ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ФИЛОСОФИЯ
СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ
SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

https://doi.org/10.31489/3134-9242/2026-1-1/14-23
UDC: 17.022.1+004.9

Received: 11 August 2025
Accepted: 14 December 2025

A.K. Abdina*

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, USA
(E-mail: abdin044@umn.edu)

Transhumanism and Digital Immortality: A Philosophical Analysis of Ethical Foundations and Future Challenges

This article presents a systematic philosophical and theoretical analysis of transhumanism as a cultural and intellectual movement, focusing on its relationship with posthumanism, digital ethics, and the concept of digital immortality. The study seeks to delineate the philosophical foundations of transhumanism, identify key similarities and differences with posthumanism, explore its intersection with digital ethics, and critically examine the ethical challenges posed by the pursuit of digital immortality. Through a review of contemporary research and philosophical literature, the article argues that while transhumanism continues the humanistic tradition of self-improvement through technology, it raises profound ethical questions about human nature, social inequality, and the very definition of life and death. The scientific novelty addresses the systematic synthesis of these concepts and the introduction of a critical framework for analyzing the ontological and ethical implications of digital immortality. The conclusion highlights the necessity for a new digital humanism that can integrate technological progress with enduring humanistic values.

Keywords: transhumanism, transhumanist paradigm, posthumanism, anthropocene, digital ethics, digital technologies, digital immortality, digital humanism.

Introduction

The rapid acceleration of technological progress in the 21st century has brought to the forefront philosophical movements that seek to redefine the human condition. Among these, transhumanism stands out for its proactive advocacy of using science and technology to overcome human biological limitations. The relevance of this research is underscored by the growing influence of transhumanist ideas, fueled by advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and neuroscience, and their tangible implementation by tech entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley.

The transhumanist paradigm is gradually turning into a significant force influencing the transformation of culture. Various forms of art already quite freely operate with the vocabulary and style of transhumanism. New genres are emerging, such as cyberpunk and nanopunk, based on the ideas of transhumanism. Furthermore, the values of the transhumanist paradigm, successfully integrating the biological human self with artificial, mechanical, and digital components embodied in various types of cyborgs, are firmly entering literature, film, and video games and are practically not rejected by consumers.

Transhumanism is based on the idea that humans are imperfect and need to be improved through technology and science. Transhumanism examines the prospects, consequences, and potential dangers of technologies that, on the one hand, help overcome human biological limitations, and on the other, involve the consideration of ethical issues related to the development and use of such technologies.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: *abdin044@umn.edu*

Buketov University

This article seeks to provide a comprehensive philosophical examination of transhumanism by achieving the following objectives: defining its core paradigm; distinguishing it from the related concept of posthumanism; analyzing its relationship with digital ethics; and identifying the primary ethical challenges associated with the pursuit of digital immortality. The central problem addresses the conceptual vacuum surrounding the ethical and societal consequences of radical human enhancement, which requires a thorough philosophical inquiry.

Methodology and research methods

This research is based on a qualitative analysis of philosophical, sociological, and ethical literature. The methodological approach employs a systematic theoretical and philosophical review. The materials include foundational texts by transhumanist thinkers, critical works on posthumanism, and contemporary scholarly articles on digital ethics and digital immortality from peer-reviewed journals and academic collections. The analysis proceeds through several stages:

- Historical-Philosophical Analysis: Tracing the origins and evolution of transhumanist thought.
- Conceptual Analysis: Comparing and contrasting the key concepts of "transhumanism" and "posthumanism."
- Ethical Analysis: Examining the debates between transhumanists and bioconservatives, and situating transhumanism within the broader framework of digital ethics.
- Critical Analysis: Identifying and systematizing the ethical dilemmas arising from the concept of digital immortality.

This multi-stage approach allows for a holistic understanding of transhumanism not merely as a technological project but as a significant cultural and philosophical phenomenon.

Results and Discussion

Intellectual Foundations of the Transhumanist Project

The transhumanist worldview, like other systemic ideologies, did not materialize in a philosophical vacuum but emerged from a distinct constellation of intellectual antecedents and philosophical assumptions. The neologism itself is attributed to Sir Julian Huxley (1887–1975), a figure whose multidisciplinary legacy as an English biologist, architect of the modern evolutionary synthesis, and inaugural UNESCO Director-General positioned him uniquely to synthesize its core principles. His familial connection to writer Aldous Huxley and Nobel laureate neurophysiologist Andrew Huxley further situates him at an intersection of scientific, literary, and philosophical thought.

Huxley's influential essay, "Transhumanism," articulates a vision of deliberate human evolution. He proposes a state of conscious agency, stating, "...Whether he wants to or not, whether he is aware of what he is doing or not, man is now indeed determining the future direction of evolution on this planet. This is his inescapable destiny..." [1]. For Huxley, this destiny involved a "cosmic duty" with a dual focus: an internal obligation for self-realization and an external imperative to serve the collective and future generations. He proposed the term "transhumanism" to describe a state where "man remaining man, transcends himself by realizing new possibilities of and for his human nature..." [1], thus positioning humanity as a project of intentional self-overcoming.

This conceptual framework was prefigured by earlier 20th-century thinkers, including biologist J.B.S. Haldane, physicist J.D. Bernal, and paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin [2; 246]. However, the movement's contemporary articulation is largely indebted to the futurist F.M. Esfandiary (writing as FM-2030) in the 1970s, with subsequent intellectual contributions from figures like Robert Ettinger, K.E. Drexler, and Marvin Minsky solidifying its modern form.

A canonical definition is provided by Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom, a leading contemporary exponent, who characterizes transhumanism as "an intellectual and cultural movement that affirms the possibility and desirability of fundamentally improving the human condition through applied reason," specifically by developing technologies to eliminate aging and radically enhance human capacities [3]. The institutionalization of these ideas was marked by the 1998 founding of the World Transhumanist Association (WTA) by Bostrom and David Pearce, an organization later rebranded as Humanity+ in 2008 to reflect a more integrated vision. The WTA's advocacy for the safe and ethical application of enhancement technologies was pivotal in establishing transhumanism as a legitimate subject of academic discourse.

The philosophical underpinnings of the movement are notably eclectic. Bostrom himself emphasizes its gradual, collaborative development, noting that "Transhumanist thinking has been shaped gradually, thanks

Buketov University

to the contributions of many thinkers," reflecting a scientific, rather than a singularly philosophical, mode of intellectual progress [4]. This view is complemented by David Pearce's perspective, which highlights the movement's diversity by drawing inspiration from a broad range of thinkers like Bertrand Russell and Richard Dawkins, whose works, while not strictly transhumanist, contribute to its intellectual tapestry [4].

Scholarly analyses acknowledge that while internal variations exist, transhumanists are united by the overarching "project of human enhancement" [5, 6]. This project leverages the interplay between nature and culture, advocating for a suite of advanced technologies — from genetic engineering and nanotechnology to artificial intelligence and brain-computer interfaces — as instruments to abolish disease, extend the human lifespan, and amplify cognitive and physical faculties.

This ambition is framed not as a historical anomaly but as the modern instantiation of a perennial human drive. As Bostrom observes in "A history of transhumanist thought," "The human desire to acquire new capacities is as ancient as our species itself," manifesting as a persistent tendency to overcome biological and environmental constraints [7].

The transition of transhumanism from theoretical framework to tangible pursuit is evidenced by its significant backing from Silicon Valley. Entrepreneurial ventures such as Calico Labs (focused on longevity), Altos Labs (aiming to reverse aging), and Neuralink (developing neural interfaces) exemplify this shift. Landmarks like Synchron's successful implantation of a brain-computer interface in a patient with ALS in 2022 demonstrate the progressive materialization of core transhumanist objectives [6].

In essence, these developments underscore a paradigm that is dynamically evolving. The fundamental aim of transhumanism remains the directed improvement of the human condition itself, leveraging technological convergence to achieve enhanced bodily perfection, superior quality of life, and the radical extension of the human lifespan.

Transhumanism and Posthumanism: Navigating the Conceptual Labyrinth

A central and persistently complex issue within contemporary futurist discourse involves the nuanced differentiation between transhumanism and posthumanism. Scholarly consensus acknowledges the significant challenge in establishing clear conceptual boundaries between these terms, a difficulty that permeates academic debate [8]. This categorical ambiguity stems from several factors: the shared deployment of the "posthuman" as a central figure, the remarkable plurality within both movements — encompassing transhumanist variants like extropianism, singularitarianism, and democratic transhumanism, alongside posthumanist iterations such as the philosophical, cultural, and critical strains — and fundamentally divergent interpretations of humanism's future trajectory. The intellectual landscape is further complicated by opposing viewpoints that position posthumanism either as transhumanism pushed to its logical extreme, or conversely, frame transhumanism as merely one constituent element within the broader, more critical project of posthumanism.

This inherent duality was astutely captured by philosopher B.G. Yudin, who highlighted the Janus-faced nature of transhumanism. He argued that its value system permits a dual interpretation: it can be viewed as "a continuation and development of the traditions of humanism," predicated on the continuity of the human subject, or, conversely, as "an overcoming of the values of humanism," should the envisioned new form of humanity prove profoundly alien to our current ontological state. Yudin notes that the foundational thoughts of Julian Huxley deliberately leave this pivotal question unresolved [9; 343].

While the relentless progression of scientific and technological advancement makes humanity's continued evolution an inevitability, a critical question looms: Is Homo sapiens equipped to navigate the profound socio-cultural and psychological challenges precipitated by a potential transformation into a "posthuman" state? A notable characteristic of many transhumanist schools of thought is their relative neglect of the broader social, environmental, and political ramifications of such a radical metamorphosis. Within this framework, technology is predominantly conceived as an instrumental tool for the direct augmentation and refinement of human biology.

In stark contrast, posthumanism shifts the analytical focus from enhancement to implication. It dedicates itself to a critical examination of the consequences brought about by technological mediation of the human condition. As contemporary research delineates, the "posthuman" describes "a being or state of being that arises from the fusion of human and machine," a category that may include genetically or technologically augmented humans, human-machine hybrids, artificial intelligences, or virtual entities. Importantly, the term also encompasses the novel forms of subjectivity, relationality, and political structures that emerge alongside the deconstruction of humanist ideology [10].

Buketov University

The posthumanist project is fundamentally deconstructive. It actively rejects the conception of humanity as a stable, transcendent essence, instead questioning the privileged status of the human and deliberately blurring the ontological boundaries that have traditionally separated it from the animal world, machines, and the broader environment. Its proponents contend that evolution is an ongoing process, accelerated by our symbiotic interaction with technology, which is catalyzing the emergence of unprecedented modes of existence and cognition. Consequently, posthumanist inquiry is directed towards the complex interrelationships within the human-machine-environment relationship, seeking to formulate new paradigms for their co-evolution.

This philosophical reorientation is exemplified in Francesca Ferrando's "Philosophical Posthumanism," which undertakes a radical rethinking of the "human" by meticulously analyzing the convergences and divergences between transhumanism, anti-humanism, and posthumanism itself. Ferrando posits posthumanism as a philosophy of mediation, one that insists on understanding the human not as an isolated entity, but as a node inextricably embedded within dense networks of technological and ecological systems, thereby engaging directly with themes of AI, bioethics, and contemporary posthuman transformation [11].

Further expanding this interdisciplinary analysis, the volume "Transhumanism and Posthumanism in the Twenty-First Century Narrative," edited by Sonia Baelo-Allué and Mónica Calvo-Pascual, surveys the pervasive influence of posthumanist questions across modern science, literature, and film. The collection re-examines the enduring inquiry "What does it mean to be human?" while probing issues of techno-utopianism, the critique of anthropocentric values, the decline of critical faculties, the decentralizing impulse of posthumanism, and the re-conceptualization of the human through the perspectives of transhumanism and posthumanism within the context of the Anthropocene [12].

The concept of the Anthropocene itself serves as a critical nexus, connecting the technological aspirations of transhumanism with the ecological and critical concerns of posthumanism. As scholars Liz-Rejane Issberner and Philippe Léna document, the term, initially proposed by biologist Eugene F. Stoermer and popularized by Nobel laureate Paul Crutzen, denotes a proposed geological epoch wherein human activity has become the dominant force driving planetary-scale biogeophysical change. They mark a departure from the relative stability of the Holocene, often tracing its origins to the advent of the Industrial Revolution around 1784, symbolized by James Watt's refinement of the steam engine [13].

This proposed nomenclature for an era defined by humanity's geological agency has, however, ignited considerable contention within the scientific community. Advocates for its formal ratification support their argument by pointing to a relationship of pervasive global shifts: accelerated climate change, a mass extinction event and catastrophic loss of biodiversity, and extensive anthropogenic alteration of the Earth's surface. Conversely, skeptics advance several counter-arguments: an alleged absence of definitive stratigraphic markers in the geological record, disputes over a precise start date, and concerns regarding the term's politicization, which they argue compromises its scientific objectivity.

The current status of the term was clarified in 2024 when the International Union of Geological Sciences declined to formally ratify the Anthropocene as an official geological epoch. Notwithstanding this decision, its utility and descriptive power ensure its continued prevalence in both scientific and public discourse concerning humanity's planetary impact. The very intensity of this debate underscores the profound complexity inherent in demarcating geological time and the need for a meticulous assessment of the human footprint on Earth. As Issberner and Léna clearly observe, the central impediment surrounding the Anthropocene is "the delicate issue of environmental injustice," as the detrimental consequences of climate change are disproportionately borne by the most vulnerable populations, a problem exacerbated by vast global inequalities in development and resources, making equitable solutions exceptionally elusive [13].

Synthesis and Discernment

In synthesizing the core distinctions, we can distill the following conceptual map. Transhumanism includes thinkers who aspire to surgically overcome the perceived constraints of human nature through the direct application of science and technology. This trajectory, with its intellectual roots in the Enlightenment, conceptualizes humanity as a biological species endowed with the right to pursue self-improvement. Its emphasis is resolutely practical, championing the implementation of specific technologies like digital immortality and biohacking, underpinned by a steadfast conviction in the benevolence of scientific progress and a conscious extension of the humanistic tradition.

Posthumanism, in direct contrast, is oriented towards the systematic deconstruction of the traditional humanist subject and a rigorous critique of anthropocentrism. It problematizes the very notion of a fixed hu-

Buketov University

man essence, re-framing the human as an integrated component of the biosphere, and prioritizes the critical analysis of the consequences — intended and otherwise — of technological intervention [8].

Thus, while both transhumanism and posthumanism grapple with the future of humanity in an age of technological acceleration, their philosophical commitments and methodologies diverge sharply. Transhumanism seeks to perfect the human using technology as its primary instrument, thereby perpetuating the humanist tradition. Posthumanism, however, launches a critique from beyond the humanist horizon, challenging its anthropocentric foundations and reconceiving human evolution as a process of ontological blurring, where the demarcations between the biological and technological become increasingly permeable. Ultimately, transhumanism is characterized by its focus on technological application, whereas posthumanism is defined by its commitment to critical interrogation. Both intellectual currents confront the formidable challenges of a digitalized world, yet neither presently offers a comprehensive framework for resolving the related ethical and social challenges. This very gap suggests the potential for an emerging synthesis — perhaps in the form of a "digital humanism" that seeks to balance technological progress with humanitarian values.

The Ethical Conundrum of Human Enhancement: Transhumanism Through the Lens of Digital Ethics

The accelerating realization of transhumanist aspirations, where previously hypothetical human-machine integrations become tangible realities, has propelled ethical considerations from speculative philosophy to public debate. This paradigm shift demands rigorous ethical scrutiny as technological augmentation ceases to be abstract and enters the realm of feasible application.

At the heart of this discourse lies a fundamental schism, clearly outlined by Luca Benvenga in his work "Transhumanism, techno-humanism and ethics" [5], which analyzes the opposing viewpoints of bioconservatives and transhumanists. The bioconservative stance views technological enhancement as a dehumanizing force, positing that genetic and other modifications represent an existential threat to social fabric and human identity. They believe technology should be used only for therapeutic purposes — restoring health rather than augmenting capability — with the pursuit of radical life extension or superhuman capacities seen as a violation of natural order.

Conversely, transhumanists champion technological enhancement as the logical extension of humanity's self-improvement drive. They argue that the moral imperative to alleviate suffering and improve well-being does not abruptly halt at the boundary of therapy. For them, their goal is to protect and extend life, health, cognitive capacities, and emotional well-being, seeing enhancement as a continuation of this goal [5]. Benvenga identifies two transformative prospects central to the transhumanist vision that are unacceptable to bioconservatives: the emergence of beings endowed with indefinite lifespans and vastly superior intellects, potentially equipped with novel senses, and the more profound possibility of attaining a "posthuman state" of existence so advanced as to be virtually unintelligible to the contemporary human mind [5]. The bioconservative argument is based on the idea that such pursuits create a conflict with human nature itself, thereby undermining societal stability.

This debate exposes the critical fault line of "therapeuticity" — the difficult criterion distinguishing healing from enhancement. The transhumanist project thus forces a re-evaluation of the relationship between its core tenets and the emerging field of digital ethics. While digital ethics arises as a result to transhumanism, scholarly analysis suggests it cannot constitute a wholly "new ethics." Instead, its values, norms, and principles — remains rooted in universal ethical frameworks, even as it adapts to novel contexts [14].

This evolutionary perspective on ethics is central to the transhumanist worldview. Proponents advocate for a dynamic view of human dignity, considering both the present and future. Accordingly, "the ethics of the future should include the ethics of the present as an integral part" [15], suggesting that values currently beyond our comprehension may become normative for enhanced future generations. This is framed as an expansion of autonomy: increased health, abilities, and talent apparently broaden an individual's spectrum of life choices. From this vantage point, to deliberately forgo enhancement and allow humans to develop with inherent biological limitations is considered inhumane [15].

The ethical stakes are dramatically amplified by the simultaneous development of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. As analyzed in the article "Ethical and Societal Implications of Transhumanism and Technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution," the transhumanist trajectory — envisioning a progression from human through a "transhuman" hybrid to a "posthuman" end point — profoundly alters the human essence and its place in the world [16]. These convergent technologies demand nothing less than a complete revision of ethical norms and a restructuring of human-technology relations to steer development toward a stable, humanistic, and sustainable future.

Buketov University

The digital revolution, while offering unparalleled benefits from personalized medicine to ecological sustainability, simultaneously generates a complex landscape of ethical hazards. The pervasive integration of Big Data analytics and autonomous algorithmic systems into decision-making processes erodes human oversight, intensifying dilemmas of fairness, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights. Mitigating these risks necessitates that digital innovation be guided by a commitment to human rights and the principles of an open, pluralistic society.

The primary objective of digital ethics is therefore to navigate a viable compromise between public apprehension and regulatory frameworks, maximizing the societal and individual benefits of technology while minimizing its perils. This requires a holistic perspective that transcends a narrow focus on specific devices like AI or IoT. Scholars emphasize the need for a comprehensive approach that considers the entire digital ecosystem — the infosphere — including the technologies themselves, the practices they enable, and the governing business and political structures [17].

The source of novel moral challenges is identified not in hardware alone, but in the complex interplay between software, data, autonomous agents, and their environment. Consequently, specialized sub-fields like "robo-ethics" are deemed insufficient to address the full scope of this paradigm shift. A robust, integrative digital ethics is required, one capable of a holistic analysis of the entire spectrum of emerging moral questions [17].

In conclusion, transhumanism, as both a philosophical paradigm and a cultural force, generates a plethora of moral dilemmas that interrogate the present and future of humanity. It compellingly demonstrates that any profound intervention into the human condition — whether biological or digital — will inevitably be accompanied by complex problems of moral choice. These challenges must be navigated within the evolving framework of digital ethics, all while remaining anchored to the enduring foundations of universal human morality.

The Ontological Challenge of Digital Eternity: Ethical Dimensions of Post-Mortem Existence

Within the transhumanist project, few aspirations provoke as much profound ethical disquiet as the pursuit of digital immortality. This concept represents not merely a technical hurdle but a fundamental philosophical challenge, positioning the achievement of endless digital existence as a central ideal within the transhumanist value system. Scholarly analysis underscores that for the first time in human history, the prospect of immortality is being systematically examined through the dual lenses of scientific paradigm and formal philosophy, necessitating a rigorous ethical appraisal. As one researcher contends, the very novelty of this inquiry lies in its comprehensive ethical dissection of digital immortality, an analysis that ultimately elevates the discourse to the ontological plane, compelling a radical re-evaluation of the definitions of "human" and the existential status of physical death [18].

The academic focus on this phenomenon has intensified markedly over the past decade, crystallizing around the concept of a sustained — whether active or passive — digital presence following biological death. Breakthroughs in knowledge management, machine-to-machine communication, and artificial intelligence are progressively transforming this presence from a static archive into a potentially interactive entity. Research is now delving into the multifaceted impact — emotional, social, financial, and institutional — of such active digital immortality on the networks of the living. This raises complex questions regarding the legal status and consequences of an autonomous digital existence that persists beyond its creator's earthly demise, while simultaneously provoking skepticism as to whether the entire concept is a substantive concern or merely a sophisticated technological spectacle, devoid of genuine legal implication despite media sensationalism [19].

The technological underpinnings for this shift are increasingly present in daily life. The proliferation of conversational interfaces like Siri, advances in machine learning for processing massive datasets, and the growing autonomy of computational systems collectively represent significant strides in AI that directly facilitate the architecture of digital immortality [20].

A particularly ambitious trajectory within this field focuses on mind cloning technology. By situating transhumanist endeavors within a comparative framework, scholars aim to deepen the understanding of the entire project, viewing it as a modern reconstitution of age-old existential negotiations. As one author frames it, the transhumanist approach is most accurately conceptualized as a "quasi-contemporary attempt to reconstruct immortality by technological means" [21].

A robust philosophical critique of this endeavor is presented in the article "Theoretical and Practical Paralogisms of Digital Immortality," which observes that as transhumanism gains academic and popular

Buketov University

traction, it resuscitates what the author deems "naive metaphysical ideas, such as immortality." Abstaining from political or ethical judgment, the critique targets the movement's metaphysical foundations, particularly the conviction that AI will enable an immortal virtual self. Invoking Kant's "paralogisms" from the Critique of Pure Reason—which dismantle rational proofs for the soul's substantiality and immortality—the author constructs a parallel argument. The article posits that the transhumanist claim for digital immortality is built upon two flawed premises: a misunderstanding of the essential nature of information (theoretical paralogisms) and an unfounded belief in infinite transformability or "pure plasticity" (practical paralogisms) [22].

Adding a crucial sociological dimension, the study "Towards a postmortal society of virtualised ancestors?" laments that while research on digital immortality has proliferated, a distinctly sociological lens remains rare. To address this gap, it introduces the concept of the Virtual Deceased Person (VDP) — a speculative digital artifact capable of convincingly emulating the demeanor and characteristics of the dead, thereby enabling them to function as posthumous social actors. Grounded in anthropological and micro-sociological theory, the VDP is characterized as a manifestation of post-mortem individuality. The author argues that such entities could sustain social bonds between the living and the dead, potentially fostering a future "postmortal society" populated by socially active, virtualized ancestors [23].

The societal debate engendered by digital immortality is therefore profound, straddling technological feasibility and deep-seated worldview conflicts. For many, these notions directly contravene religious and philosophical convictions concerning the sacred nature of life and death. A central, haunting question emerges: Can consciousness truly be preserved in a technological medium, or does this process merely amount to a sterile "canning" of personality, a data-driven simulacrum that fundamentally ignores the spiritual dimension of human existence?

The social implications are equally transformative. The perpetuation of digital replicas of the deceased could fundamentally alter the psychology of grief, fostering a persistent illusion of presence that potentially impedes the natural, healthy process of accepting loss and moving forward.

Furthermore, the prospect of digital immortality threatens to inaugurate a new and extreme form of social stratification — a "mortality gap". If access to these technologies is governed by economic and social status, it could create a permanent underclass condemned to mortality, while an affluent elite secures a form of perpetual digital existence, thereby exacerbating existing inequalities to an unprecedented degree.

A further recurrent critique addresses the demographic consequences of achieving the transhumanist goal of drastically extended lifespans through arrested aging, potentially exacerbating planetary overpopulation and resource scarcity.

Finally, a host of pragmatic concerns regarding data preservation, posthumous privacy, and the legal status of digital entities remain entirely unresolved, demanding extensive future study. Across all these challenges, a paramount ethical imperative endures: the preservation of the integral self and a respectful stewardship of its legacy, ensuring that the pursuit of digital eternity does not erase the very humanity it seeks to perpetuate.

Conclusion

This philosophical review has systematically analyzed transhumanism as a paradigm, delineating its boundaries with posthumanism and exploring its profound ethical implications, particularly regarding digital immortality. The study concludes that transhumanism represents a direct continuation of the humanistic project of self-improvement, now pursued through technological means. However, its implementation is fraught with challenges that posthumanism and digital ethics help to illuminate. The core tension lies between the drive for technological transcendence and the preservation of fundamental human values and social equity.

The findings suggest that the unchecked advancement of transhumanist technologies risks exacerbating social inequalities and creating new ontological and ethical dilemmas for which society is unprepared. Therefore, further philosophical and public discourse is urgently needed. The ultimate challenge is not merely to achieve technological breakthroughs but to guide them with a robust ethical framework — a potential "digital humanism" — that can harmonize the promise of technological progress with the enduring principles of human dignity, justice, and ecological responsibility. The future of the human condition may depend on our ability to navigate this complex intersection wisely.

Buketov University

References

1 Huxley J. Transhumanism [Electronic resource] / J. Huxley // Journal of Humanistic Psychology. — 1957. — Vol. 8, No 1. — P. 73–76. — Access mode: https://eroskosmos.org/transhumanism/

2 Луков В. Трансгуманизм / В. Луков // Энциклопедия гуманитарных наук. — 2017. — № 1. — С. 245–252.

3 Bostrom N. The Transhumanist FAQ [Electronic resource] / N. Bostrom. — Access mode: https://nickbostrom.com/views/transhumanist.pdf

4 Lomena A. Interview with Nick Bostrom by David Pearce [Electronic resource] / A. Lomena. — Access mode: https://www.hedweb.com/transhumanism/

5 Benvenga L. Transhumanism, techno-humanism and ethics / L. Benvenga // Medicina y Ética. — 2023. — Vol. 34, No. 1. — P. 160–193. DOI: 10.36105/mye.2023v34n1.04.

6 Ostberg R. Transhumanism [Electronic resource] / R. Ostberg. — Access mode: https://www.britannica.com/topic/transhumanism

7 Bostrom N. A history of transhumanist thought / N. Bostrom // Journal of Evolution and Technology. — 2005. — Vol. 14, No. 1. — P. 1–25.

8 Белобрагина А. Трансгуманизм и постгуманизм: два пути навстречу постчеловеку / А. Белобрагина // Экономические и социально-гуманитарные исследования. — 2023. — № 3 (39). — С. 136–143.

9 Юдин Б. Человек: выход за пределы / Б. Юдин. — М., 2018. — 472 с.

10 Jacobs N. The Posthuman / N. Jacobs // The Palgrave Handbook of Utopian and Dystopian Literatures / P. Marks, J. A. Wagner-Lawlor, F. Vieira (Ed.). — Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-88654-7_56

11 Феррандо Ф. Философский постгуманизм / Ф. Феррандо; пер. с англ. — М.: Изд. дом Высшей школы экономики, 2022. — 361 с.

12 Baelo-Allué S. Transhumanism and Posthumanism in Twenty-First Century Narrative / S. Baelo-Allué, M. Calvo-Pascual. — 2021.

13 Иссбернер Л.-Р. Антропоцен: научные споры, реальные угрозы [Электронный ресурс] / Л.-Р. Иссбернер, Ф. Лена. — Режим доступа: https://courier.unesco.org/ru/articles/antropocen-nauchnye-spory-realnye-ugrozy

14 Мелешко Е. Трансгуманизм и цифровая этика [Электронный ресурс] / Е. Мелешко. — Режим доступа: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/transhumanism-i-tsifrovaya-etika

15 Летов О. Трансгуманизм и этика [Электронный ресурс] / О. Летов. — Режим доступа: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/transgumanizm-i-etika

16 Radun V. Ethical and Societal Implications of Transhumanism and Technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution / V. Radun // Social Informatics Journal. — 2023. — Vol. 2, No. 2. — P. 29–35. DOI: 10.58898/sij.v2i2.29-35.

17 Floridi L. Digital Ethics: Its Nature and Scope [Electronic resource] / L. Floridi, C. Cath, M. Taddeo. — Access mode: FloridiDigitalEthicsItsNatureAndScope.pdf.

18 Назарова Ю. Проблема бессмертия в контексте цифровой этики / Ю. Назарова // Общество: философия, история, культура. — 2021. — № 11. — С. 17–21.

19 Savin-Baden M. The ethics and impact of digital immortality / M. Savin-Baden, D. Burden, H. Taylor // Knowledge Cultures. — 2017. — Vol. 5, No. 2. — P. 178–196. DOI: 10.22381/KC52201711.

20 Savin-Baden M. Digital Immortality and Virtual Humans / M. Savin-Baden, D. Burden // Postdigital Science and Education. — 2019. — Vol. 1. — P. 87–103. DOI: 10.1007/s42438-018-0007-6

21 Huberman J. Immortality transformed: mind cloning, transhumanism and the quest for digital immortality / J. Huberman // Mortality. — 2018. — Vol. 23, No. 1. — P. 50–64. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2017.1304366

22 White J. Theoretical and Practical Paralogisms of Digital Immortality / J. White // Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology. — 2022. — Vol. 9, No. 2. — P. 155–172. DOI: 10.1080/20539320.2022.2150463

23 Hurtado Hurtado J. Towards a postmortal society of virtualised ancestors? The Virtual Deceased Person and the preservation of the social bond / J. Hurtado Hurtado // Mortality. — 2023. — Vol. 28, No. 1. — P. 90–105. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2021.1878349

А.К. Абдина

Трансгуманизм және сандық өлместік: этикалық негіздер мен болашақтағы қиындықтарды философиялық талдау

Мақалада трансгуманизмнің посттуманизммен, цифрлық этикамен және сандық өлместік тұжырымдамасымен байланысына ерекше назар аудара отырып, мәдени және интеллектуалдық қозғалыс ретінде жүйелі философиялық және теориялық талдау берілген. Зерттеудің мақсаты — трансгуманизмнің философиялық негіздерін анықтау, посттуманизммен негізгі ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды айқындау, оның сандық этикамен қиылысуын зерттеу және сандық өлместікке ұмтылумен байланысты этикалық мәселелерді сыни тұрғыдан талдау. Заманауи зерттеулер мен

Buketov University

философиялық әдебиеттерге шолу негізінде мақалада трансгуманизм технология арқылы өзін-өзі жетілдірудің гуманистік дәстүрін жалғастырғанымен, ол адамның табиғаты, әлеуметтік теңсіздік және өмір мен өлімнің анықтамасы туралы терең этикалық сұрақтар туғызады деп тұжырымдайды. Ғылыми жаңалығы бұл ұғымдарды жүйелі түрде синтездеу және сандық өлместіктің онтологиялық және этикалық салдарын талдаудың маңызды негізін енгізумен тұжырымдалады. Қорытындыда технологиялық прогресті тұрақты гуманистік құндылықтармен біріктіре алатын жаңа сандық гуманизмнің қажеттілігі атап өтілген.

Кілт сөздер: трансгуманизм, трансгуманистік парадигма, постгуманизм, антропоцен, сандық этика, сандық технологиялар, сандық өлместік, сандық гуманизм.

А.К. Абдина

Трансгуманизм и цифровое бессмертие: Философский анализ этических основ и будущих вызовов

В статье проводится систематический философский и теоретический анализ трансгуманизма как культурного и интеллектуального движения, уделяя особое внимание его взаимосвязи с постгуманизмом, цифровой этикой и концепцией цифрового бессмертия. Цель исследования — очертить философские основы трансгуманизма, выявить ключевые сходства и различия с постгуманизмом, исследовать его пересечение с цифровой этикой и критически проанализировать этические проблемы, связанные со стремлением к цифровому бессмертию. На основе обзора современных исследований и философской литературы в статье утверждается, что, хотя трансгуманизм продолжает гуманистическую традицию самосовершенствования с помощью технологий, он поднимает глубокие этические вопросы о природе человека, социальном неравенстве и самом определении жизни и смерти. Научная новизна заключается в систематическом синтезе этих концепций и введении критической основы для анализа онтологических и этических последствий цифрового бессмертия. В заключение подчеркивается необходимость нового цифрового гуманизма, который сможет объединить технический прогресс с непреходящими гуманистическими ценностями.

Ключевые слова: трансгуманизм, трансгуманистическая парадигма, постгуманизм, антропоцен, цифровая этика, цифровые технологии, цифровое бессмертие, цифровой гуманизм.

Buketov University

References

1 Huxley, J. (1957). Transhumanism. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 8,* 1, 73–76. Retrieved from https://eroskosmos.org/transhumanism/

2 Lukov, V. (2017). Transgumanizm [Transhumanism]. *Entsiklopediia gumanitarnykh nauk — Encyclopedia of Humanities*, *1,* 245–252 [in Russian].

3 Bostrom, N. The Transhumanist FAQ. *nickbostrom.com.* Retrieved from https://nickbostrom.com/views/transhumanist.pdf

4 Lomena, A. Interview with Nick Bostrom by David Pearce. *hedweb.com.* Retrieved from https://www.hedweb.com/transhumanism/

5 Benvenga, L. (2023). Transhumanism, techno-humanism and ethics. *Medicina y Ética, 34*(1), 160–193. DOI: 10.36105/mye.2023v34n1.04

6 Ostberg, R. Transhumanism. *britannica.com.* Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/transhumanism

7 Bostrom, N. (2005). A history of transhumanist thought. *Journal of Evolution and Technology, 14,* 1, 1–25.

8 Belobragina, A. (2023). Transgumanizm i postgumanizm: dva puti navstrechu postcheloveku [Transhumanism and posthumanism: two ways towards the posthuman]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsialno-gumanitarnye issledovaniia — Economic and Social-Humanitarian Research, 3* (39), 136–143 [in Russian].

9 Yudin, B. (2018). *Chelovek: vykhod za predely* [Human: going beyond limits]. Moscow [in Russian].

10 Jacobs, N. (2022). The Posthuman. *The Palgrave Handbook of Utopian and Dystopian Literatures.* Marks, P., Wagner-Lawlor, J.A., & Vieira, F. (Eds.). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-88654-7_56

11 Ferrando, F. (2022). *Filosofskii postgumanizm* [Philosophical posthumanism]. Moscow [in Russian].

12 Baelo-Allué, S., & Calvo-Pascual, M. (2021). *Transhumanism and Posthumanism in Twenty-First Century Narrative.*

13 Issberner, L.-R., & Lena, F. Antropotsen: nauchnye spory, realnye ugrozy [Anthropocene: scientific disputes, real threats]. *courier.unesco.org.* Retrieved from https://courier.unesco.org/ru/articles/antropocen-nauchnye-spory-realnye-ugrozy [in Russian].

14 Meleshko, E. Transgumanizm i tsifrovaia etika [Transhumanism and digital ethics]. *cyberleninka.ru.* Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/transhumanism-i-tsifrovaya-etika [in Russian].

15 Letov, O. Transgumanizm i etika [Transhumanism and ethics]. *cyberleninka.ru.* Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/transgumanizm-i-etika [in Russian].

16 Radun, V. (2023). Ethical and Societal Implications of Transhumanism and Technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. *Social Informatics Journal, 2,* 2, 29–35. DOI: 10.58898/sij.v2i2.29-35.

17 Floridi, L., Cath, C., & Taddeo, M. Digital Ethics: Its Nature and Scope. Retrieved from FloridiDigitalEthicsItsNatureAndScope.pdf

18 Nazarova, Y. (2021). Problema bessmertiia v kontekste tsifrovoi etiki [The problem of immortality in the context of digital ethics]. *Obshchestvo: filosofiia, istoriia, kultura — Society: Philosophy, History, Culture, 11,* 17–21 [in Russian].

19 Savin-Baden, M., Burden, D., & Taylor, H. (2017). The ethics and impact of digital immortality. *Knowledge Cultures, 5,* 2, 178–196. DOI: 10.22381/KC52201711.

20 Savin-Baden, M., & Burden, D. (2019). Digital Immortality and Virtual Humans. *Postdigital Science and Education, 1,* 87–103. DOI: 10.1007/s42438-018-0007-6

21 Huberman, J. (2018). Immortality transformed: mind cloning, transhumanism and the quest for digital immortality. *Mortality, 23,* 1, 50–64. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2017.1304366

22 White, J. (2022). Theoretical and Practical Paralogisms of Digital Immortality. *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology, 9,* 2, 155–172. DOI: 10.1080/20539320.2022.2150463

23 Hurtado Hurtado, J. (2023). Towards a postmortal society of virtualised ancestors? The Virtual Deceased Person and the preservation of the social bond. *Mortality, 28,* 1, 90–105. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2021.1878349

Information about the author

Abdina Ainur — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Visiting Scholar at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, USA, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1819-7492

Buketov University