological but also a moral question, the question is whether people will be cynical, i.e. whether they will be indifferent, whether they will retreat from their value system – the transition from Holocenenic to Anthropocenic hominism/humanism, or by searching for ways for a dignified existence for humans and the preservation of the human nature inherent in the Homo sapiens species, they will reach the affirmation of a possible and adequate humanism for the new bio-geo-era – Anthropocenic humanism.

Funding/Financial Support

The article was developed as a research result of a research project for Fundamental Scientific Research at the Scientific Research Fund on the topic: “Center for the Study of Virtual Reality at the Faculty of Philosophy of the South-West University “Neofit Rilski”

Other Support/Acknowledgement

The author has no support to report.

Competing Interests

The author has declared that no competing interests exist.

References

- Anonymous. (2024). Krastnikat na AI Dzhefri Hintan: Nyama da e losho izkustveniyat intelekt da unishtozhi chovechestvoto [AI Godfather Geoffrey Hinton: It wouldn't be a bad thing if artificial intelligence destroyed humanity] Dnes + [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: https://dnesplus.bg/nauka/krastnikat-na-ai-dzhefri-hintan-nyama-da-e-losho-izkustveniyat-intelekt-da-unishtozhi-chovechestvoto_1160107.
- Aristotle. (1995). *Politika*. Sofia: Otvoreno obshtestvo [Politics] Sofia: Open Society. ISBN 954-520-049-9.
- Aristotle. (2018). *Za dushata*. Sachinenia, T.II, Naturfilosofski i estestvenonauchni sachinenia, Ch.IV. Sofia: Zahariy Stoyanov [On the Soul. Collected Works, Vol. II, Natural Philosophy and Natural Science Works, Part IV] Sofia, Zahariy Stoyanov Publishing House. ISBN 9789540901442.
- Crutzen, P. J., Stoermer, E. F. (2000). The Anthropocene. *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, 17–18 [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <http://www.igbp.net/publications/globalchangemagazine/globalchangemagazine/globalchangenelettersno4159.5.5831d9ad13275d51c098000309.html>
- Habermas, J., 2004. *Badeshteto na choveshkata priroda*. Sofia: Ideya. ISBN 9548638282.
- Hamilton, C. (2016). Define the Anthropocene in terms of the whole Earth. *Nature* 536(7616):251. DOI 10.1038/536251a.
- Harari, Y. N. (2018). *Homo Deus*. Kratka istoria na badeshteto. Sofia: Iztok Zapad. [Homo Deus: A Brief History of the Future]. Iztok-Zapad Publishing House, Sofia. ISBN: 978 619-01-0223-6.
- Heidegger, M. 1936–1953. Доклады и статьи; 1949. Vopros o tehnikе; 1954. Nauka i osmyslenie [Reports and articles; 1949. Question about technique]. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://heidegger.ru/>.
- Heidegger, M. (1993). *Za humanizma*. V: „Sashtnosti”. Sofia: GAL-IKO [On Humanism. In: “Essences”. Sofia: GAL-IKO]. ISBN 9548010208. s. 129-179.
- Hinton, D., (2024). Krastnikat na AI Dzhefri Hintan: Nyama da e losho. DnesPlus, https://dnesplus.bg/nauka/krastnikat-na-ai-dzhefri-hintan-nyama-da-e-losho-izkustveniyat-intelekt-da-unishtozhi-chovechestvoto_1160107
- Ivanov, D. (2025). Kakvo e antropotsen i stanaha li horata geolozhka sila? Klimateka [What is the Anthropocene and have humans become a geological force? Climatetheca]. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://www.climateka.bg/antropotsen-solastalgia/>.
- Jaspers, K. (1991). Istoki istorii i ee tsely. Smysl i naznachenie istorii, M.: Politizdat, 527: 28-286. Tsifrovaya biblioteka po filosofii [Sources of history and its purpose. Meaning and purpose of history, M.: Politizdat, 527: 28-286], Digital Library of Philosophy.. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000655/>.
- Krutzer P., & Stormer J. (2011). The human epoch. *Nature*. Vol. 473, 254. <https://doi.org/10.1038/473254a>.
- NBU, n.d., *Universitetski rechnik*. <https://nbu-rechnik.nbu.bg/bg/obsht-spisyk-na-ponqtiaq-humanizym>
- Nera, F. (2016). Homo Labyrinthus. Humanizam, antihumanizam, posthumanizam (otkas). Piron [Homo Labyrinthus. Humanism, antihumanism, posthumanism (excerpt). Piron]. [online] BROJ # 12 /2016 [viewed 22 September 2025]. ISSN 2367-7031. Available from: [Frederic-Neyrat_Homo-Labyrinthus.pdf](#).

- Ortega Y Gasset, J. (2014). *Razmishlenia za tehnikata. Fantazirashtoto zhivotno*. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad [Reflections on Technology. The Fantasizing Animal] Sofia: Iztok-Zapad. ISBN 9786191524020.
- Pico Della Mirandola, G. (2015). *Rech za dostoinstvoto na choveka. Kolektsiya "Izvori"*. Sofia: Iztok – Zapad [Speech on the Dignity of Man. "Sources" Collection]. Sofia: East - West.. pp. 9-63.
- Sartre, J.-P. (2021). *Ekzistentsializmat e humanizam. Liberalen pregled* [Existentialism is humanism. A liberal review]. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://www.librev.com/index.php/scribbles/essays/4077-ekzistentzializmat-e-humanizam>.
- Slavova, V. (2015). *Ideyata za otgovornostta vav filosofiyata na E. Levinas i neynite proektsii v mezhdulichnostnite otnoshenia*. LiterNet. [The idea of responsibility in the philosophy of E. Levinas and its projections in interpersonal relationships]. LiterNet. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://litenet.bg/publish29/veselina-slavova/levinas-otgovornost>.
- Sloterdijk, P. (2006). *Pravila za choveshkia park. Sotsiologicheski problemi* [Rules for the human park. *Sociological problems*]. God. XXXVIII, (1-2), 20-46. ISSN 0324-1572.
- Teilhard De Chardin, P. (1994). *Choveshkiyat fenomen*. Sofia: Arges [The Human Phenomenon]. Sofia: Arges.
- Todorov, D. (2023). *Tehno-nauchnite „svetogledi“ i krizata na humanizma*. Sofia: Paradigma [Techno-scientific “worldviews” and the crisis of humanism]. Sofia: Paradigma. ISBN 978-954-326-517-6.
- Todorov, H. (n.d.) *Humanizam. NBU – Rechnik na balgarskia ezik* [Humanism. NBU – Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language]. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://nbu-rechnik.nbu.bg/bg/obsht-spisyk-na-ponqtiq/humanizym>.
- Todorova, M. (2024). *Vidove izkustven intelekt – tesen, obsht i super izkustven intelekt. Riskove i eticheski problemi. Eticheski izsledvania. 4(2)* [Types of artificial intelligence – narrow, general and super artificial intelligence. Risks and ethical issues] Ethical research. 4(2). ISSN 2534-8434. [online] [viewed 22 September 2025]. Available from: <https://jesbg.com/mtodorova-vidove-izkustven-intelekt-tesen-obsht-i-super-izkustven-intelekt-riskove-i%20eticheski-problemi/>.
- Vernadsky, V. (2009). *Nauchnata misal kato planetarno yavlenie*. Sofia: Fondatsiya „Akad. Sava Ganovski“ [Scientific thought as a planetary phenomenon]. Sofia: Acad. Sava Ganovski Foundation. ISBN COBISS.BG-ID – 1231411684.
- Vernadsky, V. (2020). *Nyakolko dumi za noosferata*, V: MANOV, B., 2020 (red.). *Klasicheski politicheski doktrini. Avtori i idei. Antologia. Vtoro preraboteno i dopalнено izdanie, 546-560*. Blagoevgrad: UI „Neofit Rilski“ [A few words about the noosphere, In: MANOV, B., 2020 (ed.). *Classical political doctrines. Authors and ideas. Anthology. Second revised and supplemented edition, 546-560*]. Blagoevgrad: Neofit Rilski University. ISBN 978-954-00-0258-3.

About the authors

Dr. **Boris Manov** is a professor of philosophical and political sciences. His main interests are in the field of knowledge society and modifications that occur in a political and educational context. He participated in various projects - national and international, related to the problems of European political thinking and well-being.

Corresponding Author's Contact Address [\[Top\]](#)

Department of Philosophy and political sciences,
Faculty of Philosophy, South-West University "Neofit Rilski",
66 str. Ivan Mihaylov,
2700 Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria.
E-mail: bmanov@swu.bg