UDK 111.821: 316.772.5
https://doi.org/10.2298/FID2202297Z
Original Scientific Article
Received 08.05.2022. Accepted 31.05.2022.

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIETY
VOL. 33, NO. 2, 279–512

To cite text:
Žikić, Simona (2022), "How Technology Impacts Communication and Identity-Creation", *Philosophy and Society* 33 (2): 297–310.

Simona Žikić

HOW TECHNOLOGY IMPACTS COMMUNICATION AND IDENTITY-CREATION[1]

ABSTRACT
The basic thesis of this paper is that communication is a fundamental activity of all human practices and that identity is constructed with the help of communication. Defining identity cannot be explained and understood exclusively from the standpoint of philosophy, sociology, political science or psychology. Given that the Latin root of the word communication, *communio*, refers to community, we can say that communication as a science best covers the relationships that people establish within the community such as schools, families, work environment, social networks and forums. The activity of communication is the establishment of a community, i.e., sociability. To communicate means to unite something – to bring one's actions into harmony with the community and with social life. In that sense, communication is in its essence a transition from the individual to the collective.

In addition, any specific form of communication depends on the wider cultural and socio-political environment in which modern people operate. This paper aims to explore the impact of technology on individual identity, to answer questions about whether robots can have the same characteristics as personalities, and whether, and in what way, machines have an impact on people. The reason for asking such questions is the decision of the Committee on Legal Affairs of the European Parliament to pass a law that will grant autonomous robots the status of "electronic personalities".

KEYWORDS
communication, identity, personality, language, technology

Introduction

Communication is the process of exchanging information through an agreed system of signs. It is a constant companion of human activity and it is involved in almost all human behavior. Furthermore, communication is a human need, because in order for a person to survive, she must communicate with other

1 This article was realized with the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, according to the Agreement on the realization and financing of scientific research.

Simona Žikić: Assistant Professor, Faculty of Media and Communications; simona.zikic@fmk.edu.rs; Research Associate, University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory.

people. This process is very intense, complex and diverse. One constantly communicates with others and/or imagines communication with them.

Ever since the ancient times communication has undoubtedly been the most precious skill that human being have developed. All interaction between humans takes place through some kind of communication; thus, it is a catalyst essential for the emergence, functioning and progress of all types of communities. This mutual exchange of meanings between humans takes place mainly through language (an agreed system of signs) and is possible only to the extent that individuals have common knowledge, needs and attitudes.

A simple definition of communication should refer to the use of signs in order to transact in general and common information about a subject, object or situation. Although explicit language is the most important means of communication between humans, the process also includes a broader concept of languages: those of winking, nodding, smiling, moving, shrugging, waving, etc. Such non-explicit languages also convey information, i.e. thoughts, feelings and beliefs, and they sometimes do so more effectively than the explicit language (Davidson 1991).

Communication is a process that involves an interaction between the people who communicate, and this interaction occurs on a variety of levels, only one of which is strictly linguistic or couched in explicit statements. When one communicates, one never reacts only to the words one hears; rather one attempts to penetrate the other person's psychic reality, their feelings, thoughts and dispositions. Thus context is key to communication: whatever the explicit content of the messages exchanged in the process, they will only be successfully received if there is a general congruence between the sender's and the recipient's experiences of the world.

While this is not the place to enter into complex Kantian debates about the nature of the reality we experience, the 'thing in itself' and the representation, from a basically functionalist point of view the way in which we understand (our) are largely determined by our structural experiences, namely our experiences that arise from our relationships with others, both those in the present and in the past. Having been born into a language reality with already determined categories and conceptual frameworks used by our community, we reproduce those concepts daily. This means that our membership in our community constitutes a foundation of our 'Weltanschauung', our view of the world, and our sense of reality.

Although language is the basis and content of communication, a wide field of communication research includes human communication practices in their sociological, cultural, anthropological, psychological, political and philosophical dimensions. If communication is understood as a cultural phenomenon, then it can be viewed as a perspective that partly determines all cultural practices. Thus culture can be seen both as the content and method of communication, including not only language, but also cultural practices such as clothing, food, social behavior, social emotions, the various mannerisms involved in transport, in the community's rituals, etc.

Everything I have mentioned so far suggests that communication is not only a basic process of socialization, but also a fundamental facet of identity-formation (Mandić 2003). In fact, it is best described as a process of creating connections between humans; communication is an organic, living dynamics of life-long learning how to effectively establish social structure, namely relationships. In the explicit part of this process, access to information is provided by language, understood in a broader sense as a set of all signifying systems, including images and symbols. Moreover, language is also a source of social values. If language transmits knowledge and values that construct a culture and/or community, then we derive from this that existing meanings are not left to our decisions. Accurate reproduction of existing meanings is also confirmation of the values that exist before us, affirmation of the knowledge that our community and culture imply and consequently, the norms of the previous generation. Therefore, language is not only a method of expressing thoughts, but also a factor that, through its patterns, determines perception, way of thinking, worldview and form of behavior, while awareness of such a character of language usually does not exist.

Jürgen Habermas (Habermas 1979) states that people live in communities, that they have always done so and that they will most likely continue to do so in the future; emphasizing that he bases his philosophy on the principle that person is a social being. He states that communication is a necessary practice for the human race. We communicate to achieve mutual understanding on which the coordination of our mutual social relations is based and on which it depends. Habermas sees the answer to the question of what conditions communication must meet to achieve his goal, enabling and attaining mutual understanding (Habermas 1991). According to him, everyone who is involved in a certain action has the right to participate in communication about it. Thus the very foundation of 'participative democracy' is associated to deliberative democracy; both converge on the role of language and communication as a relationship building function in society.

The way a person perceives itself will largely determine the way it will perceive another person, as well as the model of communication with that person. The so-called self-assessment implies a person's image of itself and represents what that person is. The image of oneself may or may not coincide with the opinion of other humans, because it is formed and developed from relationships with other people (conversation, dialogue, word communication). Humans have always appreciated each other, and they mostly do that by observing them during the first meeting, and then every next one. Verbal and non-verbal communication is assessed, so perception thus represents predictions and speculations about a person based on prejudices, knowledge and experience (Gahagen 1978: 15–57).

In interpersonal communication, people also assess the other person's emotional state, his/her/they opinion of the person, conclusions about social, professional and family status, but also about intentions, value system and life attitudes. With the help of interpersonal communication, we get to know a

person and form an opinion about whether it is pleasant or not, sweet or not, dominant or withdrawn, good or bad, and the like. Thus, in interpersonal communication, the analysis of a certain communication situation does not have to be closely related to the message or information, but, for example, to the expectations that a person expresses through its communication behavior (Mandić 2003). In addition, through the establishment of relationships triggered by effective communication new emotions are developed, specifically the social emotions which connect people at a more integrated level (solidarity, trust, empathy, loyalty, etc.).

Today we communicate with the help of phones, applications and the Internet. We transmit messages via email and satellite. We share our attitudes, thoughts and feelings on social networks. We are able to communicate via the internet and walk and talk in cyberspace. Our interaction takes place with the help of video games, so we become parts of virtual reality. All of this makes the time in which we live into an age of communication.

In my view, the key problem with communication that is mediated by modern technology is a particular paradox. On the one hand technology appears to make expression easier and more immediate: it appears to emancipate the voices that, without modern technology, would have likely been unable to gain a hearing in the public space. This is the reason communication technology is often hailed as a benefit to human liberty and ability to participate in public discourses on a variety of issues, thus also contributing to a more democratic character of the public space itself. However, on the other hand, communication mediated by technology, while apparently fostering brief forms and thus accelerating understanding, in fact often stifles true understanding. It is the assumption that, if we communicate, we automatically understand each other, that causes many social, psychological and political issues associated with the blurring of identities that arises from technology, which fragments communication.

Associated with the above is the process of homogenization, where the immense impact generated by the social media and numerous affirmations of certain views (through 'likes', 'reshares' and other types of technological endorsement) generate numerous new themes on which there are standards of 'political correctness', prior to, or even without, first obtaining even the minimum of necessary information to form a credible opinion. This is the case with new ideologies based on group interests, which dominate the public space, as well as issues of current affairs in politics, international relations, security, health, etc.

A good example of this is the creation of identity images based on technology-mediated communication, where relationships of various types are established between the digital images (the digital self), rather than the real persons who interact. In the current information age, the digital self is arguably more important than the real self, because social transactions (social identities as they are perceived by employers, professional subjects, the state institutions, etc.) are based on internet searches, database-derived profiles and other markers of a digital self. The digital self does not necessarily correspond to the real

self, nor do the parameters specifically designed to generate a sense of the person's identity in the digital space really reflect the true identity of that person. Someone can have extremely low achievement level according to the digital parameters, for example, and be an exemplary human being, an exemplary helper, or teacher. However, this type of understanding of identity remains unavailable in the digital space.

If the goal of communication is to achieve a complete and comprehensive understanding, then all parties that are involved or in some way suffer the consequences of an action of this deficiency in the digital perception of the person and her identity, simply for the reason that the person is never reducible to her digital identity. It is interesting that in helping scientific disciplines, when it comes to taking care of ourselves, we rely on dialogue and conversation, which is the legacy of Greek philosophers. Somehow, we always return to the conversation about organic, 'real' relationships when we talk about true communication, which is traditionally expected to be able to heal misunderstanding by offering authentic persons in a genuine interaction – something that technology can only partically achieve.

The process of communication always takes place through the media – air, books, television, the Internet and more. The development of the civilization we know simultaneously developed the process of communication, especially in the field of interpersonal communication, which aims to develop levels of interactivity. The futuristic concept of uniqueness was invented by one of the most famous engineers and techno-prophets Ray Kurzweil (Kurzweil 2001) and he calls it transhumanism. Thus, it is said that life is less dependent on oxygen or water, but relies solely on information. Google is considered to be the first conduit of what defines the driving force of humanity: information (Kurzweil 2005). That information, which, as an atheistic deity, allegedly found its ideal special operative form in numerical language, as it enables us to fulfill our "posthuman" destiny. Thus, every form of human cognition and expression can be experienced as digital information.

Identity

The question of identity is pertinent to all scientific disciplines, especially the social sciences and humanities. Defining a person's identity requires that we know and understand all the processes and ways of an individual's communication with other individuals through the life cycles. Being human, driven by instincts, would mean following only our own needs, without, according to Freud (Freud 2009), looking at the mechanisms that a human being has, which related to the person's inner need for other people. That is why it is not easy to understand and define the person as 'a being'. We must consider the relevant processes that are inside and outside the individual. In the descriptions of psychoanalysis as a part of psychological and psychiatric practice, the unconscious in person is a question that is being researched. Thus, the contents of the unconscious in an individual are often determined by the moral standards

of the communities in which the human being develops. This brings us to the explanation of many psychologists: the forbidden need of an individual is always detected in some other relationships or circumstances because it is thus strengthened and remains in the deeper layers of human consciousness.

On the other hand, Lacan said that "desire is always the desire of the Other" because it comes from speech that the individual does not control; desires are beyond human consciousness, that is, "the discourse of the Other is unconscious" (Lacan 1983). He also states that the desire of the individual appears separately from the need of person, which makes a turn in relation to Freud's interpretation of the Ego (Lacan 1983). However, according to Freud, it unconsciously directs an individual's behavior: what is reflected in everyday behavior, interests, dreams and communication style will never be directly recognizable (Freud 2009). Furthermore, Lacan sees the very concept of a person's psychological "normalcy" as couched in "structure", namely in relationship with others, where the desire of the other, when legitimated through social processes, becomes a social norm. Such social norms, then, dictate the process of socialization, which, for Lacan, for largely simultaneous with attaining psychological health, namely a structurally stable view of the relationships one partakes in.

Jung, on the other hand, offered a different point of view, distinguishing between the individual and the collective unconscious. According to Jung, the conscious experience of individuals is the perception of the environment and themselves, through a comparison of stimuli from the environment and personal aspirations (Jung 2006). We will see in the next few paragraphs how much this coincides with today's understanding of the process of communication, the creation of an identity that is not a stable structure as traditional researchers believed.

We describe the term 'personality' as a set of characteristics and characteristics of an individual, as what makes "what we are". "Who am I?" is the basic philosophical question from which every person starts during the process of self-knowledge. Defining oneself as a person implies a set of character traits, roles and values that each individual has. Person is formed through others, with the help of communication, culture, the use of technology and science. By developing itself, each person develops others around oneself because he/she/they interacts with social communities. Person is a being of need and throughout life he satisfies physiological, cultural, social and emotional needs. Person is also a psychic being because it perceives, represents, thinks, remembers and feels, thus becoming a conscious being that is different from all other beings on Earth.

However, through conversation, an individual conveys its thoughts and feelings exclusively in contact with another person. Thus, in everyday speech, we often hear that person is a being of language and a being of practice. We have talked a lot about language in the previous paragraphs of this paper, and by stating that person is a being of practice, we mean that an individual designs (produces) objects and creates itself and the life human leads. Work as a social practice is something that is unique to person and that is why human determines it

to a great extent. Every human being is an individual for oneself and according to the theories and research of all scientific disciplines, there are no two completely identical human beings – in physical, mental, social or any other sense.

A person is also a dialogical being because one creates and develops in relation to others, so communication as a practice is a constitutive dimension of the human being. Personality is the result of individual differences, including all those abilities and characteristics that person acquires from a young age to those that he creates and develops in the society in which human lives, the communities to which human belongs and the communication human has with oneself and the world around them. All verbal and non-verbal behaviors in relation to others are turned into messages that the individual conveys, and because of the perception of a person, it is not so important what is said as it is important what others have heard. People remember how they felt, but not so much and what someone told them, and often in the professional literature we come across the fact that it does not matter what we say in interpersonal communication if others do not listen to us. We need to speak the language of those who listen to us and know that communication is always a two-way process, even when an individual thinks person is not communicating. Hence the question of identity, individual or system, the communicative question.

To remain constructively ideological as a subject in a democratic exchange of ideas, it appears to me, one needs to keep the technologically induced facets of the very process of communication in check, specifically by bearing in mind that what technology offers inherently misses a dimension of the person's identity. While in many situations one must act based on the perception of another's digital self, and thus one must work only with what communication based on technology delivers, the actual substantive choices and decisions might be of a better quality if there is psychological 'reservation' with regard to the actual completeness of the identity of another that is presented through technology. Hence, being aware of the incompleteness of the digital identity might, in itself, as an attitude, help prevent biases and assumptions that might cut short the fullness of an interpersonal process between real personalities when the communication takes place through technology alone.

Technologically Mediated Communication

David Hanson (Hanson 2017), an engineer and robotics expert, believes that by 2029, the artificial intelligence of humanoid robots will develop to the level of a one-year-old child. He also predicts that by 2045, robots will become full citizens. Therefore, it is already necessary to ask what should be done if machines enhanced by artificial intelligence really develop reason and consciousness, which would be similar to human. In the age of trans-humanity, the question of the rights of robots arises, more precisely about the "robot person", it is finally realized science fiction, somewhere between the caring mechanics of the robot cycle Isaac Asimov (Asimov 1950) and metaphysical questions Philip K. Dick (Dick 1981) about androids and their endless desire

for humanity. How to treat them; as according to property, i.e. a tool designed to perform different tasks, or as an equal "person"?

Latour (Latour 2017) says that person never became modern, but that everything too modern, as anti-modern or non-modern, has always accompanied human, pointing to the intertwining of human and machine and cybernetic organisms since both cyborgs and monsters pre-modern and anti-modern) constitute communities. It was Cary Wolfe (Wolfe 2009), one of the pioneers in trying to define post-humanism, who stated that the socio-humanistic roots of post-humanism in the 1960s were in the works of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Judith Butler, Bruno Latour, Donna Haraway and other poststructuralists, deconstructionists and postmodernists, who together marked the death of the Cartesian humanist, but also ran alongside the great achievements of the social and technological sciences, such as the development of cybernetic systems theory, which included new theoretical models for biological, mechanical and communication processes. Homo sapiens removed from a privileged position in the processes of cognition and perception of the world. Laying the foundations of post-humanism, Katherine Hayles (Hayles 1999) adds the development of artificial intelligence and the desire to abolish the physical, whereby the human being as a biological organism, bound by the body, dematerializes in the information space and is interpreted as an information pattern.

These challenges were also noted by Mady Delvaux (Delvaux, Internet), Member of the European Parliament, who in mid-2016 presented to the Committee on Legal Affairs a draft law on civil law rules on robotics, which would address legal and ethical issues development and use of robotics and artificial intelligence. In February 2017, a Resolution based on this Draft Law was adopted in Europe, albeit in a slightly modified form (Hasselbalch, Internet).

Luhmann affirmed: Reality is what one does not perceive when one perceives it (Luhmann 1990: 76). Various phenomena that have influenced the theory of post-humanism to focus on reality and the individual as a decentralized information unit in the constant process of transformation and transmission, which have thus become essentially close to their technological and cyber counterparts. The post-humanist perspective points to the gradual merging of human being and machine, i.e. biological and synthetic or mechanical organism, which can even be claimed to be the end result of the millennial process of human creation and use of tools. "From a club that extends and replaces the hand to virtual reality in cyberspace, technology has evolved to mimic and multiply, multiply and thrive by relying on the real" (Poster 2012: 554).

Technology is evolving every day, so it is inevitable that intelligent robots and machines will become more and more present in our lives. Many ideas that were unthinkable in the past have been successfully realized today, so it is not impossible to develop robotics to such an extent that in the near future robots could become our fellow citizens. It is likely that this idea will initially meet with outrage from the general public, but over time, androids and other robots will become part of everyday life around the world. It is only necessary to establish certain rules in time in order to avoid abuse.

Nonhuman Agents, Trans-Humanism and Post-Humanism

American political scientist Francis Fukuyama (Fukuyama 2019) considers the interference of technology in biological generation and human development as the end of history, and he began to deal with this topic in the 1990s. In his major work, Our Posthumous Future, Francis Fukuyama explores the implications of human genetic modification, bioengineering, and technological advancement (Fukuyama 2009). Dealing with the impact of genetic engineering and pharmacology on the human body, Fukuyama warns that human nature and essence are changing significantly, interpreting these new technologies as a threat, a challenge to moral principles and an attempt at dehumanization. And more than that, Fukuyama suggests that the new post-human world will be even more hierarchical and filled with deeper social conflicts, greater inequality based on genetic perfection and greater social control and supervision.

Humanism presents person as a rational being, putting human in the center of attention, human being is spoken of as a source, a catalyst of action, while in post-humanism we think of networked, captured, produced, and uttered by technology, political powers. So human being is no longer a source but technology integrates with person. Thus, person's identity in the 21st century is no longer physically the same as the person of the 20th century, but even before that. Natasha Vita-More, Max More (More, Vita-More 2013) and Nick Bostrom (Bostrom 2014) talk about the concept of trans and post human being and take Nietzsche's example as his philosophical concept of human. Nietzsche (Nietzsche 2014) said that God is dead and that now is the time for human being to be surpassed, but Nietzsche did not leave a trace that technology could be the one that will surpass human.

Today, we often talk about the fourth revolution in which new technologies are the ones that serve to expand human possibilities. In other words, the merging of technologies leads to the blurring of the boundaries between the physical, digital and biological spheres. The mentioned revolution mainly refers to new nanotechnologies, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, neurotechnology, robotics, 3D, quantum computing and others. As such, they can reconstruct, construct and build a new form of person. Post-humanism claims that a person has limited possibilities and abilities.

Earlier, we saw technology as an extension of the human body, an auxiliary instrument that has a purpose to help a person. We are witnessing the technological and biological convergence and the creation of robotic organisms that manage to surpass human capabilities in many fields. However, we must follow the development of technology, and as a society we cannot separate ourselves from technology (McLuhan 2012). The main human trait is to communicate, to think, to have a concept of ideas, to have emotions. However, in the public-media discourse, it is said that the machine is more capable than human being, and more and more machines are taking over a part of the intellectual ability.

History has shown that people are at the core to strive forward, to develop, and that brings with it the expansion of science and technology. There will

always be two sides to the coin, that is. Reasons for and against giving androids, not necessarily human rights, but some kind of legal status. Individuals will continue to oppose the progress of robotics and claim that robots are just machines, whose sole purpose is to help us perform our daily tasks. But it is inevitable that a certain group of people will work on improving artificial intelligence and robotics, and that there is a high probability that we will live in a community with humanoid robots in the future.

We are becoming aware that technical means of transmitting messages are not passive intermediaries between transmitters and recipients, but like other intermediaries, they change not only the language, form and structure of the message but also strongly influence the transmitter and receiver (Šušnjić 1997: 112). All channels of communication are used to establish a strong communication link between people. Communication skills are the ability to effectively use the means of communication while understanding and respecting the needs of other participants in the communication process. Kittler (Kitler 2018) transferred Foucault's idea of the "end of the subject" into the field of media determination of human existence. The consequence of such a belief is that the media determines our situation, which leads to the conclusion that networks of technologies and institutions allow a given culture to select, store and process relevant data that redefine human. The human being is the effect of technology or "extension of the media" (a thought that opposes McLuhan's theory of the media as a human extension), and changes in the human are conditioned by changes in technology. However, the human is a communicative being and all communication with others is through some kind of technology, with the help of which human gets to know oneself and the world around them.

In recent years, it has been said in the public media sphere that artificial intelligence is the technology of the future and that whoever takes the lead in its development will become the ruler of the world. But many organizations, scientists and some citizens believe that all ideas and discoveries should be shared with everyone so that humanity can progress in harmony. Again, the values on which the direction of development of technology are based must be organic in themselves: technology must be directed by specifically human values, which is a point often neglected in the over-arching global enthusiasm about the new forms of technology, especially that of Artificial Intelligence. It is possible that robots will be as intelligent as human beings, but it is far less clear that robots can have actual values. Hence our reliance on values in understanding communication must remain unwavered in the face of technological advancements.

Conclusion

Communication can be defined as the process of transmission, i.e. transfer of opinions, instructions, ideas, desires, and feelings – from one person to another or to others. In the process of communication, the reciprocal role of the participants in the communication is important, as well as the context, i.e. the circumstances that determine not only the content of a message, but also the

code that shapes it. Therefore, it can often be found in the literature that the meaning of a message, i.e. information, depends on the intention of the sender, language and system of symbolic forms that structure the message, i.e. information, context and various communication possibilities.

In addition to the above, today's digital culture (hyper-sphere) can no longer survive without technology and media that affect our knowledge, our ideas, our evaluation, even if it comes down to informing about the exact time, weather forecast or news about the seasons. Referring to McLuhan's theories, technology is a message, i.e. a means of communication, a space through which some content is transmitted (McLuhan 2012). We, as a society, as a community, cannot separate ourselves from technology. In the modern world, digital culture shapes everyday life and influences people's thinking, forms their attitudes, values and norms, creates forms and mechanisms of ideological domination and helps shape the identity of the individual, shapes the message itself but also shapes the society within which the message is transmitted. With the help of technology and media content, an individual learns about oneself, others, the country in which one was born, as well as the entire planet. Person is able to learn about other nations, cultures, religions and continents. It is present in the lives of individuals, who spend time by the screen, reading newspapers, portals, going to the cinema, listening to the radio, browsing the Internet, social networks and the like. In fact, technology has a significant role to play in today's society by providing, in different ways, a wide range of information. Technology (including the media) strongly influences attitudes in a particular community, behavior and beliefs, but also plays a significant role in economics, politics and various social practices.

Long-term technologies are not just intermediaries that transmit some content, as previously believed. They created a social environment and thus became part of our personal environment. We expect a lot from technology. Today, the human defines oneself in relation to and through technology and media content. They entertain us, teach us, inform us, with their help we identify ourselves and more. Our lives unfold and are inevitably realized in the digital space.

Adam Greenfield (Greenfield 2017), who calls himself the Architect of Information, came up with a coin that reads "everywhere + hardware / software". We have all become an integral part of technology that is invisible. All places and all objects have become smart technology. In fact, we communicate using that invisible technology.

The key role in creating today's post-human world is played by Internet search engines (like Google), where the Internet has spread around the world and in which we are all networked. So, they are no longer networked worlds, but networked lives. The influence of technology on the process of communication and identity creation can be seen in trans-humanism, which eliminates the possibility of further development of spirituality, humanity, feelings and compassion, while instead of freedom of speech, diversity and play, it offers a limited, one-dimensional, uniform and homogeneous world. Such a world is made up of different combinations and syntheses of people and machines.

A key concept that is closely related to communication's role in articulating identity, and the specific role of technology in 'growing' our identities is that post-humanism largely arises from a grand vision: the vision that humans in fact 'grow' themselves in much the same way as they 'grow' vegetables and various cultures. This idea was first articulated by Daniel Sarewitz (Sarewitz 1996). We grow ourselves by implementing various technologies to our own development, in a way similar to the manner in which we use the machinery and fertilizers to grow various bio-cultures. This vision, in Sarewitz's view, gets a radical dimension in the claim that human beings themselves, in the sense of self-development, are in fact the most widely grown culture of all the cultures human beings grow, and the key element of this process is the invention and use of technology as form of communication of both the self-development and self-improvement ideal, and of the paradigm of an ideal community, which, as structures, is the framework within which we establish and confirm our individual and collective identities. These radical claims in fact suggest, but do not explicate, the idea that communication is the over-arching process for the entire technological development in the service of human development and articulation of various levels of socially informed and articulated identities.

Transhumanism is an obstacle to the further development of identity, and thus communication. On the one hand, transhumanist principles condition and change everything that characterizes an individual as a human being; while at the same time, on the other hand, instead of democracy, freedom of choice, equality, diversity and others, transhumanism offers a limited, uniform, homogeneous world, where and machines coexist in every closer arrangements. The modern man is expected to live a healthy long life; this proposition seems like a value "bait" offered in the way of a potential promise of immortality, which should symbolize the greatest achievement of the absolute robotization of man. In other words, the robot as the absolute instrument of the 21st century in Marcuse's one-dimensional world. The proposition of transhumanism in the form of merging artificial intelligence with human identity is thus a treacherous one: it 'dangles' the prospect of physical and, more immediately, intellectual immortality in its one hand, so to say, while in the other hand it holds the threat of depersonalization of identity. It is possible for a transhuman individual to have a clearly definable identity that is, at the same time, person-less in the Jugian sense. It is highly dubious whether most current human beings, if presented with this choice clearly and simply enough, would choose the trans-humanist path despite its promises.

If communication theory is predicated upon a prospect of some kind of ultimate fulfillment of the need for communication, it is only natural that such a theory suggests some kind of leveling of traditional organic interpersonal differencesing the interest of more seamless digitality in the creation of identities. Hence, transhumanism uses the principles of communication discussed here to largely level the differences between biological, human and machine systems as a form of new tranhumanist ideology that arises from communication that is increasingly reduced to digital means.

References

Asimov, Isaac (1950), "Runaround", in *I, Robot*, New York: Doubleday.

Bostrom, Nick (2014), *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers*, *Strategies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Collins, Tim (2022), "Sophia the robot's creator, Dr David Hanson, claims humans will marry life-like droids by 2045", (internet) available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-5767077/Sophia-robots-creator-says-humans-marry-life-like-droids-civil-rights-2045.html (viewed 5 May, 2022)

Davidson, Donald (1991), "James Joyce and Humpty Dumpty", *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 16 (1): 1–12.

Delvaux, Mady (2022), „Nacrt izvješća s preporukama Komisiji o pravilima građanskog prava o robotici" (internet) available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=//EP//NONSGML+COMPARL+PE-582.443+01+DOC+PDF+V0//HR (viewed 5 May, 2022).

Dick, Philip K. (1981), *VALIS*, New York: Mariner Books.

Freud, Sigmund (2009), *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, USA: Martino Fine Books.

Fukujama, Frensis (2003), *Naša posthumana budućnost*, Podgorica: CID.

Fukuyama, Francis (2019), *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*, UK: Profile Books Ltd.

Gahagen, Džudit (1978), *Interpersonalno i grupno ponašanje*, Beograd: Nolit.

Greenfield Adam (2017), *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life*, London: Verso.

Habermas, Jürgen (1979), *Communication and the Evolution of the Society*, London: Heinemann.

—. (1991), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought, UK: The MIT Press.

Hanson, David (2017), *Humanizing Robots: How making humanoids can make us more human*, Editorial: Independently published.

Hasselbalch, Gry (2022), "New EU rules for the ethical and legal status of robots and AI", (internet) available at: https://dataethics.eu/en/new-eu-rules-ethical-legal-status-robots-ai/ (viewed 6 May, 2022).

Hayles, Katherine (1999), *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jung, G. Carl (2006), *The Undiscovered Self: The Dilemma of the Individual in Modern Society*, Boston: Berkley.

Kitler, Fridrih (2018), *Optički mediji*, Beograd: Fakultet za medije i komunikacije.

Kurzweil, Raymond (2001), *The Age of Spiritual Machines*, UK: Texere Publishing.

—. (2005), *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*, UK: Penguin Books

Lakan, Žak (1983), *Spisi*, Beograd: Prosveta.

Latur, Bruno (2017), *Mreže, društva, sfere*, Beograd: Fakultet za medije i komunikacije

Luhmann, Niklas (1990), "Technology, Environment and Social Risk: A Systems Perspective", *Industrial Crisis Quarterly* 4: 223–231.

Makluan, Maršal (2012), *Elektronski mediji i kraj elektronske pismenosti*, Beograd: Karpos.

Mandić, Tijana (2003), *Komunikologija – psihologija pregovaranja*, Beograd: Clio.

Marcuse, Herbert (2013), *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, UK: Routledge.

More, Max; Vita-More, Natasha (2013), *The Transhumanist Reader: Classical and Contemporary Essays on the Science, Technology, and Philosophy of the Human Future*, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
Nietzsche, Friedrich (2014), *Beyond Good and Evil*, Florida: Millennium Publications.
Poster, Mark (2012) „Postmoderne virtuelnosti", u Jelena Đorđević (ed.), *Studije kulture*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik, pp. 539–554.
Sarewitz, Daniel (1996), *Frontiers of Illusion: Science, Technology, and the Politics of Progress*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Šušnjić, Đuro (1997), *Ribari ljudskih duša*, Beograd: Čigoja štampa.
Tomić, Zorica (2003), *Komunikologija*, Beograd: Čigoja štampa.
Wolfe, Cary (2009), *What Is Posthumanism? (Posthumanities)*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Simona Žikić

Kako tehnologija utiče na proces komunikacije i kreiranja identiteta

Apstrakt

Osnovna teza ovog rada jeste da komunikacija predstavlja bazičnu aktivnost svih ljudskih praksi i da se identitet konstruiše uz pomoć komunikacije. Definisati identitet ne može se objasniti i razumeti isključivo sa stanovišta filozofije, sociologije, politikologije ili psihologije. S obzirom na to da latinski koren reči komunikacija, *communio*, upućuje na zajednicu, slobodno možemo reći da komunikologija kao nauka najbolje pokriva niz odnosa koje ljudi uspostavljaju unutar zajednice kakvu predstavljaju škole, porodica, radno okruženje, društvene mreže i forumi. Delatnost komunikacije jeste uspostavljanje zajednice, odnosno društvenosti. U kontekstu komunikacije, saopštiti znači nešto združiti, odnosno dovesti svoje delovanje u sklad sa zajednicom i društvenim životom. U tom smislu, komunikacija je u svojoj suštini prelaz od individualnog ka kolektivnom. Pored navedenog, specifičan oblik komunikacije zavisi od šireg kulturnog i društveno-političkog okruženja u kojem današnji čovek funkcioniše te zbog toga ovaj rad ima za cilj i da istraži uticaj tehnologije na identitet pojedinca, da odgovori na pitanja da li je moguće da roboti imaju iste karakteristike ličnosti, i da li i na koji način mašine imaju uticaj na ljude. Razlog postavljanja ovakvih pitanja je i odluka Odbora za pravna pitanja Evropskog parlamenta da se donese zakon koji će autonomnim robotima dodeliti status „elektronskih ličnosti".

Ključne reči: komunikacija, identitet, ličnost, jezik, tehnologija