

Posthuman Freedom as the Right to Unlimited Pleasure

Постлюдська свобода як право на необмежене задоволення

Received: April 4, 2021

Accepted: May 1, 2021

Written by:

Meliakova Yuliia Vasylivna¹⁹<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0200-1141>**Kovalenko Inna Igorivna**²⁰<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3156-9254>**Zhdanenko Svitlana Borysivna**²¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4335-8224>**Kalnytskyi Eduard Anatolievich**²²<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1777-9992>**Krasiuk Tetiana Vasyliivna**²³<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3233-6310>

Abstract

The study discusses the evolution of the concept of "freedom": from its humanistic existential to transhumanistic corporeal meanings. The authors refer to the pure transhumanist discourse regarding the moral, legal and physical freedom when the man is transiting from existence to presence, from the body to corporeity, from material to virtual being. Overall, the problem of moral values is raised in terms of transhumanist philosophy, the ethical assessment is provided to the contemporary transhumanistic projects of humanity improvement, as well as to the current concept of its freedoms. As a result of the study the authors conclude that the category of "freedom" in the epoch of metamodernity is free from elevated, spiritual and transcendental forms that used to be so typical of it not long ago, and it returns to its literal and primitive manifestations showing unlimited corporeal pleasure, cognitive opportunities and human mental self-control.

Key words: corporeity, freedom, metamodernity, post human, transhumanism.

Анотація

У дослідженні розглядається еволюція поняття "свобода": від його гуманістичного екзистенціального до трансгуманістичного тілесного значення. Автори посилаються на суто трансгуманістичний дискурс моральної, правової та фізичної свободи, коли людина переходить від існування до присутності, від тіла до тілесності, від матеріального до віртуального буття. Загалом проблема моральних цінностей розглядається в термінах трансгуманістичної філософії, дається етична оцінка сучасним трансгуманістичним проектам вдосконалення людства, а також сучасній концепції свободи. У результаті проведеного дослідження автори дістаються висновку, що категорія "свобода" в епоху метамодерності звільняється від притаманних їй піднесених, духовних і трансцендентальних форм й повертається до своїх буквальних і примітивних проявів, що демонструють необмежену тілесну насолоду, пізнавальні можливості і психічний самоконтроль людини.

Ключові слова: тілесність, свобода, метамодернізм, постлюдство, трансгуманізм.

¹⁹ PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Philosophy Department of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Ukraine.

²⁰ PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Philosophy Department of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Ukraine.

²¹ PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Philosophy Department of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Ukraine.

²² PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Philosophy Department of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Ukraine.

²³ PhD in Law, Associate Professor of Labor Law Department of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Ukraine.

Introduction

Humans are continuously developing at each stage of their cultural, social and technical evolution of society. They are moving forward, reassessing their ideals, aims, prospects and possibilities, transforming the space of their creativity, consumption, cognition, self-realization and personal identification, the space of social and legal regulation, pleasure and freedom. In the contemporary and especially futuristic discourse the concept of human freedom is increasingly expanding its content, including intellectual, physiological, mental, real and virtual resources.

The aim of the research is to consider the most advanced and promising human features in the field of their individual practices and initiatives. The focus is on the evolution of morality, in particular, on reloading the moral category of “freedom”, which might be dangerous to a certain extent for the overall threat of godlessness and despiritualization of the post-humanity. The mercantile consciousness of the neo human prefers effective means of emotional and physical pleasure, regarding them as the tools to achieve freedom.

Higher significance of physicality and corporeity in various realities is explained by their ability to ensure pleasure, which is expressed in the human “happiness rate”. The care of corporeity is proclaimed a priority and value for the mankind. It is the corporeity (as a cyber, digital nature) enables to maximize senses, emotional and tactile sensations and the experience of perception as a whole. In the situation of the spiritual devaluation sensual pleasure is becoming its only alternative.

Methodology

This research contains the analysis of the human ontological freedom in its current extreme forms. The philosophical anthropological perspective within the metamodern paradigm highlights a human as an intellectual, moral and biophysical creature that tends to have corporal freedom and the freedom of corporeity. To consider the phenomenon of freedom in the context of virtuality anthropology this research applies the method of critical analysis of individual classical concepts of freedom; methods of comparative philosophy and discourse – when comparing anthropological positions of different paradigms; the hermeneutic method to interpret and understand the futurological human rights; the

phenomenological reflection of the right to pleasure, as well as the reflection of the ways to position a human and the types of human reading the world; the method of deconstruction of some notions, in particular, “freedom”, “humanism”, and “corporeity”. The study also applies the principles of polyonticity, dialogics, corporeity, simulativeness, consumerism, dynamics, transhumanism and post-non-classical anthropology of virtuality. Rational individualistic and humanistic approaches were used for the axiological analysis of the futurological image of a human in the metamodernity paradigm.

Theoretical framework

To consider the problem of freedom in its postmodern understanding and transhumanist context, it is necessary to provide a preliminary methodological overview of the history and genesis of the philosophical cultural paradigm of the human being as well as the analysis of cultural human types and related concepts. The evolution of the paradigm over the past two centuries has been manifesting the continuity of three consistent traditions – modernity, postmodernity and post-postmodernity (also referred to as metamodernity, hypermodernity or ultramodernity). Each of these phenomena (M, post-M and post-post-M) is interpreted, *inter alia*, as a special way of world understanding (reading, outlook) and human existence in the world at a certain stage of social development, consciousness, culture, state building and the very *homo sapiens* as a biological species.

Therefore, modernity, postmodernity and metamodernity, each individually, formed not only their specific methodological paradigms in gnoseology and hermeneutics, special ontological models of finitude (or infinity) of the world development, their own traditions of expressiveness in art and trends of regulation in sociopolitical and legal practices. They also demonstrated unique authentic styles of self-realization and the ways of subject being in a specific epoch, the features of their symbolic culture and typical verbalization forms.

Thus, postmodernity that emerged in the 1960s and followed modernity as its alternative had the following theoretical and practical world outlook settings: anti-dialectics, anti-historism, the end of history, forgotten traditions, individual autonomy, the development of economic human

rights in consumers' society, the value of pleasure and comfort, a man "sliding on the surface", the culture of simulacra, the anonymity and lack of responsibility, "the death of the author" in drama and publicist literature, irony in stylistics and art, narrative logic in descriptive history and practice, multi-layered cento intertext in structuralism, the metaphor "the world as a text", intersubjectivity in philosophy and law, the phenomenon of interactivity of the subject in verbal symbolic structures, humanitarian theory of communicative society, discursivity principle in social, political and economic reality.

In the mid-1990s pure researchers claimed that post-postmodernity was a new way of world reading, caused by the "disappointment in postmodernity", its "overcoming". Still the opinion on the postmodernity as a new stage of postmodern development or even return to modernity seems to be more persuasive.

What theories, categories, metaphors and methodological principles can be considered conceptual features of metamodernity? Its methodological development paradigm finally refuses eschatologism and apocalyptic scenarios, substituting them with the principle of infiniteness, globality, self-generation and self-organization of open synergetic systems. The principles and categories of synergetics extrapolate to all areas and fields. A person still simulates in the medium of verbal signs, interactive and deconstructive. However, radical changes are happening to the sign nature and structure themselves. The quality of the simulational reality where a person exists and acts changes, too. From being intertextual, reality is becoming digital, virtual hyper-reality – digital culture (Meliakova, Kovalenko, Zhdanenko & Kalnytskyi, 2020, 345–346). The world is not a "text" any longer, it is a "play" – performance (or installation) – a space of immanent total presence and participation (co-participation). The same performance is recognized a relevant method of understanding, the way of modern person self-realization, the technique of their integration into the dynamic virtualized meta-reality, and, overall, the way of their being in the world (Melyakova, 2018).

Post-postmodernity, or metamodernity, continuously shows the deficit of reality, genuineness and naturalness. Most effective substitutes here are virtual images and interfaces (textual, graphical, kinetic and visual), as well as modified corporeity of objects. In the context of polyreality and radical expansion of human impact borders, special popularity has been

gained by the discourse of somatic human rights, including life extension, gender self-identity, humane death, commodification of organs and tissues, cryocontracts, use of nootropics etc. The theorists of post-postmodernity widely apply Baudrillard's epithets: "hyper-realism", "hyper-esthetics", "implosion", "excremental, crap and waste culture".

Russian philosopher and lawyer A. Pavlov (2019), referring to the experience of Canadian political theorists Kroker, A. and Cook, D. (1986), critically admits that the new consciousness "in the dark time of ultramodernity and hyperprimitivism opens a great arch of deconstruction and decay against the background of radiated parody, kitsch and burnout" (Pavlov, 2019, 22). A. Pavlov (2019) also supports the statement by French philosopher of the 1980s G. Lipovetsky (2015) of hypermodernity as the second modernity, more specifically, "the modernity inside out". If the epoch of Enlightenment is a synonym to maturing, the epoch of hypermodernity is vice versa, the synonym to the return to the childhood, which, actually, means infantile and immature society. The hypermodernity structures the paradoxical present, which, in turn, continuously exhumes and "reloads" the past. On the whole, reasoning about hypermodernity is based on the capitalistic opportunities, which generate the phenomenon of hyper-consumption. While the consumption used to be the essential feature of postmodernity, hypermodernity preserves some features of the previous epoch, in particular, consumption but at the hyperbolic scale. Prefix "hyper" is generally symbolic for hypermodernity: "hyper-individualism", "hyper-primitivism", "hyper-consumerism" are different aspects of the same logic of hypermodernity. As a rule, it is described with the experience of intensity, immediacy, urgent and instant satisfaction, via reasoning about corporeity and manipulations with the body, as well as about the emergence of such disorders as anorexia, bulimia, mental instability, which demonstrate the systemic effect of surplus (or "hyper") (Pavlov, 2019, 28–29).

When comparing modernity, postmodernity and metamodernity special focus should be made on the analysis of people's social positioning themselves. Each of the above mentioned epochs and cultural traditions has a specific principle of human self-assessment. Today's popular axiological term "positioning" was borrowed from economic vocabulary and literally means marketing and advertising activities to provide a product (company or service) with a certain

decent place (niche) on the market of goods and services, to develop clientele, the market of consumers of the product (company or service). In other words, “positioning”, from Latin “position”, stands for the determination or self-determination of a human, the designation of the person’s status, the establishment of a beneficial image for the human, a comfortable place, as well as attractiveness on the social relations market.

Therefore, a modern person once openly claimed his/her position of otherness: I am not like the others! I do not care if others like me! I do not need general approval and recognition! The value-based anthropological and social position of a modernist was the protest and opposition to the crowd.

The postmodern person, in turn, featured the position of skeptical indifference and social apathy. This person’s autonomy was publicly manifested as ironic self-sufficiency: I do not care whether others like me or not! It does not matter to me! The postmodernist inter-subject drifted in the endless realm of metanarrative, staying unrecognized, anonymous, non-sentimental, emotionless and independent.

The post-postmodern human (also known as a trans-human or a post-human) has been seriously worried about shaping his/her image and status: I want to be liked by everybody! I need it because it determines my attractiveness, my competitiveness on the global market of skills, opportunities, goods and services. The players of the consumer virtual meta-space must have mutual freedom of using one another for their benefit. To get engaged in social roles, be in demand, not to mention, to “sell themselves for a good price”, market participants seek to be as appealing as possible for partners or clients. The eagerness to interest others is based on the anthropological human need to be liked and appreciated. It is this need that underlies any productive social human activity: entrepreneurship, legal activities, political democracy and arts.

Results and Discussion

The basic principle of total equality leaves only one chance to build an imminent social hierarchy – the competition of quality and rationally practical natural selection. It comes as a no surprise that in the discourse of any area of human activities the following categories have become popular: “top”, “trendy”, “top-rated”,

“highly rated”. The competitiveness of a consumer in the consumerist society does not tolerate modernist nihilism and postmodernist indifference. It is based on the need to be liked, but this attitude should not be sentimental, deep, mental, but purely superficial, pragmatic and attractive on the market. The practical need of a meta-modern person to be socially engaged is due to his/her key personal aim and value – achieve satisfaction. Whoever the subject of the post-postmarket space is – a salesman, manager or consumer – regardless of their roles, the limits of personal freedom and happiness are determined by the opportunities to find corporeal pleasure.

Thus, being deprived of true innovations and courage, post-postmodernity has merely democratized hedonism – the value of pleasure. “Pleasure” involves the philosophy of nootropics, plastic surgery, computer-brain interface, cryonics, genomics, and immortalism, by the way. Recipient’s body, health, attractiveness, longevity, sensuality, and the effectiveness of mental and cognitive functions have become essential for his or her pleasure. These can explain increasing popularity of somatic human rights and their boosting. They are in ethical harmony with total individualism. For instance, the “Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights” emphasizes that “The impact of life sciences on future generations, including on their genetic constitution, should be given due regard” (United Nations, 2005, Art.16). ...The interests and welfare of the individual should have priority over the sole interest of science or society” (United Nations, 2005, Art.3).

According to A. Pavlov (2019), in the epoch of late modernity the body disappears as material substance. It reached “purely rhetorical being” and transformed into the virtual corporeity – a simulacrum. The researcher confirms the statement of the “body invasion” in hypermodernity with the fact that there was no surprise that Christian Dior launched a range of “Poison” perfumes in 1985: the company actually literally offered *poison* so that women could apply it voluntarily onto their bodies – a “projection of evil” (Pavlov, 2019, 23). Technologies enable to carry out unbelievable manipulations with the body – aesthetic surgery and genomic engineering, sex selection, obtaining “tailor-made” children. Virtual reality also contributes in the “destruction” of the body, and not only mentally. For example, pornography and “virtual sex” reduce the

frequency of everyday sexual interaction. The libidinal object turns into an image as online it is possible to imagine and reproduce any image – according to the recipient’s wish. In the situation of hypermodernity the body is becoming sacred, not an individual. Thus, not surprisingly, a person under the pressure of everyday life consumerism sets the focus on his or her body (Pavlov, 2019, 24).

It is appropriate to return from the right to pleasure to freedom. The feeling of freedom, its sense and limits, has been changing along with the human historical and cultural, social and biological type, as well as with the world outlook (from modernity to post-postmodernity). The very concept of the “existence”, semantically tightly related to “freedom”, appears instable in terms of its content and theoretical meaning. For instance, in the early twentieth century N. Berdyaev (1951) noted that human understanding and expression of his/her own existence were possible only in faith and creativity as identification and fusion of the person and the object of his/her understanding, similar to coupling, to the cognition of the divine via love to God. Nonetheless, in the second half of the twentieth century M. Heidegger (1967) sees existence, internal “Self” possible only via keeping the distance, going beyond oneself, one’s own human abilities and being – into the space of nothingness, which is the only way to exist and self-cognition. Thus, nothingness was reanimated by M. Heidegger (1967) from its oblivion and recognized as the only condition of human existence. The contradiction between these two existential theories (by N. Berdyaev and M. Heidegger) lies in the following. Berdyaev’s understanding through fusion and identification with the subject is the method of art and creativity, which contradicts rational cognition. Instead, Heidegger’s distancing and alienation in the topos, in spite of being an irrational method of existential philosophy is similar to the cognitive method in science, whose logic is based on the subject-object opposition. Gnoseology and cognitivism imply that for the comprehensive and reliable understanding of the object it is necessary to go beyond the object. Probably, answering cultural, research and anthropological trends – from modernist to postmodernist ones – the existence itself changed its nature, or more specifically, its meaning in the existentialism.

In this case, it is reasonable to ask the question if the human existence has gained any new senses since Heidegger’s time and if it has not lost its meaning completely in the trend of post-

humanism? It was existentialism became the “singer” or “leading voice” of freedom in the twentieth century. However, over the past decades gnoseological and value-based realities have changed dramatically. The concept of freedom has been modified there as well: the freedom focus has shifted from spiritual and mental aspect to the biomaterial and corporeal ones. These are corporeal interests that are currently determinant and relevant in the freedom practices.

Twentieth-century existentialists, from N. Berdyaev to J.-P. Sartre, being natural romanticists, regarded freedom as a creative human inner power, the ability to assume personal responsibility “for the destinies of the world”, imagined life as a “challenge with freedom”, the right of choice, as the “doom” for responsible freedom (Sartre, 1989). N. Berdyaev claimed that the “full and good slave is the biggest enemy of freedom” (Berdyaev, 1951). Does this philosopher’s phrase reflect the contemporary concept of human freedom? Not at all, since the features of being full and satisfied are not crucial for a slave, but they are rather the signs of social, physical and substantial independence of a free person. Freedom is no longer understood as a pure “freedom of spirit” – the power of opposition and strong will. From being factual (in the phenomenological meaning) freedom is shifting to the actual, corporeal form that objectivizes its holder in presence and self-expression – in digital, social, political or creative performance.

The transhumanist model of freedom does not remind of the moral freedom of humanism as the anthropological concept and the whole system of values currently appear absolutely reformatted. The ideal and aim of transhumanism, a post-human (or a post-post-human), is a new biogenetic species, (theoretically) modified and perfected so much that he/she can refuse from their own body and exist in verbal non-metrical forms as information structures in computer networks (as artificial intellect, meta-brain) (Goryachkovskaya, 2014). Even a trans-human, not to mention his follower, a post-human, will have a “distributed individuality”, since he/she will be able to become a user of an artificial body – avatar, while continuously preserving their personality, experience, and memory. The body of a post-human will be equipped with implants, which will enable it to feel much more pleasure, sensual satisfaction, more emotions, avoiding anxiety, fatigue, boredom and despair, fully control them, expand memory and intellect opportunities. Implants

will provide a neo-human with unlimited energy and longevity, exclude genetic diseases and strengthen the immune system. Freeing humans from their own biological nature is the way to self-improvement, protection from global problems, caused by egotism and consumerism – it is the way to neo-humanity. This is the view currently shared by advanced researchers and ideologists of transhumanism.

Transhumanism can be referred to as humanism overcoming, or, to be more specific, overcoming the humanist value hierarchy. The most advanced values are gaining mercantile case-based logic and they get scattered throughout the horizontal dynamic space of the matrix that verbally but effectively systematizes human activities.

The human improvement biopolicy already has its projects and forms in the area of neuro-ethics and commodification of the human body. The phenomenon of comprehensive and primarily corporeal improvement of a human expresses their eternal thirst for power over nature, including their own one, the urge to get rid of their main dependence and predicament – substantial-biological – objectively pre-set frames, which even recently still seemed to be firmly fixed. To this end, J. Habermas (2002) raised the issue of whether embryonic genetic diagnostics and genetic modification contradicts the basics of the human species ethics and modern moral values. Therewith, the philosopher personally criticizes liberal autonomy and liberal eugenics of a human (Habermas, 2002). American philosopher H. Haker (2019), in turn, contextualizes the problems raised by J. Habermas (2002) in a wider discourse of bioethics. He considers catholic approaches to bioethics under the critical theology. H. Haker (2019) expresses hope that moral philosophy and moral theology will ally in fighting against the new “unbearable world of moral emptiness”.

However, the trans-human does not agree to tolerate with the pre-set and rather limited potential of memory, attention, power, stamina, health, sensitivity, thinking, and cognition. This human’s wish to control him/herself and the environment is growing. From the user’s function the person seeks to the management function – the role of a “manager” of the Universe system and all its resources. The human brain seeks to conquer natural bases of its own activity thus making him/herself free, unlimited and powerful. At this stage this aim is drawn closer by biostimulators, various pharmaceutical doping (including academic doping), and also

technological means of brain stimulation (electric charges, ultrasound and magnetic pulses) – the so-called non-invasive stimulation. Moreover, these are easily accessible and applicable even at home (Popova, Tishchenko & Shevchenko, 2018, 97–98).

In the obsessive urge to accelerate their lives and development, people make mobility, procedures, effectiveness, motion – motion as the potential and unlimited opportunities but not compulsory high performance as the symbol and way of their existence. In this case, these are not the aim and result that give the sense to the motion, but the very motion itself provides meaning to existence. The autonomic subject does not need any technologies of social freedom and protection of collective rights any more. All his activity aims at expanding personal, individual freedom in its most intimate aspects. This is due to the fact that virtual being, as egotistic satisfaction does not need corporativism. Virtuality has managed to overcome the objectivity of physical via stepping over the boundaries of space and time. It is only speed that preserves its objective parameters in the digital space. It actually shapes contemporary ontology of motion.

Overall, human’s attempt to conquer space and time with IT has turned out to be quite successful. Contemporary means of communication enable to cover huge distances within seconds. It is high time the same approach was applied to the human consciousness, human cognitive processes and functions, whose development implies rather strict sequence of formation and personal growth stages. So far academic doping biotechnologists and genetic engineers, integrating into the increasing pace of life, are taking a risky attempt to bypass natural and necessary path of personal development by limiting it to the very minimum. The parameters of motion and speed invade into the area of consciousness, simulating thinking, feelings, emotions, attention, and memory. For instance, one of the shocking options of exogenic post-humanism is the technology of brain-computer interface (BCI), when some highly appreciated biological human functions (e.g. thinking and health) can be transformed and mediated with a non-biological (technological, digital) medium BCI. Today BCI devices enable to create unique exogenic kinds of a post-human, which will gradually be tightly integrated and interrelated with bodies and socially controlled (project “Thought under Control”) (Oodorcak, 2019).

However, these are mainly nootropics that currently refer to the reality. Neuroethics names the phenomenon of self-regulation and consciousness functioning using nootropics as “cognitive freedom”. The argument of the value of cognitive freedom has become widely spread in the context of new European concept of human autonomy and human right to self-identity. Human use of biotechnologies of Cognitive Enhancement (CE) is justified by the need to “respect the autonomy of a human”, his/her right to decide what is good and what is bad for him/her, i.e. the freedom of thought in the 21st century. Therewith, the “freedom of thought” (in the meaning of cognitive freedom) is understood as the human power to actually monitor and control cognitive skills, which he/she has and will improve in the near future. For example, cognitive freedom is expressed in the fundamental right of a person to think independently, that is to apply the full range of his/her intellectual skills and “autonomously dispose of the chemistry of their brain”. In addition, cognitive freedom includes ethics and the right to protect their intellectual processes and states (Popova et al., 2018, 102).

Therefore, the field of freedom of the contemporary human is rapidly expanding, going far beyond the limits of social reality. Trans-human’s freedom embraces his/her personal mental and neurophysiological conditions, biochemical and molecular-biological processes. Being their potential resource, carrier and prisoner, a human is recognized as their authorized moderator (“the right to dispose of own body”). This turn seems possible only against the background of the general trend for pragmatic objectification of non-material natural phenomena as the objects of market relations (i.e. objects of possession, disposal and sales). Human’s inherent skills and traits may serve as the means for enrichment similarly to conventional property. The same principle of commercialization is a hallmark of legalizing biotechnological manipulations with a human body overall, including the dead body (commodification of it as a medical product and an object of biotechnological transformations). In its trans-human freedom, the human body is gaining popularity as a resource for economic investments (Polyakova, 2017).

The image of a body as a biomaterial and a resource is based on the extended personal human rights, on the one hand; and on the trend for total commercialization in all areas of life, on the other (the sale of biosamples for banks, gene patenting, functioning (including illegal) of the

markets of human organs and tissues). These phenomena are called the expansion of market economy into the areas that used to be restricted for the market laws, and also the ethical problem of consumerism (Popova, 2016).

Currently, it is being discussed whether a human has the right to reproductive and therapeutic cloning, at least Article 11 “Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights” dated 11.11.1997 states that the practice of cloning for the species reproduction is not allowed as the practice “contrary to human dignity” (1997). Another relevant discourse is about the recognition of the human’s freedom for virtual modelling, in vitro fertilization, the freedom of gender identification (up to asexuality or non-binary sexual identification – as a sign of a post-human) and many other freedoms, related to the human corporeity and reproductive self-realization.

Today American researchers note the significant role of bioethics in the physiologically ageing European society, where older people quantitatively prevail. They call for agreeing that population ageing is morally important and causes ethical problems in rich and ageing societies, consider the suggestion of removing the problems of gerontosophy (Germ. Gerontosophie) and social injustice using biotechnologies and the ethics of transhumanism. According to the American authors, bioethics, along with many other disciplines, can influence demographic changes and contribute to political decisions capable of improving the experience of ageing and human life. This shapes the concept of good civic consciousness in the ageing society, which goes beyond healthcare (Berlinger & Solomon, 2018). Therefore, in medical literature there is a term the solidarity concept – a way of meeting the requirements of justice and equal treatment in healthcare. It includes such advanced medical developments as healthcare information databases, biobanks, personalized medicine and donors of organs, tissues, cells and blood (Gould, 2018).

Scientific initiatives in genome science continuously provide people with new opportunities. However, they still raise new problems regarding the owners of the research results, including intangible ideas and discoveries, as well as material works, tools, technologies and products. Legal and ethical requirements of the participants to research findings are becoming increasingly stricter, and more often they contradict other requirements of other stake holders (researchers, institutions).

There are also emerging the issues of research participants' access to the information and their control of the results. The American research team analyzed twenty-two genome scientific initiatives in the USA and found two essential trends: the first – commercialization of genomics; the second – the introduction of the philosophy of openness (accessibility, publicity of results and data), it includes participants' control of the results via intellectual property rights and licensing (Guerrini, Lewellyn, Majumder et al., 2019).

In other words, the theory and practice of genome science is not purely academic any longer and becomes absolutely commercialized. It often has no institutional reference, i.e. it functions according to the market rules. This shows that transhumanism protects not only new moral and healthy nature but also new market opportunities despite the fact that the “Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights”, adopted by the UNO in 1997, states in Article 4: “The human genome in its natural state shall not give rise to financial gains.” (United Nations, 1997).

Another area of anthropological freedom is, in turn, the freedom of pleasure. It is in the avant-garde of all achievable freedoms of post-human. One of the main tasks of transhumanism, formulated at numerous international fora of the World Transhumanist Association and recorded in its formal declarations is to “make a human happier”, including by means of fighting against suffering. The recommended means to reach pleasure include anxiolytics (medicines against fear and anxiety), analgesics (pain relievers, or killers), entactogens and antidepressants (medicines for short-term suppression of negative feelings), doping and nootropics, as well as technologies, expected by the scientific world, which will increase human pleasure. These include: telepresence systems, computer-brain interfaces, neuro-prosthetics and brain simulation, human Self transfer to the non-biological substrate – artificial body (body-avatar) etc. (Goryachkovskaya, 2014).

Seeking happiness, transhumanists use rather rational and mercantile techniques, lacking any morality or spiritual altruism. For example, today Nick Bostrom and David Pearce's concepts about super-bodies, being the result of turning varied substance in the Universe, are trendy in the scientific world. Swedish philosopher N. Bostrom (2003), hypothetically assuming that the humanity lives in the world internally

simulated in the computer, points at the total absence for it to survive. Along with the technological progress, the number of technologies, their share in human experience and the quality of simulations of reality is continuously growing, while the cost is falling. That opens a prospect of converting the Earth into the “computronium” – a single huge computing device – self-developing artificial intelligence, which will enable to simulate simultaneously 10^{13} virtual civilizations similar to ours. This computing power could create detailed simulations of its human past. According to N. Bostrom (2003), it cannot be affirmed that the computronium is impossible at all, since people normally see dreams that are not differentiated from inside from reality (i.e. being a quality simulation), which means that using genetic manipulations it is possible to grow a super-brain that sees dreams continuously. The philosopher claims: the probability that we are in the simulation is many times higher than the probability of us being a real civilization (Bostrom, 2003). It is essential that the computronium will be optimized not only for the fastest thinking and computing possible, but also for the maximum possible pleasure. To achieve this aim it is allowed even to destroy all the other creatures in the Universe.

Further, being engaged in “paradise engineering”, the legendary British evangelist, rock-musician, a philosopher-utilitarian and a member of the British Immortality Institute and the Extension Foundation D. Pearce (2015) in “The Hedonistic Imperative” lays the foundation for a separate futurological area of studies – hedonistic transhumanism. His theory of values is as naturalistic as that created by N. Bostrom (2016). This is an ambitious abolitionist project to eliminate suffering in reasonable life using genetic engineering and nanotechnologies. A new kind of neuron architecture, based on the inherited gradients of happiness will enable a human to stop being a slave of his natural instincts, voluntarily and individually regulating the level of their pleasure after having learnt to enjoy any action. These technologies will be able to artificially program human needs and motivations. Mental and physical pain may be fully removed from our life (Pearce, 2015).

For example, D. Pearce (2015) tends to the idea of the “utilitronium”, a hypothetical super-happy super-body, which needs to increase its own weight to maximize happiness. If this creature emerges on the Earth, and its average pleasure heavily exceed the pleasure of other creatures, it

will deem it morally justified to destroy all life on the planet by taking up all its resources. As a result, the total happiness of the Earth inhabitants will increase, though most of them will be destroyed. Whether or not this scenario is realistic depends on the features of the “neural correlate of pleasure”, which are still unknown. If pleasure is limited in size, and its maximum may be reached using depletable resources (and their media), then the peaceful coexistence of a variety of super-happy bodies is possible. If pleasure can increase endlessly when using more new resources (e.g., weight increase), there is a chance of an unlimited war of post-humans for resources followed by a takeover (Piarce, 2015). Thus, the final aim of transhumanism is not too bright, and what is more, it is not just cognitive but hedonistic.

Transhumanism calls for the use of diets and exercises to improve health and extend life expectancy, for entering agreements for cryonic freezing, for the use of nootropic medicines to improve cognitive and mental functions, for self-development using various cognitive or psychological methods (mnemonics, meditation, critical thinking), for the use of advanced information technologies, for the use of food supplements etc. The philosophy of transhumanism is a plan of transforming human consumers’ interest to ensure profits in NBICs (Nano-Bio-Info-Cogno and social technologies as well as related scientific knowledge fields). The NBICs are busy forming “right” consumers’ interests. Even today Google seeks to provide the user with answers to most questions before the user actually asks them since it knows everything that can interest him/her, taking into account his/her history in the Internet and the context of interests (“emotional intelligence” technology). Having made a portrait of a user, the system will soon be able to guess user’s interests and needs matching his/her mood. Consequently, the initiative will be transferred from the user to the computer, which will shape and guide human interests by itself.

An optimistic forecast of the human species and artificial intelligence hybridization, or “self-hybridization” with a computer is given by well-known futurist R. Kurzweil (2012). He is a director of engineering for machine learning and language processing in Google. During his speech at the SXSW festival in Austin in 2017 he (Kurzweil) noted that these innovations would be beneficial for people and improve their life quality. People will transfer their consciousness to the “cloud” and will be able to relieve their mind. Gradually there will emerge computers

intellectually comparable to humans. We will download our thinking there, connect it to the “cloud” and broaden our opportunities. This will also ensure the enlargement of the “neocortex” – new cortex regions, responsible for the sensory perception, conscious thinking, speech, art skills and the sense of humor. The expert is convinced that we will become more laughsome, musical, and sexual. We will embody our own values. According to his predictions, in 2029 there will be a fusion of human and artificial intelligence, whereas the singularity (the emergence of the mega-mind) will take place in 2045 (Kurzweil, 2012).

Therefore, seeking to avoid emotional slavery and any dependence on artificial intelligence, in his rational cognition, a human reduces spiritual worries to a pure thought along with avoiding anything sensual, creative, spontaneous, intuitive, yielding to the utilitarian ethics of reasonable egotism and agenda-setting philosophy. This is the way from humanistic anthropology to E-homo post-anthropology. It is rather hard to accurately assess the degree of human learning and loss during the evolution. Many trans-humanistic forecasts imply optimal and simultaneous development of his rational and creative skills. The key point here is the measure of expected independence of a post-human, i.e. his independence, freedom from AI-based determinism. It is the threat of replacing exclusive spirituality of a subject with programmed algorithms activates unsettled controversies in the discourse related to the trans-humanistic model. For example, contemporary critic and publicist V. Lobanov (2020) mentions the claim made by advanced genetic scientists that genetically (pre-)determined features include: intelligence level, independence and dependence, activity and passiveness, hypochondria and anxiety, extraversion and introversion, sensitivity or tolerance to stresses, altruism and egotism, passiveness and sexuality, aggressiveness and friendliness. Therefore, via deciphering the human genetic code, it will be possible to combine new genotypes and after their adjustment (removal of the genetic debris) to create improved personalities while maintaining the optimal size of their population (Lobanov, 2020).

At first sight, the problem of spiritual deficit is in no way connected with law. The increase of the range of human cognitive, emotional and mental opportunities only shows the areas of his personal rights. However, the willingness to gain quantitative increase of pleasure and success, i.e. the degree of life euphoria, is inverse to the

human efforts to self-criticism, self-analysis, self-development, personal will strengthening and it interferes with his/her ideological stability and moral identity. Thus, the paralysis of will does not rule out the progress of human personal rights and his/her ability to choose. The will of the artificial intelligence is capable of subordinating an individual much more than the cognitive will. In this tight human-machine union the former always follows the leader. Consequently, post-human freedom can easily be limited only to the choice of operational cognitive opportunities, with no choice of his/her internal skills, existential power, and his/her identity. In this case the function of law is reduced to a simple algorithm, the identity – to simulation while the value – to “zero”.

It is rather hard to forecast social effects of technological development. Smart cheap accommodation, life in virtual reality, loss of work, lower mortality, higher life quality and human intelligence enhancement. Undoubtedly, the freedom of humans to choose their lifestyle will increase significantly. Humans will be able to live either in large cleaner and cozier cities or in autonomous settlements. Automated multimodal transport systems will be widely used. Human transformations will gain the pace. Biological processes will be taken under control for medical purposes (using genetic engineering, hormonal drugs and micro devices). Intellectual skills will be extended considerably (cognitive methods, computer-brain interface, augmented reality, nootropic drugs, artificial intelligence agents). The human body will be rebuilt for beauty as well as other purposes. Trans-humans will form a significant share of population.

The prospect of humanity transformation and transition to a new quality is considered as the most probable way of development for most active and educated people. According to the forecasts, that will lead to the creation of planetary management mechanisms, whose influence will continuously strengthen. To solve the global environmental crisis it will be necessary to shift reasonable life to a higher level – noosphere or the collective intelligence sphere, where people and computers will become similar to + global size brain neurons, controlled by PAIS (personal computer) (Lobanov, 2020). However, according to V. Lobanov (2020), it means that individual freedom of personality will there be limited much stricter than in the modern society, since “collective intelligence” is basically the global totalitarianism or, in other words, a man-made god – “human ant-hill” (*term*

“human ant-hill” was coined in 1996 by the Russian philosopher A. Zinovyev (2006) as the scientific satire to the phenomenon of “West person”).

Those who criticize trans-humanism observe one of the trends of the trans-human project – the gradual loss by a human of his essential identity that follows the disruption between consciousness and corporeity. Therewith corporeity begins dominating the consciousness and strives to replace the phenomenon of being. Anthropology is regarded as a purely physical domain. The corporeal independence turns into the main area of human freedom. Actions, physical activity, existence, participation, function, and effectiveness are essential manifestations of life; they are currently the main ways of human self-realization and self-assertiveness.

It seems that the search for immortality is one of the deepest eternal human aspirations, underlying most religious teachings and epic: Taoism, buddhism, hinduism, Epic of Gilgamesh etc. Immortality is a doctrine, proclaiming human life as its key value, in particular, its endlessness. The aim of immortality is the maximum extension of human life expectancy and, finally, unlimited longevity and eternity. Thus, immortality is another common value, in addition to the practices of somatic transgression, uniting sacred teachings and trans-humanism (Russian Transhumanist Movement, 2020).

Physical activity, including active modification of the very corporeity, has been recognized the most authentic human self-expression in the individualistic social media. The personality is optimally and reliably self-realized in his/her own actions, regarded as the manifestation of his/her freedom. The main threat to freedom is the loss by the human of his ability to communicate in the equal-partner community. However, as corporeity may be transcendent, i.e. mediated by the digital identity, while the activity may be virtual, in this case today’s communication is becoming the only guarantor of social adequacy, equality, safety and freedom.

The importance of physicality and corporeity in different realities is explained by their ability to ensure pleasure, which is expressed at the human “happiness level”. The care of corporeity is declared a priority human objective and value. It is the corporeity (cybernetic, digital nature) that enables to maximize sensitivity, emotional and kinesthetic sensations, experience of perception

as a whole. In the situation of the spirit devaluation, material pleasure becomes its only alternative. New mercantile priorities fundamentally change the content of “happiness” and the principles of human freedom. Freedom is mainly associated with unlimited body transformations (tranquilizers, doping, prosthetics, chip implantation, transplantation, cloning, cryonics, body-avatar), and physical, intellectual and mental safety.

Not so long ago books “Generation Me” and “iGen” became incredibly popular in the USA, written by the professor of social psychology of San Diego State University Jean M. Twenge (2006, 2017), discussing moral, cognitive and mental features of millennials, or the so-called I generation, (iGen’ers), who grow up with iPhones and cannot imagine life without googling, video streaming and social media. Numerous studies by J. Twenge (2006, 2017) enable her to make generally unfavorable conclusions on the lack of sociability and helplessness of “the selfie generation” who are potentially the most capable so far. Clear and stable individualism and comfort against the background of too lenient upbringing by baby-boomers have given controversial results.

On the one hand, i-Gen’ers are too narcissist, selfish, unconfident and scared to make a mistake, they lack independence and feature infantilism, isolation, susceptibility to depressions and mental disorders. Typical slogans for them, e.g. “Just be yourself!” “Everybody is good as is!” “You deserve more!” “Love yourself!”, turn out to be an illusion in adult reality, in the conditions of tough competition, personal responsibility and unemployment. i-Gen’ers, obsessed with their vulnerability, sensitivity and susceptibility, most value security that includes physical safety (power, stamina, life pleasures) and emotional invincibility (guarantee to save reputation, status, recognition and attractiveness). On the other hand, broadly, individualism shaped basic beliefs of the “selfie generation” on equal rights and freedom. Their worldview features inclusivity (consideration of all members of the society), tolerance, intolerance to any discrimination (racial, sexual, gender, thought etc.), political independence, recognition of total equality and freedom of speech (Twenge, 2006, 2017).

That way anthropological evolution from generation to generation determines new needs and opportunities for humans and, therefore, the catalogue of their rights and freedom limits. A modernist, a trans-human and a post-human have

absolutely different views on the correlation of dialogue and communication, sign and body, existence and presence, life and reality. Even today’s human, defined by progressive theorists as a trans-human, is a transitional stage on the way to the post-human, has made a new hierarchy of values, crowned by pleasure. Yet, according to many scientists (e.g., P. Strandbrink (2018) from Stockholm), contemporary values are completely free from the vertical structure and are in horizontal but not hierarchical alternative configurations. And they are called from there as necessary merely by person’s subjective cynical and rational need. P. Strandbrink (2018) notes the extinction of modernistic and post-modernistic methodological principles of agreement, narration, deconstruction, structural and post-structural nature. The philosopher concludes that this affects human image of equality, freedom, mind, autonomy, justice, history, authority and progress, and he asks whether this fall of postmodernism and justification mean the return to the utopic thinking (Strandbrink, 2018)? According to the Swedish researcher, “we seek reunion, but we cannot choose constructive strategies to synthesize hyper-varied forms, values, requirements, rules, restrictions and epistemological modes that are valid in the complex hybrid cultural pallets of the global world” (Strandbrink, 2018).

The confirmation to the post-postmodernist return to the utopic thinking can be found in the futurist forecast of transhumanism in the field of synergy of anthropic and technetronic, generation of meta-mind and neo humanity, guarantees of cybernetic immortality etc. The more confident transhumanists promise spiritual development to the humanity, the more utopic this progressivism appears since the analysis of the current achievements does not provide any grounds to consider transhumanism as a decent alternative to humanism. Unfortunately, new theories of human values and rights in the meta-modernist anthropological paradigm based on the ethics of rational individualism, do not promote perfect happy human society in any way.

If the freedom of pleasures does not crown the pyramid of liberal values, it is still a model that balances the scales determining the value (significance) of justice, equality, order, happiness and other public ideals. It is the maximum of pleasure that arithmetically justifies the ethics of rational individualism and legitimizes liberal democracy. Its sources are in the philosophy of utilitarianism: a human seeks pleasure and avoids pain; an individual knows

what is better for him or her; the objective moral is the total of individual benefits, their satisfaction and rational consensus among them. These principles have been the foundation of the humanistic moral and law since the times of the Enlightenment republics to the epoch of liberal democracy. The rational consensus and contractual justice recognize the priority of freedom of self-expression and independence of every individual, mutual recognition of each other's value and the sufficiency of the principle of keeping others harmless.

The evolution of humanism led to the rule of the principle where the key is not to interfere with others' affairs, regardless of the relations among these others, of the unions and families they create, of their lifestyle, of their sexual, religious and political interests, of whether they are ready to commit a homicide or suicide, or the like. Every human "is entitled" to nearly everything if aims are set and as long as that will not contradict others' interests. Since the main interest is to enjoy pleasure more and more, everybody has the right thereto. At the same time, a human "is not entitled" to judge and condemn anybody for the quality of the pleasures, as there is no vertical scale of values – everything is subjective. That is an obvious axiom of the rational utilitarian ethics: there is no difference in the quality of pleasures and enjoyment, while the only difference is in their quantity. There are no "high" and "low" values – sex and theatre are equally important and wonderful – the choice depends on the taste. This is the foundation of the contemporary moral of human rights, and it is shifting towards utilitarian consumerism.

The moral of human rights today is very far from the classical humanism with its "high values" and even opposes it. The contemporary liberal concept of human rights does not differentiate between animalistic and humane features in a human thus equally protecting both. For example, law and public moral frequently allow animalistic features to win, if needed, if it is reasonable and justified and the majority will vote for that. An example is a private advertisement that he once found online in Germany: "A person who seeks to be eaten is wanted". The deconstruction of this phrase in the neo-liberal values and human rights discourse relieves its seemingly shocking meaning, to be more specific, substitutes it with another also shocking meaning: "eat" and "be eaten" – that is the natural human right if the goal is set and the consensus is reached as a result of arrangements. The logic of this conclusion shows the moral

deadlock and the crisis of the classical concept of human rights in the contemporary reality. This statement underlies of "humanistic criticism" of human rights that have become anti-humane.

A phrase placed on the official website of the Russian transhumanist movement as an epigraph or the preamble to the essential statements of the philosophy of transhumanism may confirm the rule of the subjective rational cynicism. The content of the phrase is as follows: "Directives "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" and "eat human meat on Wednesdays and Fridays" are perceived by the philosophy of transhumanism equally skeptically" (Russian transhumanist movement, 2020). In other words, it is to be understood that the moral categorical imperative in its dogmatic integrity, objectivity and universality is as ridiculous methodologically and morally in relativistic individualized society as a call for "eating human meat on Wednesdays and Fridays".

Therewith, modern Chinese philosopher Yong Li (2019), engaged in the issue of moral, suggests avoiding the term of "moral relativism", calling the moral intolerance and value disagreements "moral ambivalence", a currently relevant phenomenon. Moral ambivalence also assumes that the unified and universal, true moral does not exist. However, this concept does not coincide with moral relativism. Rather, moral ambivalence corresponds to the moral pluralism – the statement that there are various acceptable vectors of actions and their assessments (Yong, 2019).

In any way, extreme liberalism entails excessively egotistic naturalism in ethics and law. Thus who still speaks about the basic values in the contemporary world? Those who oppose the liberal concept of human rights: ISIS, al-Qaeda, Patriarch Kirill, Dalai Lama – that is ideological fundamentalists and traditionalists. The curiosity of this situation is only superficial. In fact, everything is rather tragic: objective ideals have been busted, the "eternal truth" has been slayed, all limitations have been lifted from human morals and physiology. Anthropological transgression beyond the borders that are natural, mental, virtual-and-corporeal makes the metaspace of law the area of potential human freedom beyond the human body.

The issues of trans-human and post-human conditions are highly popular with contemporary European authors. For instance, Romanian researchers A. Sandu and L. Vlad (2018) regard

this condition as being “Beyond Technological Singularity” and “having ontological borders”. Using technologies free from spatiotemporal, causative, cognitive and bio-systemic localization, a post-human individual (in effect, being limited to active consciousness only) exists in the “transcendent self”, i.e. both biological and non-biological corporeity. The willingness and ability of a post-human to leave the physical temporary and finite horizon is compared by the Romanian scientists with the effect of spiritual practices in Buddhist, Hinduist, Krishnaist, Taoist, Shia and other oriental philosophies (Sandu & Vlad, 2018).

The conditions of postmodern “trans-humanity” and “sacred enlightenment” coincide in one important aspect – they are transgressive and non-substantial human existence. This post-human “refusal from metaphysical, transcendent foundation, or from the substantiality itself”, is mentioned by Finnish researcher L. Kakkori (2018). According to her, people are to accept the uncertainty and discreteness as the basis of our volatile transgressive creature (Kakkori, 2018). While analyzing the philosophy and culture in post-postmodern conditions, Swedish scientist P. Strandbrink (2018) also notes the emergence of the “new type of post-postmodern citizens, created by neoliberal democracy in normative political spaces”.

Conclusions

That being said, trans-humanist projects of improving the human species cannot be assessed expressly and unambiguously. Along with solving the global problems of survival, ageing, immortality, immunity, birth rate, consumption and resources, biopolitics generates completely different new problems, related not to the body, but to the spirit and threatening the society with a new status of “human ant-hill”. Liberal eugenics seeks the ways to reduce the time for personal development at the same time improving its efficiency. Therewith, it mistakenly associates personality development only with intellectual power, independent thinking and person’s “cognitive freedom”. The will of the artificial intelligence can make an individual obey much better than the collective will. Digital communicative space closes a human within the so-called corporeal freedom, freeing from the need or sometimes depriving of very possibility to actually communicate interpersonally face-to-face. In this situation the optimal way to achieve personal freedom is the individual body dimension – physical pleasure

and satisfaction, whose increase is ensured to the humanity by the transhumanist prospect.

Bibliographic references

- Berdyayev, N. A. (1951). *The kingdom of the spirit and the kingdom of Caesar*. Paris: Umca-Press. Recovered from: https://vtoraya-literatura.com/pdf/berdyayev_tsarstvo_dukha_i_t_sastvo_kesarya_1951__ocr.pdf.
- Berlinger, N., & Solomon, M. Z. (2018). *Becoming Good Citizens of Aging Societies*. Hastings center report, Vol. 48(3), 2–9.
- Bostrom, N. (2003). *Are You Living in a Simulation?* Philosophical Quarterly, Vol. 53(211), 243–255.
- Bostrom, N. (2016). *Development of values. Artificial Intelligence: Stages. Threats. Strategies*. Moscow: Publishing House "Mann, Ivanov and Ferber". Recovered from: https://element.ru/bookclub/chapters/433044/Isk_usstvennyy_intellekt_Glava_iz_knigi.
- Goryachkovskaya, A. N. (2014). *Philosophy of transhumanism: on the surrogates of being, the abduction of identity and euthanasia of humanity*. Bulletin of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series: Theory of Culture and Philosophy of Science, Vol. 1092, Issue 50. Recovered from: <http://periodicals.karazin.ua/thcphs/issue/view/209>.
- Gould, C. C. (2018). *Solidarity and the problem of structural injustice in healthcare*. Bioethics, Vol. 32(9), 541–552.
- Guerrini, C., Lewellyn, M., Majumder, M. et al. (2019). *Donors, authors, and owners: how is genomic citizen science addressing interests in research outputs?* BMC Medical Ethics, Vol. 20, Issue 1, Article number 84.
- Habermas, J. (2002). *The future of human nature. Towards liberal eugenics*. Moskva: Ves' Mir.
- Haker, H. (2019). *Habermas and the Question of Bioethics*. European journal for Philosophy of Religion, Issue 4, 61–86.
- Heidegger, M. (1967). *Being And Time*. Max Niemeyer loading facility in Tübinge. Recovered from: https://taradajko.org/get/books/sein_und_zeit.pdf.
- Kakkori, L. (2018). *Postmodern as Secularization in Philosophy of Education*. Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 50(14), Special issue: SI, 1639–1640.
- Kroker, A., & Cook, D. (1986). *The Postmodern Scene. Excremental Culture and Hyper-Aesthetics*. Montreal: New World Perspectives.
- Kurzweil, R. (2012). *How to create a mind: the secret of human thought revealed*. New York: Penguin Books.

- Lipovetsky, G. (2015). Time Against Time, or The Hypermodern Society. In D. Rudrum and N. Stavris (Ed.), *Supplanting the Postmodern. An Anthology of Writings on the Arts and Culture of the Early 21st Century* (p. 191–208). New York; London; New Delhi; Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lobanov, V.A (2020). Transhumanism in the interpretation of V. A. Lobanov. *Samizdat Magazine*. Recovered from: http://samlib.ru/l/lobanow_w_a/samlibrullobanow_w_w_amsworddocshtml-2.shtml.
- Meliakova, Y., Kovalenko, I., Zhdanenko, S., & Kalnytskyi, E. (2020). Performance in the Postmodern Culture and Law. *Amazonia Investiga*, Vol. 9(27), 340–348. <https://amazoniainvestiga.info/index.php/amazonia/article/view/1247>
- Melyakova, Yu. V. (2018). Being of law and being in law: from performative to performance. *Bulletin of the National University "Yaroslav the Wise Law Academy of Ukraine"*. Series: Philosophy, Vol. 1(36), 90–113.
- Odorcak, J. (2019). Exorganic Posthumanism and Brain-Computer Interface Technologies (BCI). *Postmodern openings*, Vol. 10(4), 193–208.
- Pavlov, A. V. (2019). Images of modernity in the 21st century: hypermodernism. *Philosophical Journal*, Vol. 12(2), 20–33.
- Piarce, D. (2015). *The Hedonistic Imperative*. eBook. Recovered from: <https://ubq124.wordpress.com/2019/12/22/the-hedonistic-imperative-pdf>.
- Polyakova, O. V. (2017). Commodification of the dead body: ethical and legal aspects. *Bulletin of the RSUH. Series "Psychology. Pedagogy. Education"*, Vol. 2(8), 118–128. Recovered from: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kommodifikatsiya-mertvogo-tela-etiko-pravovye-aspekty>
- Popova, O. V. (2016). Man, its price and value: to the problem of body commodification in scientific knowledge. *Epistemology and philosophy of science*, Vol. 49(3), 140–157. Recovered from: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/chelovek-ego-tsena-i-tsennost-k-probleme-kommodifikatsii-tela-v-nauchnom-poznani>.
- Popova, O. V., Tishchenko, P. D., & Shevchenko, S. Yu. (2018). Neuroethics and biopolitics of biotechnology for cognitive improvement of human improvement. *Philosophy questions*, Vol. 7, 96–108.
- Russian Transhumanist Movement (2020). About the possibilities of self-upgrade and life extension. Recovered from: <http://transhumanism-russia.ru/content/view/629/94/>
- Sandu, A., Vlad, L. (2018). Beyond Technological Singularity – the Posthuman Condition. *Postmodern openings*, Vol. 9(1), 91–102.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1989). Existentialism is humanism. In: *Twilight of the Gods*. Moscow: Politizdat, 319–344.
- Strandbrink, P. (2018). Nostalgia and Shrinkage: Philosophy and culture under post-postmodern conditions. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol. 50(14), 1407–1408.
- Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation Me: Why Today's Young Americans Are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled – and More Miserable Than Ever Before*. New York: ATRIA paperback. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Generation-Americans-Confident-Assertive-Entitled/dp/1476755566>.
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why Today's Super-Connected Kids Are Growing Up Less Rebellious, More Tolerant, Less Happy – and Completely Unprepared for Adulthood*. New York: ATRIA books. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/iGen-Super-Connected-Rebellious-Happy-Adulthood/dp/1501151983>.
- United Nations (1997). *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights*. Recovered from http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/human_genome.shtml
- United Nations (2005). *Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights*. Recovered from: http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/bioethics_and_hr.shtml
- Yong, L. (2019). Moral Ambivalence: Relativism or Pluralism? *Acta analytica-international periodical for Philosophy in the analytical tradition*, Vol. 34(4), 473–491.
- Zinovyev, A. (2006). *Global Human*. Booksonline. Recovered from: <http://booksonline.com.ua/view.php?book=97560> (in Russian).