

*Borivoje V. BALTEZAREVIĆ**

Institute for Serbian Culture Prishtina – Leposavic

PERSONALITY AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF TRANSHUMANISM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES OF INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY**

Abstract: This paper analyses the complex interaction between personality and technology in the contemporary world through a multidisciplinary perspective, with a special focus on transhumanism. The problem of personality is often taken for granted and insufficiently problematised, despite the fact that this intimate human structure is exposed to serious threats posed by modern technologies and cultural changes. The paper explores how advancements in artificial intelligence, digitalisation, and the algorithmisation of social life affect the perception of personality, its identity, and self-realisation. Through an interdisciplinary approach, including philosophical, psychological, sociological, political, cultural, and technological aspects, it attempts to address the issue of the extent to which personality can maintain authenticity and autonomy in the circumstances of an all-encompassing technological dictate. Particular attention is given to the issues of depersonalisation, loss of authenticity in politics, art, and science, as well as in the field of communication. The paper concludes with the need for improved and more clearly defined ethical frameworks and interpretative models, as well as more functional paradigms, which would enable the preservation and development of personality in the context of a transhumanist and technologically mediated world.

Keywords: personality, technology, transhumanism, artificial intelligence, individual identity, depersonalisation, autonomy, communication, contemporary world.

INTRODUCTION

The question of personality, seemingly simple and self-evident, has become one of the most complex and significant phenomena in the contemporary world. Despite long-standing study in philosophy, psychology, and other humanities,

* Research Associate, ORCID 0000-0002-6798-6981, baltezb@yahoo.co.uk

** This paper was written as part of the scientific research work of a scientific research organisation under the Agreement with the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia, N° 451-03-136/2025-03 dated 27th January, 2025.

personality in modern reality is often regarded as something obvious and indisputable, resulting in a superficial and insufficiently deep understanding of this concept (Taylor, 2020). The contemporary era, marked by the expansion of technology and the digitalisation of life, radically changes the way personality perceives itself and its environment. The rapid development of artificial intelligence, algorithmic systems, and digital media drastically affects individual authenticity, privacy, and identity, placing humans before new challenges and dilemmas (Harari, 2021; Floridi, 2020). These challenges become particularly evident in the context of transhumanism, a philosophical and technological movement that seeks to fundamentally alter human nature and the boundaries of subjectivity (Bostrom, 2020; More–Vita–More, 2021).

In accordance with the multidisciplinary approach, perspectives from various disciplines are included – from philosophy, psychology, and sociology to communication studies, political science, and cultural studies – in order to analyse the current and future implications of these changes on personality (Zuboff, 2019). A synthetic approach to this problem allows for a more comprehensive insight into the phenomenon, thereby more clearly identifying the real consequences of these processes on human life and subjectivity. The issue of personality in this paper is considered beyond the traditional frameworks of Western culture, which enables understanding of the specificities of global processes and local identity problems arising from accelerated technological changes (Fukuyama, 2018).

THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FRAMEWORKS OF PERSONALITY

The question of personality occupies a central place in philosophy, science, and culture from the earliest civilisations to the present day. From ancient Greek philosophers to contemporary thinkers, the concept of personality has been the subject of numerous interpretations, resulting in a complex network of understandings related to identity, subjectivity, autonomy, and relations with society. In ancient thought, personality was not considered an independent concept in the modern sense, but rather as a function of the soul or virtue. Plato linked personality to the three parts of the soul – reason, will, and desire, arguing that harmony constitutes the basis of a just personality. Aristotle, on the other hand, viewed personality through the prism of praxis (practical doing), i.e., as the bearer of ethical activity and moral character developed through habit and education. In the Stoic tradition, personality acquired traits of inner autonomy and spiritual strength. Stoics such as Epictetus and Seneca defined personality through the capacity for self-control, rational judgment, and acceptance of fate. This model of personality as inner freedom would become especially significant in the later Christian tradition, where personality is perceived as a unique and unrepeatable spiritual individuality. In Christian theology, personality

(Lat. *persona*) acquires an ontological dimension: man is created in the image of God and possesses an immortal soul, which makes him worthy of freedom and moral responsibility. During the Renaissance, under the influence of humanism, the concept of personality transformed towards individuality and creativity. Pico della Mirandola, in his “Oration on the Dignity of Man”, argued that man is the only being who has the freedom to shape himself, thus personality becomes a project of self-realisation. With the development of modern philosophy, especially in the works of Descartes, Locke, Kant, and Hegel, personality acquired new meanings. Kant’s concept of personality is based on the idea of autonomy and the capacity for moral reasoning – personality is a being that acts according to maxims that it can will as a universal law. For Hegel, personality develops through the historical process of self-consciousness, recognition, and social interaction.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, new paradigms of personality emerged. Nietzsche questioned traditional moral values and introduced the concept of the “superman” (Ger. *Übermensch*) who creates his own standards and values. Heidegger views personality as an existential being that relates to its own existence in the world, emphasising authenticity and “being-towards-death” as the essence of human existence. Existentialists such as Sartre highlight the freedom of choice and responsibility for one’s own life as key characteristics of personality. Contemporary personality theories in psychology provide new insights through empirical studies of behavior, motivation, and emotions. The humanistic approach (Rogers, 2024) as well as cognitive-behavioral theories attempt to explain how personality is formed, maintained, and manifested. Maslow emphasises self-actualisation as the pinnacle of personality development, while Rogers believes “conditional acceptance” by others is necessary for the development of a healthy personality. In addition to psychological and philosophical approaches, sociological and cultural theories add the dimension of intersubjectivity. Goffman’s theory of social roles and the symbolic interactionism in the works of Mead and Blumer point out that personality is not formed in isolation but through interaction with society by adopting and internalising social roles (Mead 2020). Hofstede and Hall emphasise that cultural differences significantly influence the structure and expression of personality (Hofstede 2020).

In recent decades, neuroscience and genetics have introduced a new dimension to understanding personality. Research points out the importance of neurochemical mechanisms, brain structures, and genetic predispositions in shaping personality traits. Plomin (2019) emphasises that personality is formed at the intersection of nature and nurture – biological basis and experience. Genetics provides insight into stable components of personality, while social experiences shape its dynamics. At the same time, the development of information technologies, digital platforms, and artificial intelligence has opened new challenges for the concept of personality. From the perspective of contemporary cultural and technological philosophy, personality is increasingly exposed to processes of fragmentation, surveillance, and algorithmic intervention. Instead of an integral subjectivity, digital masks, profiles, and anonymous identities emerge, influencing

an individual's self-understanding (Zuboff 2019; Floridi 2020). Today, the problem of personality must be considered through the integration of various disciplines. No single field alone can encompass the complexity of the personality phenomenon. Therefore, what is necessary is a synthetic approach, involving philosophical reflection, empirical research from psychology and neuroscience, culturological contexts, and technological implications. Only such an approach can answer the question: how to preserve and develop personality in a rapidly transforming world? This lays the foundation for further consideration of transhumanism as one of the greatest threats, but also the potential opportunities, for the fate of the human personality in the 21st century.

TRANSHUMANISM AND THE FUTURE OF PERSONALITY

In contemporary thought and public discourse, transhumanism emerges as one of the most controversial and promising visions of the future of humanity. As a philosophical and technological movement, transhumanism promotes the use of scientific and technological achievements with a view to enhancing human cognitive, physical, and psychological capacities. Its proponents believe that human nature is subject to revision, that aging, disease, and even death are technologically solvable problems, and that it is the moral obligation of humanity to utilise all available tools to improve life and intelligence (More–Vita-More 2021; Bostrom 2020).

However, the transhumanist perspective also brings a series of profound philosophical, ethical, and anthropological questions. If personality – in its traditional definition – is linked to limited human corporeality, mortality, affectivity, vulnerability, and the finiteness of experience, what happens to the concept of personality in a world where these categories are technologically abolished or drastically transformed? Can personality, as the essence of the human being, persist under conditions of bioengineering revision of cognitive capacities, nanotechnological life extension, or in a digitalised “upload” of consciousness? The transhumanist vision often implies overcoming the so-called biological destiny of humans. Through genetic engineering, neuroimplants, biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and the cyborgisation of the body, the creation of “posthuman” beings is anticipated – entities that are superior to contemporary humans in strength, intelligence, and even moral capacity (Kurzweil 2019; Harari 2021). Such visions open the space for a new evolution, no longer biological, but technological, driven by the conscious decision of humans to “upgrade” themselves beyond natural limits. Although this approach seems progressive and liberating at first glance, at its core it questions the meaning of humans as finite, limited, and in that sense authentic beings. Some critics, such as Francis Fukuyama, George Grant, or Jürgen Habermas, emphasise that transhumanism threatens fundamental humanistic values because it abolishes the kind of dependence and fragility that are prerequisites for morality, empathy,

and interpersonal solidarity (Fukuyama 2018; Habermas 2019). One of the most significant challenges of transhumanism concerning personality is the question of identity. If a person undergoes numerous technological modifications – from organ replacements, through neural implants, to the uploading of consciousness into digital media – the question arises: is that still the same person? According to classical philosophical tradition, personal identity is the continuity of consciousness, memory, and autonomy. However, modern neuroscience points to the fluidity and variability of neural networks, and transhumanist visions call that continuity into question. In the digital transition of subjectivity, what remains of the authentic personality if all its functions can be simulated and manipulated by algorithms (Floridi 2020)?

In addition, transhumanist technologies bring political and social consequences. The question of technology accessibility and its impact on social inequality is becoming increasingly relevant. If only a portion of humanity can afford technological upgrades, this will lead to the creation of a new elite of “enhanced” people and a subordinate mass of the “unenhanced”. Such a division not only disrupts democratic values but can also threaten the very idea of human equality (Buchanan 2011). Moreover, transhumanist progress often implies the implicit colonisation of the body and mind through technologies that lack transparency, which can lead to new forms of control, surveillance, and manipulation, endangering the fundamental freedom of the individual. On the other hand, transhumanism also has its defenders within humanistic circles. Some authors argue that the very ability to transform and enhance is what makes humans unique, as well as their openness to the future and the possibility to be more than they currently are. In this sense, transhumanism is interpreted as an extension of humanism or “posthumanism”, where biological and existential limitations are denied, and freedom of self-shaping is affirmed (More–Vita–More 2021). Nevertheless, the question remains: does this freedom lead to greater humanity, or to the loss of what is essentially human? The ethical dilemmas opened by transhumanism also relate to the concept of responsibility. If decisions are transferred to systems based on artificial intelligence, does the human still remain responsible for the consequences? In the case of autonomous cyber-subjects, who bears moral and legal responsibility: the algorithm creator, the user, or the “agent” itself? This leads to a crisis within the classic categories of moral agency and legal subjectivity. Philosophers like Grace, Kapoor, and Berens emphasise that the legal system is not prepared for the status of posthuman entities, nor for the issues such as digital personal rights or “disembodied personalities” (Kapoor 2020).

Furthermore, transhumanism introduces new dimensions in religious and spiritual interpretations of humanity. Some thinkers see it as a secular eschatology, an attempt to realise the promise of salvation without transcendence. Instead of the soul – data; instead of salvation – technological perfection; instead of a community of believers – a network of interconnected subjects. From the perspective of religious anthropology, this signifies a profound crisis

in the understanding of personality, since it is separated from its vertical dimension, its relation to God, meaning, and ultimate truth (Taylor 2020).

In light of all the dimensions previously considered, the question arises: is transhumanism the end of personality or its evolution? Some authors argue that new types of subjectivity will emerge in the posthuman era, which will not be based on the existing biological, moral, and psychological foundations. Others, however, warn that preserving what makes a human a personal being – freedom, empathy, the sense of boundaries and meaning – is a prerequisite for technology to remain in the service of humanity, and not the other way around (Habermas 2019; Fukuyama 2018). One possible strategy in confronting transhumanism is the development of so-called critical transhumanism – an approach that accepts technological possibilities, but subjects them to ethical, legal, and cultural evaluation. The goal of such an approach is not to deny progress, but to defend humanity. This implies an open interdisciplinary discussion, involving citizens in decision-making, and forming normative frameworks that protect human rights and dignity. Transhumanism represents a great opportunity and an even greater responsibility. It calls on us to rethink what it means to be human, what it means to be a personality – not only in a biological and technical sense, but also in ethical, existential, and spiritual terms. Instead of fleeing into the promises of technological utopia or nostalgia for the “natural” human, our task is to shape the future critically, responsibly, and with hope – the future where personality, despite all challenges, will endure and actualise itself in the richness of its own authenticity.

TECHNOLOGY AND DEPERSONALISATION OF PERSONALITY IN THE MODERN WORLD

The accelerated technological development in the 21st century, especially in the fields of digital communication, artificial intelligence, big data, and biometric surveillance, has caused profound changes in the way individuals experience themselves and the world around them. “As the digital age matures, artificial intelligence emerges at the forefront as perhaps the most important technological frontier. AI, although still in the developmental phase, promises (or for some, foreshadows) the initiation of changes on an unprecedented scale. Distinctly different from previous technologies, AI not only automates tasks but has the potential to think, learn, adapt, and even make decisions – domains historically reserved for human cognition” (Baltezarević 2024: 171).

Technology is no longer merely a tool used by humans but is becoming a structure within which identity, relationships, and everyday life are constituted. In such a context, personality is increasingly reduced to a profile, data point, or function within a technological network. This process is often called depersonalisation of personality – a phenomenon of loss of individuality, autonomy, and deeper existential dimensions in favor of technological efficiency,

standardisation, and algorithmic logic (Zuboff 2019; Han 2021). The question posed is not only “what technology does to us”, but also “who we become within technology”. Are we witnessing an epochal transformation of subjectivity, or a process that distances us from the possibility of being personalities at all in the classical sense of the word? One of the key mechanisms of depersonalisation in the technological age is algorithmic prediction of behavior. Companies that possess vast amounts of data – such as Google, Meta, Amazon – use algorithms to predict, shape, and modify user behavior. In doing so, the individuality of the person disappears into a sea of statistical categories and predictive patterns. Instead of a human as a free agent, we get a consumer as a behavioral model whose choices are predetermined and, through encouragement to repeat familiar patterns, reduced to a manipulative loop (Zuboff 2019). This process is especially prominent in the context of social networks. In virtual communities, users can communicate, exchange ideas, share information, provide social support, conduct business, direct activities, create art, play games, or participate in a political debate (Baltezarević, Baltezarević et al. 2019). However, instead of open communication, more and more interactions are filtered and processed through algorithmic mechanisms that determine what we see, who we make contact with, and how our identity is presented to others. The result is the so-called “echo chamber”, a digital environment in which an individual is surrounded only by similar opinions, leading to the loss of critical attitude towards reality and self-reflection. Thus, personality does not develop in relation to the Other, but is confirmed and closed within its own repetitive illusion. At the same time, digital profiles increasingly replace the overall experience of personality. Identities on the internet are often created, altered, or completely fictitious. In this sense, depersonalisation is not only a process of losing identity but also of fragmenting it. A single individual can have multiple “selves” – one for work, another for social networks, a third for intimacy – which do not communicate with each other or form a stable inner whole. As Spitzer (2020) points out, such a division leads to digitally induced anxieties, depression, and a sense of alienation from oneself.

Another key aspect of the depersonalisation of personality is the automation of communication. A large part of interpersonal interaction today takes place via digital interfaces that reduce non-verbal communication, spontaneity, and emotional depth. Video platforms, chatbots, and formalised forms of online expression often result in shallow communication in which the personality is not fully present. Instead of a live dialogue, we have pre-formed reactions in the form of emoticons, likes, and short messages that cannot carry the complexity of emotions, meanings, and interpretations (Turkle 2019).

In the context of education and work, digital technology is transforming the ways of learning and collaboration, but at the same time leads to a reduction of direct interaction and social bonding. Educational systems that rely on e-learning and automated testing increasingly treat students as numerical units rather than individuals with unique capacities and emotions. In the work

environment, the platformisation of labor (gig economy) leads to increased flexibility but also to the loss of stable identities that were once tied to professions, titles, and social contributions. Depersonalisation also manifests itself in mass culture. Series, films, advertisements, and music are increasingly becoming generic products of algorithmic marketing, where creativity is replaced by repetitiveness and modularity. The artist is no longer a person expressing an inner vision, but a producer of content adapted to social media algorithms. In this context, art loses its subjective and transcendent dimension, along with the ability to express or reshape personality. In addition to this, a significant influence on depersonalisation comes from the concept of surveillance, which is increasingly moving from the domain of state security into everyday life. Modern cities, workplaces, and even homes are equipped with cameras, sensors, and smart devices that continuously collect data about an individual's behavior, movement, and habits. In such an environment, personality is no longer an inviolable internal reality, but becomes a transparent object, accessible to analysis, manipulation, and commercialisation. Such a model of surveillance society not only violates privacy, but also causes changes in behavior, known as the "panopticon effect" – when people begin to regulate their behavior according to expected norms, even when it is uncertain whether they are being observed. Such a condition produces a form of self-imposed conformity and loss of authenticity, because personality no longer acts from inner motivation but out of fear of judgment or sanction (Foucault 2019). In technological everyday life, the experience of time and space also changes in a way that affects subjectivity. With constant connectivity, every moment is recorded, archived, and shared. Time is no longer a continuum but a series of fragments that must be "captured", edited, and presented to others. Space is reduced to interfaces: the home becomes an office, school, studio, while the boundaries between public and private blur. These changes in temporal and spatial perception contribute to acceleration, distraction, and a superficial experience of self and the world (Han 2021). To respond to the challenges of depersonalisation, new strategies of resistance and renewal of the personal dimension of the human being must be devised. One approach stems from the idea of digital ethics and technological humanism and represents an attempt to place technology at the service of humans not only as users but as subjects with dignity. This implies building platforms that do not exploit users' attention, data, and emotions, but encourage critical thinking, empathy, and creativity. Some examples of such practices are already being developed in education, alternative media, and open-source communities (Lanier 2020). Another strategy includes a return to art, reading, face-to-face conversation, and other forms of deep communication. These are spaces where personality does not appear as a function of the system but as a living, unpredictable, unique voice. Art, especially literature and theatre, offers a space for the development of inner life and imagination, which are often suppressed in the technological era (Nussbaum 2021). Finally, a political response is also necessary. Personality cannot be defended solely by individual

resistance, but also by creating institutions, laws, and educational models that respect freedom, privacy, and the complexity of the human being. This means enacting regulations that protect against digital violence, manipulation, and surveillance, as well as supporting a culture that nurtures diversity, slowness, contemplation, and free thought.

As nature and natural elements (fire and water) are not enemies in themselves, the same can be said for technology. However, alongside all the advantages that technology brings, it is necessary, on the other hand, to develop a critical awareness of what is lost by consenting to its use. What is of crucial importance for our survival as a species that thinks, empathically feels itself and others, and meaningfully belongs to a community is maintaining an internal critical stance that constantly monitors our use of and exposure to technology, with an ever-present awareness of its feedback effect on us (Baltezarević 2023: 125).

Instead of capitulating to technological necessity, a vision of humans as persons and technology as a tool, not fate, is needed. Only in a relationship where the person remains an active principle, rather than a passive result of the system, is it possible to restore the dignity of subjectivity in the technological age. This opens up space not only for critique but also for the creation of new, humane forms of life in the digital era.

PERSONALITY IN POLITICS, ART, AND SCIENCE

In an age of rapid global changes, personality is no longer only a private category but also a political, artistic, and scientific factor. The sphere of public life becomes a place where the real scope of freedom, autonomy, and integrity of the individual is examined. However, in contemporary politics, art, and science, the shadow of crisis is increasingly present. The political arena witnesses the disappearance of leaders of character and the rise of officials without vision. Art more often becomes aesthetically sterile, ideologically programmed, or market-adapted. Science, under the influence of corporate and institutional demands, frequently drifts away from critical reflection and becomes a production machine of knowledge without deeper ethical or cultural sensitivity.

In the political sphere, the concept of personality undergoes profound transformations. Modern political spaces are increasingly characterised by the dominance of technocratic structures, party discipline, and PR strategies instead of authentic visions and charismatic leaders. Contemporary politicians often act as administrative officials rather than personalities who shape history and influence collective morals. This trend leads to the political arena being emptied of genuine subjectivity and turned into a controlled field of power management. Historically, political development was linked to the emergence of strong personalities, visionaries, revolutionaries, reformers, who acted from

deep conviction and often clashed with the institutional status quo. From Pericles and Cicero to Abraham Lincoln, Churchill, and Nelson Mandela, political history remembers personalities capable of articulating values, hope, and moral authority. In the modern era, such examples are becoming increasingly rare, replaced by strategically constructed media images, polls, and marketing simulacra of authenticity (Debord 2018). The increased use of social networks and digital communication in politics further contributes to depersonalisation. Instead of personal engagement and dialogue, political messages increasingly take the form of short posts, memes, and PR releases, thereby reducing the depth and complexity of political discourse. The audience no longer reacts to arguments but to images, tone, and associations. This leads to the erosion of political space as a place for rational debate, turning it into a realm of affective manipulation.

In art, personality has traditionally appeared as an expression of inner autonomy, individual imagination, and social critique. Great artists – from Dante and Michelangelo to Bach, Van Gogh, and Beckett – represented personalities whose works opened new horizons of meaning, experience, and identity. However, in the contemporary era, art is progressively subjected to the logics of the market, algorithmic visibility, and ideological utility. The personality of the artist is often reduced to a branded image, while the artwork itself is subordinated to aesthetic trends or conceptual ideology.

Contemporary art institutions, from biennials to galleries and foundations, often favor works that are easily communicable, quickly recognisable, or that “thematised” current political or identity discourses. Although criticality is often present as rhetoric, art is increasingly reduced to representation and becomes part of the spectacle. Thus, the artistic personality loses its subversive potential, and the artist becomes part of the cultural industry producing content for algorithmic consumption (Adorno–Horkheimer 2020). On the other hand, there are still spaces where the personality of the artist manages to break through technological and ideological barriers. Independent productions, digital literature, experimental theatre, and subcultural networks often nurture authenticity, risk, and individual expression. In these spaces, personality is not a predefined set of parameters, but a process of continuous artistic reflection, self-examination, and social interaction. In the realm of science, personality was once inseparable from discovery – scientists such as Nikola Tesla, Albert Einstein, Marie Curie, and Milutin Milanković were simultaneously thinkers, visionaries and public figures who embodied scientific curiosity and ethical responsibility. Their work was not a product of collective knowledge production, but the result of persistent individual research, inspiration, and often struggle with the dominant tendencies of their time.

Contemporary science, however, increasingly operates within institutional and project frameworks that favor teamwork, standardised methodology, and “measurable” results. Although this approach has its advantages in terms of objectivity and efficiency, it simultaneously stifles individual initiative, curiosity, and the capacity for critical thinking. Scientists often become task executors,

specialised in narrow fields and pressured by demands for publication, funding, and citation, which limits their freedom and personal relationship to science (Latour 2019). Moreover, the growing influence of technological corporations on the funding and direction of scientific research means that scientific investigations increasingly serve economic interests rather than the common good. Issues such as ethical boundaries of biomedicine, climate change, or the impact of digital technologies on humans often remain secondary to profitability and technical applicability. This situation leads to a crisis of scientific personality – the loss of its moral autonomy and critical function in society.

Nevertheless, even within contemporary science, there are examples demonstrating that personality remains possible – not as an isolated figure of genius, but as an ethically oriented, culturally conscious, and socially engaged subject. Such individuals often resist trends, pose difficult questions, and seek ways to return science to the service of humanity, life, and the planet.

PERSONALITY AND COMMUNICATION: LANGUAGE, UNDERSTANDING, AND HETERONOMY

One of the main challenges facing contemporary communication is the issue of superficiality and speed. Social networks, mobile applications, and algorithmically filtered platforms encourage communication that is short, fragmented, and often devoid of context. In such an environment, deep exchange of ideas and feelings becomes increasingly rare, while language is reduced to slogans, symbols, and reactions. Personality, as a linguistically active subject, finds it ever more difficult to find a space where it can be heard, understood, and respond with integrity. This degradation of language also affects the ability to understand. When communication is reduced to impressions and visual impulses, the capacity for empathy, argumentation, and respect for differing viewpoints diminishes. Personality is no longer a dialogical subject, but a consumer of communicative content, often isolated in “info-silos” where public speech turns into a series of repetitive affirmations of existing beliefs. Instead of open dialogue, algorithmically optimised monologues dominate, pushing personality into a passive role. Furthermore, contemporary communication increasingly functions within the attention economy, a model in which user attention is currency, and communicative content is optimised not for depth, but for retaining interest. This approach leads to the production of content that is emotionally charged, conflictual, or sensationalist, which not only destabilises public discourse but also affects the self-perception of personality: it feels insufficiently important if it is not “viral”, not part of a “trend”, or if it does not provoke reactions (Lanier 2020). Additionally, in the contemporary media and technological space, the phenomenon of communicative heteronomy emerges, i.e., a situation where the individual is no longer the master of their own speech, but their language is shaped by external structures: platforms, algorithms, norms of political

correctness, and media trends. Instead of a free subject who speaks, the personality increasingly turns into a “spoken being”, instrumentalised through patterns that dictate what is acceptable, visible, and worthy of response. In such a context, freedom of expression is increasingly replaced by self-imposed control, and authenticity gives way to simulacrum (Baudrillard 2019). Alongside this, global political conflicts and cultural divisions further complicate the possibility of understanding between different communities. Examples such as the situation in Kosovo and Metohija, or relations between East and West, show that communication is often not just a technical process of exchanging signs, but a space of deep misunderstandings, historical traumas, and value disagreements. Heteronomy here appears as a culturally conditioned closure into “us” and “them”, within frameworks that prevent dialogue and transcendence.

However, despite all these challenges, the possibility of resistance remains. This resistance is not necessarily political or technological, but – linguistic. By returning attention to the quality of speech, to the meaning of words, to the relationship to the Other as a personality, it is possible to open space for the renewal of dialogue. Education that nurtures criticism, empathy, and understanding of diversity; art that seeks expression instead of impression; and philosophy that asks questions instead of giving ready-made answers – these are all forms of communication that affirm personality in the time of its digital dissolution.

CONCLUSION

This paper aimed to examine the contemporary position of personality through a multidisciplinary analysis, encompassing philosophical, cultural, technological, and political aspects. It was determined that personality, as a unique and moral structure of subjectivity, undergoes processes of transformation under the influence of global changes, accelerated technological development, and increasing algorithmic mediation of communication and knowledge. Instead of understanding it as linear progress or inevitability, this transformation has been shown to carry complex epistemological, ethical, and anthropological consequences.

The analysis showed that digital platformisation, depersonalisation of communication, and the institutional instrumentalisation of art and science contribute to the erosion of the integrity and depth of the concept of personality. The contemporary individual is increasingly treated as a data carrier, a representative unit within technological networks, or a consumer of communicative impulses, which diminishes their capacity for ethical reflection, creative expression, and critical attitude toward reality. Special consideration was given to the transhumanist paradigm, which, although based on technological optimism, influences the shifting boundaries of human subjectivity toward post-biological and algorithmic identities. Such a vision requires critical reconsideration: if personality is no longer based on mortality, empathy, and corporeality, the question arises

– what are the criteria for morality, authenticity, and responsibility in such a context? This opens space for necessary ethical regulation and a new definition of what it means to “be human” in the posthuman age. Communication is identified as the key sphere where processes of preservation or loss of personality take place. Contemporary linguistic patterns, accelerated communication rhythms, as well as the dominance of visual and symbolic impulses reduce space for dialogue, empathy, and meaningful understanding. In this context, it is necessary not only to educate about digital literacy but also to encourage practices of linguistic ethics, philosophical thinking, and discourse culture.

The conclusion drawn from the analysis is not pessimistic but cautiously open. The contemporary world does not necessarily lead to the end of personality but rather calls for its re-definition. A proposed direction is towards building a new anthropology of personality – one adapted to the challenges of the digital age, but simultaneously grounded in enduring values of subjective autonomy, moral responsibility, and existential dignity. In this sense, personality does not appear as an outdated concept, but as a central category for critical understanding and shaping of the future.

LITERATURE

- Балтезаревих 2023: Боривоје Балтезаревих. *Деконструкција културној идентитету у сусрећу са новим медијима*. Институт за српску културу Приштина – Лепосавих, Лепосавих.
- Балтезаревих 2024: Боривоје Балтезаревих. *Технолошки детерминизам и културна еволуција - значај културној диверзијету у етичкој процени вештачке интелигенције*. *Башихина*, 62, 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.5937/bastina34-46882> Институт за српску културу Лепосавих, Лепосавих.
- Adorno–Horkheimer 2020: Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Official Gazette, Belgrade.
- Baltezarević–Baltezarević et al. 2019: Radoslav Baltezarević, Borivoje Baltezarević, Piotr Kwiatek, Vesna Baltezarević. *The Impact of Virtual Communities on Cultural Identity. Symposium*, 6(1), 7–22.
- Baudrillard 2019: Jean Baudrillard. *Simulacra and Simulation*, Novi Sad, Mediterran Publishing.
- Bostrom 2020: Nick Bostrom. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan 2011: Allen Buchanan. *Beyond Humanity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Debord 2018: Guy Debord. *Society of the Spectacle*, Grafos, Belgrade.
- Damasio 2020: Antonio Damasio. *On the Way to Consciousness*. Lisbon: Themes.
- Floridi 2020: Luciano Floridi. *The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Design*. Oxford University Press.
- Foucault 2019: Michel Foucault. *Discipline and Punish*, Klio, Belgrade.
- Fukuyama 2018: Francis Fukuyama. *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. Picador.
- Habermas 2019: Jürgen Habermas. *The Future of Human Nature*. Polity.

- Han 2021: Byung-Chul Han. *The Burnout Society*, Arhipelag, Belgrade.
- Harari 2021: Yuval Noah Harari. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. Harper.
- Hofstede 2020; Kapoor 2020: Reena Kapoor. "Human Enhancement and Rights Discourse". *Bioethics Today*, vol. 7, no. 1, 15–27.
- Kurzweil 2019: Ray Kurzweil. *The Singularity Is Nearer: When Humans Transcend Biology*. Viking.
- Lanier 2020: Jaron Lanier. *Ten Arguments for Deleting Your Social Media Accounts Right Now*, Heliks, Belgrade.
- Latour 2019: Bruno Latour. *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime*. Polity.
- Mead 2020: Lawrence Mead. Cultural Change and Political Character. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 49(4), 258–268.
- More–Vita-More 2021: Max More, Natasha Vita-More. *The Transhumanist Reader*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nussbaum 2021: Martha Nussbaum. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Plomin 2019: Robert Plomin. *Blueprint: How DNA Makes Us Who We Are*. MIT Press.
- Rogers 2021: Jenny Rogers. *Coaching Skills: The Definitive Guide to Being a Coach* 5e. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Spitzer 2020: Manfred Spitzer. *Digital Dementia*, Plato, Novi Sad.
- Taylor 2020: Charles Taylor. *The Language Animal: The Full Shape of the Human Linguistic Capacity*. Harvard University Press.
- Turkle 2019: Sherry Turkle. *Reclaiming Conversation: The Power of Talk in a Digital Age*. Penguin.
- Zuboff 2019: Shoshana Zuboff. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Public Affairs.

Боривоје В. БАЛТЕЗАРЕВИЋ

ЛИЧНОСТ И ТЕХНОЛОГИЈА У КОНТЕКСТУ ТРАНСХУМАНИЗМА:
МУЛТИДИСЦИПЛИНАРНИ ПРИСТУП САВРЕМЕНИМ ИЗАЗОВИМА
И ПЕРСПЕКТИВАМА ИНДИВИДУАЛНОГ ИДЕНТИТЕТА

Резиме

У раду се анализира комплексна интеракција личности и технологије у савременом свету кроз мултидисциплинарну перспективу, са посебним освртом на трансхуманизам. Проблем личности се често узима здраво за готово и не проблематизује се довољно, упркос томе што је управо ова интимна људска структура изложена озбиљним претњама савремених технологија и културолошких промена. Рад истражује како напредак у области вештачке интелигенције, дигитализације и алгоритамизације друштвеног живота утиче на перцепцију личности, њен идентитет и самореализацију. Кроз интердисциплинарни приступ, који укључује филозофске, психолошке, социолошке, политичке, културолошке и технолошке аспекте, покушава се одговорити на питање у којој мери је личност способна да задржи аутентичност и аутономију у околностима свеобухватног технолошког

диктата. Посебна пажња посвећена је питањима деперсонализације, губитка аутентичности у политици, уметности и науци, као и у области комуникације. Закључује се потребом за унапређеним и јасније дефинисаним етичким оквирима и интерпретативним моделима, као и функционалнијим парадигмама, који би омогућили очување и развој личности у контексту трансхуманистичког и технолошки посредованог света.

Кључне речи: личност, технологија, трансхуманизам, вештачка интелигенција, индивидуалн иидентитет, деперсонализација, аутономија, комуникација, савремени свет.