Thai NATIONAL INTEREST ISSN 3088-2729

DOI: 10.14456/tni.2026.7

Posthumanism and the Crisis of Social Equality: Reconfiguring Justice through New Humanism

Author

Olga Dobrodum [1]

Affiliation

[1] State University of Trade and Economics, Department of Journalism and Advertising (Kyiv, Ukraine)

Corresponding Author

Olga Dobrodum

Email: dobrodum.olga@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines posthumanism as a conceptual framework for understanding the transformation of social equality and justice under conditions of accelerating technological change. Drawing upon an interdisciplinary conceptual methodology that integrates posthumanism, political philosophy, science and technology studies (STS), bioethics, and ecological ethics, the study critically analyzes how developments in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, neurotechnology, and digital infrastructures challenge the anthropocentric assumptions underlying classical theories of justice.

The analysis demonstrates that technological transformation extends questions of justice beyond distributive equality among autonomous human subjects toward broader concerns involving distributed agency, socio-technical systems, and non-human forms of

existence. While posthumanism provides important conceptual resources for interpreting emerging forms of biological, cognitive, digital, and ecological inequality, it also reveals important tensions associated with distributed responsibility and the risk of obscuring persistent structures of political, economic, and social inequality.

Building upon these findings, the study argues that new humanism may serve as a normative framework capable of reconciling the ethical commitments of classical humanism with the relational insights of posthumanism. Rather than rejecting human dignity, new humanism repositions it within broader networks of technological, ecological, and social interdependence while emphasizing inclusivity, ecological responsibility, multispecies ethics, and technological accountability.

The principal contribution of the study lies in its conceptual integration of posthumanist philosophy, political philosophy, and science and technology studies into a coherent analytical framework for examining contemporary transformations of equality and justice. The findings contribute to ongoing debates concerning technological governance, social equality, and the normative foundations of justice in the Anthropocene and the emerging Technocene.

Keywords: posthumanism; new humanism; social equality; justice; technological governance.

Received: 20/05/2026

Revised : 30/06/2026

Accepted: 27/07/2026

1. Introduction

Rapid advances in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and digital infrastructures have fundamentally challenged conventional understandings of human agency, equality, and justice. These transformations have significantly increased the relevance of posthumanism as one of the most influential philosophical paradigms for rethinking the relationship between humanity, technology, and society.

The accelerating pace of technological development, together with global challenges such as climate change, pandemics, and widening social inequalities, has transformed posthumanism from a predominantly philosophical discourse into an important analytical framework for examining contemporary transformations of social justice. Rather than merely questioning anthropocentrism, posthumanism emphasizes the hybridity of human existence and its interconnectedness with technologies, ecosystems, and non-human actors. Inspired by the works of scholars such as Rosi Braidotti and Donna Haraway, this perspective challenges the privileged ontological status traditionally assigned to the human subject. At the same time, it highlights the emergence of new forms of inequality resulting from unequal access to advanced technologies, including biotechnology, neurointerfaces, and genetic engineering.

Under these conditions, conventional theories of distributive justice—from Rawls's concept of the "veil of ignorance" to Habermas's theory of communicative rationality—face increasing difficulties in addressing technologically mediated inequalities. Likewise, transhumanist visions of technological enhancement, while promising the expansion of human capabilities, have also been criticized for reinforcing social stratification and creating new forms of biological and cognitive privilege.

From a conceptual perspective, the crisis of social equality in the posthumanist context stems from a profound ontological shift from the autonomous human subject toward distributed networks of human and non-human agency. As agency becomes increasingly dispersed across technological systems, biological processes, and algorithmic infrastructures, traditional concepts of responsibility, legal accountability, and social justice become progressively more difficult to sustain. Within the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, characterized by advances in artificial intelligence, robotics, and nanotechnologies, posthumanist scholarship argues that algorithmic systems governed by commercial and institutional interests may amplify existing asymmetries of power by transforming human bodies, behaviours, and cognitive activities into sources of economic value.

Consequently, vulnerable populations—including migrants, indigenous communities, and socially marginalized groups—may experience new forms of exclusion and exploitation. These developments contribute to what has been described as the posthuman condition, in which equality can no longer be understood exclusively in human-centered terms but requires consideration of broader forms of life through the concept of *zoe* and the principle of species egalitarianism. Nevertheless, critics have argued that excessive emphasis on networks, objects, and non-human agency risks obscuring persistent class, racial, and gender inequalities while weakening the capacity of critical social theory to address structural injustice.

The contemporary world therefore stands at the threshold of an anthropological transformation driven by the convergence of nano-, bio-, information-, and cognitive technologies (NBIC). The posthumanist project emerging from this technological convergence seeks to overcome biological limitations associated with the human condition while

simultaneously transforming the fundamental concepts through which society understands justice, equality, freedom, and solidarity. This dual character constitutes the central problem addressed in the present study. On the one hand, posthumanism presents an emancipatory vision by promising liberation from disease, aging, and cognitive limitations. On the other hand, its practical realization may legitimize and intensify previously unprecedented forms of biological, cognitive, and digital inequality.

Against this background, the crisis of social equality becomes increasingly evident. Technological progress has created unprecedented opportunities for expanding human knowledge, communication, and productive capabilities. At the same time, however, it has widened disparities between those who possess access to emerging technologies and those who remain excluded from them. Consequently, traditional systems of justice, grounded primarily in liberal conceptions of rights, equality, and individual autonomy, face growing difficulties in responding to a world in which the boundaries separating humans, machines, and natural systems have become increasingly fluid. These developments raise fundamental questions regarding how justice should be understood and institutionalized under conditions of technological transformation.

In response to these challenges, growing attention has been directed toward the concept of **new humanism**. Rather than rejecting the value of the human person, new humanism seeks to reconcile human dignity with recognition of interdependence among humans, technologies, ecosystems, and other forms of existence. From this perspective, justice extends beyond the distribution of rights and material resources among individuals to encompass the balancing of relationships among social, technological, ecological, and cultural systems. By preserving the

ethical concerns of humanism while incorporating the relational insights of posthumanism, new humanism offers a normative framework for addressing emerging forms of inequality and for promoting a more inclusive understanding of global solidarity.

The significance of posthumanism extends beyond philosophical debate into the domains of public policy, governance, and international development. Questions concerning technological inequality, digital sovereignty, artificial intelligence governance, and biotechnology regulation have become central policy challenges for both developed and developing societies. In the Ukrainian and broader post-Soviet context, these issues are further intensified by the consequences of war, technological asymmetries, and post-war reconstruction. Under such conditions, access to advanced technologies influences not only economic opportunities but also broader questions of human security, social participation, and justice. Consequently, the transformation of justice systems increasingly requires movement beyond exclusively anthropocentric legal frameworks toward approaches capable of incorporating technological and non-human dimensions of social life.

Despite the rapid expansion of posthumanist scholarship, existing studies have largely concentrated on philosophical critiques of anthropocentrism or ethical debates surrounding emerging technologies. Comparatively less attention has been devoted to systematically examining how these developments collectively transform the conceptual foundations of social equality and contemporary justice systems. Furthermore, although new humanism has increasingly been proposed as a normative response, its capacity to address the structural consequences of technological inequality has not yet been comprehensively articulated.

The purpose of this article is to examine how posthumanism reconfigures contemporary understandings of social equality and justice under conditions of accelerating technological transformation. It further evaluates the extent to which new humanism provides a coherent normative framework for responding to the ethical, political, and social consequences of these transformations.

The following section reviews the principal theoretical debates that provide the conceptual foundation for the subsequent analysis.

2. Review of Previous Research

Scholarship on posthumanism in relation to the crisis of social equality and the transformation of justice systems has developed at the intersection of philosophy, feminist theory, science and technology studies (STS), bioethics, and ecological thought. Rather than representing a single theoretical tradition, posthumanism encompasses diverse yet interconnected perspectives that collectively challenge anthropocentric assumptions while reconsidering the relationships among humans, technologies, ecosystems, and non-human forms of existence. Within this intellectual landscape, several major streams of scholarship have significantly contributed to contemporary debates on equality and justice.

One of the most influential approaches is **critical posthumanism**, represented primarily by the works of **Rosi Braidotti** and **Donna Haraway**. Braidotti (2013, 2019) argues that the universal humanistic subject historically excluded numerous "others," including women, racial minorities, animals, and marginalized forms of life. To address these exclusions, she proposes the concept of **zoe-centred egalitarianism**, which extends ethical consideration beyond the human species toward life as a whole. Similarly, Haraway (2016) develops the

concepts of hybridity and multispecies ethics, emphasizing the interdependence of humans, technologies, and non-human actors. Collectively, these perspectives challenge anthropocentric assumptions and expand contemporary understandings of justice through relational ethics, ecological responsibility, and multispecies coexistence. A second major perspective is **transhumanism**, represented by **Nick Bostrom**, **Ray Kurzweil**, and **James Hughes**, which emphasizes technological enhancement as a means of overcoming biological limitations and expanding human capabilities. Although transhumanism presents technological progress as an opportunity for improving health, intelligence, and longevity, critics argue that unequal access to enhancement technologies—including biotechnology, neurointerfaces, and genetic engineering—may intensify biological, cognitive, and social inequalities. Consequently, debates surrounding transhumanism increasingly focus on questions of ethical governance, equitable access, and the potential emergence of technologically privileged social groups (Bostrom, 2005; Hughes, 2004; Kurzweil, 2005).

A complementary body of literature examines these issues through **biopolitical** and **science and technology studies** (**STS**) perspectives. Building upon the works of **Michel Foucault**, **Giorgio Agamben**, and **Achille Mbembe**, biopolitical scholarship conceptualizes justice through the governance of life, vulnerability, and unequal exposure to technological and political risks, particularly during crises and armed conflicts (Foucault, 1977; Agamben, 1998; Mbembe, 2003). Likewise, **Bruno Latour's** actor-network theory and **Jane Bennett's** work on material agency argue that technologies, infrastructures, and material objects actively participate in shaping social relations rather than functioning merely as passive instruments (Latour, 2004; Bennett, 2010). These perspectives broaden conventional understandings of

justice by recognizing the agency of technological and material systems in reproducing or mitigating inequality.

Within **political philosophy**, theories of justice continue to provide the principal normative foundations for evaluating contemporary inequalities. The works of **John Rawls**, **Amartya Sen**, and **Nancy Fraser** have significantly influenced debates concerning distributive justice, capabilities, participation, and social recognition (Rawls, 1971; Sen, 2009; Fraser, 2008). More recently, scholarship on **algorithmic justice**, represented by **Shoshana Zuboff**, **Cathy O'Neil**, **Safiya Umoja Noble**, and **Ruha Benjamin**, has demonstrated how digital platforms and algorithmic systems reproduce structural biases and reinforce existing inequalities through data-driven governance (Zuboff, 2019; O'Neil, 2016; Noble, 2018; Benjamin, 2019). Complementing these perspectives, economists such as **Thomas Piketty** and **Branko Milanović** argue that technological transformation contributes to capital concentration, technological rent, and widening socio-economic disparities (Piketty, 2014; Milanović, 2016).

Despite these important theoretical advances, posthumanism has also attracted substantial criticism. Critics argue that excessive emphasis on distributed agency, flat ontology, and human–technology assemblages may unintentionally weaken attention to enduring structures of class, race, gender, and political power. From this perspective, posthumanism risks depoliticizing social struggle by shifting analytical attention from material inequalities toward abstract ontological relationships. In response, the concept of new humanism has emerged as an attempt to reconcile the relational insights of posthumanism with renewed commitments to human dignity, solidarity, care, and social responsibility. Rather than rejecting posthumanist

critiques, new humanism seeks to integrate technological transformation within an ethical framework that preserves both human agency and social justice.

Empirical research further demonstrates that technological inequality extends well beyond philosophical debate. Studies of artificial intelligence in public administration, platform economies, and biomedicine have documented persistent disparities in technological access, participation, and capability. Within the Ukrainian and broader post-Soviet context, existing scholarship has primarily focused on digitalization during wartime, post-conflict reconstruction, infrastructure resilience, and the ethical governance of artificial intelligence. Nevertheless, research in this regional context remains comparatively fragmented and continues to rely heavily on theoretical developments originating in Western scholarship.

Taken together, the existing literature demonstrates substantial progress in explaining posthumanism, technological transformation, and emerging forms of inequality. However, most studies have examined these issues from separate philosophical, ethical, technological, or political perspectives. Comparatively less attention has been devoted to integrating these diverse theoretical traditions into a coherent explanation of how technological transformation reshapes the conceptual foundations of contemporary justice systems and social equality. Furthermore, although new humanism has increasingly been proposed as a normative response to technological change, its implications for the transformation of justice systems have not yet been systematically synthesized. Addressing this conceptual gap constitutes the principal objective of the present study.

To facilitate comparison among the principal theoretical perspectives discussed above, Tables 1–3 provide an analytical synthesis of the major concepts, normative implications, and

contemporary debates identified in the literature. Rather than representing a chronological model of theoretical development, the tables summarize representative perspectives and illustrate their respective contributions to understanding equality, justice, and technological transformation.

To facilitate comparison among the principal theoretical perspectives identified in the literature, Table 1 provides an analytical synthesis of their core assumptions and implications for equality and justice. The table does not represent a chronological model of theoretical development but summarizes representative perspectives discussed in previous research.

Table 1

Major Theoretical Perspectives on Posthumanism and Their Implications for Equality and Justice

Theoretical Perspective	**Core Characteristics**	**Implications for Equality**	**Normative Implications for Justice**
Critical Posthumanism (Braidotti; Haraway)	Critiques anthropocentrism; emphasizes relational subjectivity, multispecies ethics, and interconnectedness between humans and non-human actors	Expands moral consideration beyond the human while raising concerns regarding political representation and exclusion	Zoe-centred egalitarianism; ethics of care; multispecies justice

Theoretical Perspective	Core Characteristics	Implications for Equality	Normative Implications for Justice
Transhumanism (Bostrom; Kurzweil; Hughes)	Advocates technological enhancement to expand human capabilities and overcome biological limitations	Unequal access to enhancement technologies may intensify biological and cognitive inequalities	Ethical governance and equitable access to enhancement technologies
Biopolitical Perspective (Foucault; Agamben; Mbembe)	Examines governance of life, vulnerability, and power under technological and political transformation	Highlights unequal exposure to technological, political, and social risks	Protection of vulnerable populations and equitable governance
Actor–Network Theory (Latour; Bennett)	Understands humans, technologies, and material infrastructures as interconnected actors within hybrid assemblages	Recognizes infrastructural and technological sources of inequality	Incorporation of material and technological agency into justice frameworks
New Humanism	Integrates human dignity with relational ethics, technological	Seeks to balance technological transformation with	Ethical governance, solidarity, ecological responsibility, and responsible

Theoretical Perspective	Core Characteristics	Implications for Equality	Normative Implications for Justice
	responsibility, and ecological awareness	social inclusion and human dignity	technological development

Note. This table is an analytical synthesis developed by the authors based on the literature reviewed in this study. It is intended to facilitate conceptual comparison rather than to represent a chronological model or a universally accepted classification of posthumanist theories.

As shown in Table 1, contemporary debates on posthumanism encompass diverse theoretical traditions that differ in their understanding of human agency, technology, and justice. Despite these differences, the literature demonstrates growing convergence in recognizing that conventional anthropocentric frameworks are increasingly insufficient for explaining emerging forms of technological inequality. Collectively, these perspectives provide the conceptual foundation for examining how justice systems are being transformed under conditions of accelerating technological change.

Table 2

Comparative Perspectives of Traditional Humanism, Posthumanism, and New Humanism

Dimension	**Traditional Humanism**	**Posthumanism / Transhumanism**	**New Humanism**
Conception of the Human	Autonomous, rational individual; anthropocentric subject	Hybrid, relational, technologically enhanced or distributed subject	Human dignity embedded within relational and ecological interdependence
Core Values	Reason, autonomy, individual rights, dignity	Interdependence, technological enhancement, relationality	Care, solidarity, inclusiveness, multispecies justice
Understanding of Technology	Instrument serving human purposes	Constitutive element of human existence and social organization	Technology governed through ethical responsibility and human well-being
Communication and Governance	Public discourse, legal institutions, representative democracy	Digital platforms, algorithmic governance, networked infrastructures	Ethical governance, transparency, participatory and responsible innovation

Dimension	Traditional Humanism	Posthumanism / Transhumanism	New Humanism
Understanding of Justice	Distributive justice, equality before the law	Reparative, relational, and procedural justice	Integrated social, technological, ecological, and ethical justice
Major Sources of Inequality	Economic and social exclusion	Biological, cognitive, digital, and algorithmic inequalities	Interconnected technological, ecological, and social inequalities
Normative Responses	Universal rights, legal equality, rational deliberation	Algorithmic accountability, equitable technological access, decentralization	Human dignity, responsible innovation, ecological responsibility, multispecies solidarity

Note. The table presents an analytical comparison developed by the authors based on the literature reviewed in this study. It is intended to summarize representative conceptual differences among traditional humanism, posthumanism, and new humanism rather than to imply mutually exclusive or universally accepted theoretical categories.

Table 2 illustrates the conceptual evolution of humanistic thought from anthropocentric understandings of the autonomous individual toward increasingly relational conceptions of humanity embedded within technological, ecological, and social systems. While traditional humanism primarily emphasizes individual autonomy, universal rights, and distributive justice,

posthumanism broadens the analytical focus by recognizing the agency of technologies, infrastructures, and non-human actors in shaping social relations. However, this theoretical shift also introduces new challenges, including biological, cognitive, and algorithmic inequalities that extend beyond conventional socio-economic forms of exclusion. New humanism seeks to reconcile these perspectives by preserving human dignity and ethical responsibility while acknowledging the interconnected nature of contemporary societies. Rather than replacing humanism, it attempts to provide an integrative normative framework capable of addressing the ethical and governance challenges associated with rapid technological transformation.

To summarize the principal debates identified in the literature, Table 3 synthesizes the major challenges associated with posthumanist scholarship together with the principal normative responses proposed by representative theoretical perspectives. Rather than presenting policy recommendations, the table summarizes the principal responses discussed in existing scholarship.

Table 3

Major Challenges and Normative Responses in Contemporary Posthumanist Scholarship

Major Challenges	**Normative Responses Identified in the Literature**	**Representative Scholarly Perspectives**
Biological and cognitive inequality resulting from unequal access to enhancement technologies	Universal accessibility, ethical governance of enhancement technologies, and	Bostrom; Hughes; Kurzweil

Major Challenges	Normative Responses Identified in the Literature	Representative Scholarly Perspectives
	protection against technological exclusion	
Algorithmic discrimination, digital inequality, and technological concentration of power	Algorithmic transparency, accountability, democratic governance of AI, and equitable access to digital infrastructures	Zuboff; O'Neil; Noble; Benjamin
Depoliticization of social justice through excessive emphasis on distributed agency and flat ontology	Reintegration of social responsibility, political participation, and material inequality into posthumanist debates	Fraser; Braidotti; Haraway
Ecological and multispecies exclusion	Ecological responsibility, multispecies ethics, ethics of care, and responsible governance	Haraway; Braidotti; Bennett

Note. The table presents an analytical synthesis developed by the authors based on the literature reviewed in this study. The challenges and normative responses summarize recurring themes identified across representative posthumanist, political-philosophical, and science and technology studies (STS) scholarship. The table is intended to facilitate conceptual comparison and does not imply consensus among the cited theoretical perspectives.

Table 3 demonstrates that contemporary debates on posthumanism are characterized not only by the identification of emerging technological risks but also by the search for

corresponding normative responses. Although individual theoretical traditions differ in their understanding of technology, justice, and human agency, they converge in recognizing that technological transformation introduces new forms of biological, cognitive, digital, and ecological inequality that cannot be adequately addressed through conventional anthropocentric frameworks alone. The literature therefore increasingly emphasizes ethical governance, algorithmic accountability, ecological responsibility, and inclusive technological development as complementary rather than competing approaches to justice. These observations provide the conceptual basis for the analytical framework developed in the subsequent sections of this study.

3. Methodology of the Research

This study adopts an integrative and interdisciplinary conceptual methodology that combines perspectives from critical theory, including poststructuralism, feminist theory, and posthumanism, together with political philosophy, science and technology studies (STS), and ecological ethics. Rather than employing empirical investigation, this study adopts a conceptually oriented interpretive design based on critical theoretical analysis. The purpose is not to generate empirical generalizations but to examine how posthumanist thought reconfigures the conceptual foundations of equality and justice under conditions of accelerating technological transformation.

The principal analytical approach is critical theoretical analysis, which is employed to examine the conceptual limitations of anthropocentric models of justice and to explore alternative normative interpretations proposed within posthumanist philosophy. This analysis is complemented by a dialectical approach that identifies tensions and contradictions embedded

within posthumanist thought, including the relationships between emancipation and domination, universality and particularity, and nature and technology. Rather than treating these tensions as mutually exclusive, the study interprets them as constitutive features of contemporary debates concerning technological transformation and social equality.

The study further applies normative-critical analysis to examine the conceptual meanings of equality, justice, dignity, and responsibility within competing philosophical traditions. This approach enables critical evaluation of the assumptions underlying both techno-utopian and conservative interpretations of technological development. In addition, conceptual analysis and hermeneutic interpretation are employed to examine the major theoretical contributions of representative scholars, including Bostrom, Braidotti, Fukuyama, Habermas, Haraway, Latour, and Barad, with particular attention to the evolution of key concepts and their implications for contemporary justice.

A comparative philosophical approach is used to contrast traditional theories of justice represented by Rawls, Sen, and Fraser with posthumanist perspectives concerning technological enhancement, distributed agency, and multispecies ethics. The comparison does not seek to establish the superiority of one theoretical tradition over another. Instead, it identifies areas of conceptual convergence, divergence, and complementarity in order to clarify how posthumanist thought extends or challenges conventional understandings of justice.

The analysis also incorporates an interdisciplinary synthesis that integrates insights from social philosophy, political theory, bioethics, and science and technology studies (STS). Contemporary developments—including algorithmic governance, biotechnology, neurotechnology, digital platforms, and environmental transformation—are examined as

illustrative cases that highlight how technological change generates new questions concerning equality, responsibility, and justice. These cases are employed to clarify theoretical relationships rather than to provide empirical verification or establish causal claims. Instead, they serve as analytical illustrations that support the interpretation of broader conceptual developments. Their interpretation is further informed by assemblage thinking, particularly the works of Latour and Bennett, which facilitate examination of how human and non-human actors interact in shaping emerging socio-technical relationships.

Accordingly, the methodology represents a critical and conceptually oriented interpretive approach that integrates theoretical comparison, normative analysis, hermeneutic interpretation, and interdisciplinary synthesis. This methodological framework enables the study to examine how posthumanist scholarship reconfigures the conceptual foundations of freedom, equality, and justice while identifying the normative implications of these transformations for contemporary societies experiencing accelerating technological and ecological change.

4. Presentation of the Main Material

The present analysis begins with the humanistic conception of communication because it provides the normative foundation upon which modern understandings of freedom and justice were originally constructed. Within the humanistic paradigm, communication is understood as a rational and critical discourse among autonomous subjects who possess the capacity for reflection, mutual recognition, and moral responsibility (Habermas, 1989). Freedom and justice are therefore conceptualized as outcomes of communicative rationality, where legitimate social order emerges through reasoned dialogue rather than coercion.

From this perspective, communication performs both an instrumental and a constitutive function. It serves as the principal mechanism through which autonomous individuals negotiate social norms while simultaneously providing the normative conditions necessary for emancipation. The public sphere enables argumentative exchange in which rational deliberation protects individuals from domination and distortion (Kant, 1784/1991; Arendt, 1958). Likewise, speech acts generate institutional legitimacy through their performative capacity to establish rights, obligations, and social realities (Searle, 1969; Rawls, 1971). Within this framework, consensus achieved through rational communication constitutes the principal criterion for the legitimacy of social norms.

The comparative analysis further indicates that freedom within classical humanism is understood primarily through the autonomy of the rational individual. It encompasses both freedom from external coercion and the positive capacity for self-determination exercised through rational choice (Berlin, 1969). Justice, correspondingly, is grounded in the universal moral equality of rational persons before legal and ethical principles, reflecting the Kantian conception of moral reciprocity. Communication therefore remains fundamentally anthropocentric because only human beings are recognized as legitimate participants in rational discourse, capable of responsibility, recognition, and reciprocal moral obligation (Taylor, 2007). The human subject consequently occupies a privileged epistemological and ethical position that structures both freedom and justice.

The analysis demonstrates that the first significant transformation of this framework emerges through poststructuralist critiques of power and discourse. Rather than treating communication as an inherently emancipatory process, poststructuralist scholarship argues that

discourse itself constitutes an important mechanism through which relations of domination are produced and reproduced. From this perspective, the humanistic ideal of rational communication cannot be separated from the institutional practices that define normality, exclude alternative forms of subjectivity, and regulate acceptable forms of knowledge.

This critical transformation is particularly evident in the work of Foucault (1977), who argues that communication does not simply facilitate freedom but simultaneously disciplines individuals through interconnected regimes of knowledge and power. Humanistic concepts of freedom and justice are therefore understood not as universal principles existing independently of history but as historically contingent products of biopolitical governance. Subjectivity itself becomes an effect of discursive practices through which institutions regulate populations, normalize behavior, and define legitimate forms of participation.

Poststructuralist critiques further deepen this interpretation by questioning the universality of communicative rationality. Lyotard (1979/1984) argues that communication presented as neutral or universally accessible often conceals relations of power by privileging dominant narratives while marginalizing alternative voices. The analysis therefore suggests that communication cannot be understood solely as a neutral medium for achieving consensus but must also be examined as a site in which competing forms of knowledge, authority, and exclusion are continuously negotiated.

The transition toward the algorithmic era intensifies these dynamics. Rather than merely mediating communication, digital platforms increasingly determine the conditions under which communication becomes visible, accessible, and politically significant. As Zuboff (2019) demonstrates, algorithmic systems actively organize information flows according to

commercial and institutional interests, thereby producing asymmetrical structures of visibility and invisibility. Under such conditions, participation in public discourse increasingly depends upon algorithmic selection rather than communicative equality. Consequently, freedom of expression becomes closely associated with algorithmic visibility, while justice increasingly involves the distribution of attention, data, and digital access rather than solely the protection of formal rights. This transformation is further reinforced by what Couldry and Mejias (2019) describe as data colonialism, whereby human experience itself becomes a source of economic value through continuous extraction, processing, and commodification of personal data.

Taken together, the analysis identifies a clear conceptual transition. Within classical humanism, communication functions primarily as a rational instrument through which autonomous individuals establish legitimate social order. Poststructuralist critiques subsequently reveal that communication also constitutes an important mechanism of power, normalization, and exclusion. This analytical progression establishes the conceptual foundation for the subsequent examination of posthumanism, where communication is no longer interpreted primarily as discourse among autonomous human subjects but is progressively reconfigured as a distributed relational process involving both human and non-human forms of agency.

Following the poststructuralist critique of communicative rationality, the analysis identifies a further conceptual transformation introduced by posthumanist scholarship. Rather than merely questioning the neutrality of communication, posthumanism fundamentally challenges the anthropocentric assumption that communication is an exclusively human activity. The comparative analysis suggests that this transformation is characterized by an

ontological shift from communication as interaction among autonomous human subjects toward communication as a distributed network of human and non-human agencies.

Within this perspective, Braidotti (2019) and Haraway (2016) reject the privileged epistemological status traditionally assigned to the human subject. Instead, communication is reconceptualized as a heterogeneous assemblage in which agency is distributed across human and non-human actors, including technological systems, biological entities, material infrastructures, and virtual environments. Consequently, the human subject no longer functions as the exclusive producer, interpreter, or recipient of meaning. Rather, communicative processes emerge through interactions among algorithms, datasets, bioengineered organisms, ecological systems, animals, and material objects, thereby extending agency beyond conventional human-centered understandings of discourse (Latour, 2004; Barad, 2007).

The analysis further indicates that this ontological transformation substantially reconfigures the concepts of freedom and justice. Freedom is no longer understood solely as individual autonomy or independence from external constraints. Instead, it increasingly refers to the capacity for coexistence, interaction, and compatibility across heterogeneous forms of intelligence, materiality, and life without requiring assimilation into anthropocentric norms. This relational understanding corresponds to the ethical notion of **symbiotic becoming**, which emphasizes interdependence rather than autonomous self-realization (Hayles, 1999; Floridi, 2014).

Similarly, justice extends beyond the distributive and recognition-based models that characterize classical political philosophy. The posthumanist perspective introduces reparative

and infrastructural dimensions of justice by recognizing historical responsibilities toward animals, ecosystems, future generations, and other non-human entities. Justice therefore increasingly encompasses equitable access to communicative infrastructures, political representation, and conditions that enable heterogeneous actors to participate within shared socio-technical environments. In this sense, justice evolves into what has been described as a **practice of care**, emphasizing relational responsibility rather than solely legal or distributive equality (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017; Costanza-Chock, 2020; Wolfe, 2010).

The empirical illustrations examined in this study further demonstrate how this conceptual transformation manifests across multiple contemporary domains. Algorithmic platforms increasingly transform freedom of expression into a struggle for algorithmic visibility, where participation in public discourse depends upon opaque recommendation systems and data-driven ranking mechanisms rather than equal communicative opportunity. Consequently, exclusion is often produced through algorithmic selection rather than direct political coercion, creating new forms of digital marginalization and unequal visibility.

Comparable transformations are evident in contemporary bioethical debates concerning genome editing and biotechnology. Questions concerning who possesses the authority to speak on behalf of future generations, genetically modified organisms, or emerging forms of life illustrate how communication increasingly extends beyond exclusively human participants. Genetic information itself becomes incorporated into broader communicative and ethical processes, thereby expanding the scope of justice beyond conventional legal subjects (Jasanoff, 2016; Ferrando, 2019).

The analysis also identifies similar developments within climate governance. Environmental systems—including oceans, forests, and the atmosphere—are increasingly represented politically through scientific institutions, legal mechanisms, and civil society organizations, thereby extending communicative representation beyond human communities. Such developments resonate with Latour's conception of a "**Parliament of Things,**" in which non-human entities acquire indirect political representation through institutional mediation.

The experience of the COVID-19 pandemic provides an additional illustration of this transformation. Digital surveillance, epidemiological modelling, and algorithmically coordinated public health interventions demonstrated how individual autonomy became increasingly intertwined with collective security and technologically mediated governance. Under these conditions, freedom and responsibility could no longer be understood exclusively through individual rights but required broader ethical consideration of interconnected biological, technological, and social systems (Stiegler, 2018).

Taken together, the analysis demonstrates that posthumanism fundamentally reconfigures the communicative foundations of freedom and justice. Communication no longer functions merely as an instrument through which predefined values are negotiated. Rather, it increasingly constitutes the ontological infrastructure through which freedom, justice, and political participation are continuously produced, negotiated, and transformed. This transition marks a movement away from communication understood as dialogue among autonomous human subjects toward communication as an evolving network of material-discursive interactions among heterogeneous actors.

Accordingly, the principal contribution of this analysis lies not in arguing that communication has simply expanded beyond the human sphere, but in demonstrating that the ontological status of communication itself has been transformed. Within the posthumanist perspective, communication becomes the foundational condition through which ethical responsibility, political legitimacy, and social justice are constituted across interconnected human and non-human worlds. This conceptual transformation provides the analytical basis for reconsidering contemporary justice systems under conditions of accelerating technological and ecological change.

5. Results and Discussion

The analysis demonstrates that posthumanist scholarship fundamentally reconfigures the conceptual foundations upon which contemporary justice systems have traditionally been constructed. Rather than treating justice exclusively as a relationship among autonomous human subjects, posthumanism expands the analytical framework by recognizing distributed forms of agency that encompass technological systems, biological processes, ecological entities, and other non-human actors. This transformation challenges the anthropocentric assumptions that have historically underpinned modern theories of justice and equality.

The comparative analysis indicates that conventional models of distributive and recognition-based justice become increasingly constrained under conditions of technological transformation and subject hybridization. Classical approaches represented by Rawls and Habermas remain grounded in assumptions of autonomous rational subjects capable of reciprocal participation within human-centered communicative frameworks. However, the emergence of biotechnology, neurotechnology, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic governance introduces new asymmetries that cannot be adequately explained through these

conventional models alone. Unequal access to technological enhancement—including genetic engineering, neurointerfaces, and cognitive augmentation—creates new forms of biological and cognitive stratification, thereby extending inequality beyond socio-economic distribution toward ontological differentiation.

The findings further suggest that posthumanism interprets these emerging inequalities not as isolated technological consequences but as manifestations of deeper anthropocentric assumptions embedded within modern conceptions of justice. From this perspective, exclusion is no longer limited to marginalized human populations but extends to non-human forms of existence that have historically remained outside conventional legal and political frameworks. The analysis therefore supports the posthumanist argument that anthropocentric universalism may unintentionally reproduce exclusion by restricting moral and political recognition to the human subject alone.

The analysis also demonstrates that technological transformation alters the mechanisms through which inequality is produced. Within contemporary algorithmic environments, decision-making processes are increasingly distributed across complex socio-technical systems in which algorithms, digital platforms, and data infrastructures actively shape access to information, visibility, and participation. Consequently, inequality emerges not only through direct institutional discrimination but also through algorithmically mediated processes that influence opportunities, representation, and public recognition. Contemporary examples, including algorithmic governance, digital surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic, and environmental decision-making associated with climate governance, illustrate how material

and technological infrastructures participate in the production of new forms of exclusion and vulnerability.

These findings indicate a corresponding transformation in the conceptualization of justice itself. Rather than remaining primarily distributive, contemporary justice increasingly incorporates reparative, relational, and infrastructural dimensions. Justice is therefore understood not only as the equitable distribution of rights and resources but also as the ethical responsibility to recognize historical exclusions affecting marginalized communities, ecosystems, future generations, and other non-human forms of existence. In this context, the ethics of care, multispecies responsibility, and **zoe-centred egalitarianism** emerge as complementary normative principles that broaden the scope of justice beyond exclusively human concerns.

Building upon these analytical observations, the study suggests that **new humanism** provides a possible normative framework for reconciling the ethical commitments of classical humanism with the relational insights of posthumanism. Rather than abandoning human dignity, new humanism repositions it within broader networks of technological, ecological, and social interdependence. Human agency therefore remains ethically significant while no longer functioning as the exclusive foundation of justice. This synthesis enables the concepts of species egalitarianism and **symbiotic becoming** to be interpreted not as alternatives to human rights but as extensions of justice under conditions of increasing human–technology–environment interdependence.

The findings further highlight several implications for governance. The analysis suggests that democratization of algorithmic systems, ethical governance of artificial

intelligence, multispecies representation within legal and environmental institutions, and the development of normative frameworks for hybrid socio-technical assemblages represent important directions for future justice systems. These implications should not be interpreted as policy prescriptions but rather as conceptual consequences derived from the theoretical analysis undertaken in this study.

Finally, the analysis indicates that these transformations possess particular significance for societies experiencing technological asymmetries, political instability, and post-conflict reconstruction. Within the Ukrainian and broader post-Soviet context, questions of technological sovereignty, digital governance, and equitable access to emerging technologies acquire strategic importance because technological infrastructures increasingly shape not only economic development but also democratic participation, social resilience, and long-term justice. Consequently, the transformation of justice systems must be understood as part of a broader process of institutional adaptation to conditions of accelerating technological and ecological change.

The findings suggest that posthumanism provides an important conceptual framework for understanding the contemporary crisis of social equality by revealing the limitations of anthropocentric models of justice. Rather than treating inequality solely as a problem of unequal resource distribution among human individuals, posthumanist scholarship broadens the analytical perspective to include technological systems, ecological relationships, and non-human forms of agency. This expansion enables justice to be reconsidered within the broader context of interdependence characterizing the Anthropocene.

The analysis further indicates that posthumanism contributes to the development of reparative and relational approaches to justice. By extending ethical concern beyond exclusively human communities, concepts such as **zoe-centred egalitarianism**, multispecies ethics, and the "**Parliament of Things**" proposed by Latour encourage more inclusive understandings of responsibility and political representation. Rather than replacing distributive justice, these perspectives expand its normative scope by incorporating historical responsibilities toward marginalized human communities, ecosystems, future generations, and other non-human entities.

At the same time, the analysis also identifies important limitations within contemporary posthumanist scholarship. Excessive emphasis on distributed agency and flat ontology may weaken analytical attention to persistent structures of class, race, gender, and political power. If responsibility becomes excessively dispersed across heterogeneous networks, the identification of political accountability may become increasingly difficult. Consequently, posthumanism requires continued engagement with critical social theory to ensure that technological and ecological perspectives do not obscure enduring forms of structural inequality.

From this perspective, the concept of **new humanism** emerges as a possible normative synthesis rather than as a rejection of posthumanism. The findings suggest that new humanism preserves the relational insights of posthumanist thought while reaffirming the ethical significance of human dignity, solidarity, and social responsibility. Human agency therefore remains an essential normative reference point, although it is no longer understood as existing independently from technological, ecological, and multispecies relationships.

The comparative analysis also indicates that posthumanist approaches provide a broader analytical framework than traditional distributive theories of justice for interpreting contemporary technological transformations. While classical theories represented by Rawls primarily address justice among autonomous human subjects, posthumanist perspectives extend the analysis to socio-technical systems characterized by algorithmic governance, biotechnology, and ecological interdependence. Nevertheless, this conceptual expansion also highlights the growing importance of institutional mechanisms capable of ensuring transparency, accountability, and ethical governance within increasingly complex technological environments.

Finally, the analysis demonstrates that these theoretical developments possess particular relevance for societies experiencing technological asymmetries, geopolitical conflict, and institutional transformation. Within the Ukrainian and broader post-Soviet context, questions of technological sovereignty, digital governance, and equitable access to emerging technologies acquire increasing significance because technological infrastructures shape not only economic development but also democratic participation, social resilience, and long-term justice. These observations suggest that future discussions of justice should integrate technological, ecological, and political dimensions within a common normative framework while remaining attentive to historically embedded forms of inequality.

Taken together, the findings indicate that posthumanism should not be understood simply as a rejection of humanism but as a critical reconfiguration of the conceptual foundations through which freedom, justice, and equality are interpreted under conditions of accelerating technological transformation. Within this perspective, new humanism represents an attempt to reconcile technological change with ethical responsibility by emphasizing care,

interdependence, and inclusive forms of justice appropriate to increasingly interconnected human and non-human worlds.

6. Conclusion

The present study has examined how posthumanist thought reconfigures contemporary understandings of social equality and justice under conditions of accelerating technological transformation. The analysis demonstrates that posthumanism does not merely criticize anthropocentric assumptions but fundamentally challenges the conceptual foundations upon which modern theories of justice have traditionally been constructed. Rather than limiting justice to relationships among autonomous human subjects, posthumanist perspectives expand the analytical framework to include technological systems, ecological processes, and non-human forms of agency. Consequently, justice increasingly becomes a relational and multidimensional concept that extends beyond distributive equality toward broader considerations of interdependence, responsibility, and participation.

The findings indicate that traditional theories of justice, while remaining important normative foundations, encounter increasing limitations in explaining contemporary forms of technological inequality. Developments in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, neurotechnology, and algorithmic governance generate new forms of asymmetry that cannot be fully understood through exclusively anthropocentric conceptions of rights, recognition, and distributive justice. The analysis further suggests that posthumanist scholarship provides valuable conceptual resources for interpreting these transformations by recognizing that communication, agency, and political participation are increasingly distributed across interconnected human and non-human systems.

At the same time, the study identifies important limitations within contemporary posthumanist scholarship. While the decentralization of the human subject broadens ethical concern beyond exclusively human communities, excessive emphasis on distributed agency may reduce analytical attention to persistent structures of political, economic, and social inequality. The findings therefore suggest that technological and ecological perspectives should complement rather than replace critical analyses of power, responsibility, and institutional accountability.

From this perspective, the study argues that new humanism may serve as a normative framework capable of reconciling the ethical commitments of classical humanism with the relational insights of posthumanism. Rather than rejecting human dignity, new humanism repositions it within broader networks of technological, ecological, and social interdependence. Human beings therefore remain ethically significant while no longer constituting the exclusive foundation of justice. This synthesis enables concepts such as zoe-centred egalitarianism, multispecies ethics, and the ethics of care to be interpreted as complementary extensions of contemporary justice rather than alternatives to human rights.

The principal contribution of this study lies in its conceptual integration of posthumanist philosophy, political philosophy, science and technology studies, and bioethical scholarship into a coherent analytical framework for examining contemporary transformations of equality and justice. Instead of proposing an entirely new theory of justice, the study demonstrates how these theoretical traditions collectively reveal an ongoing transition from anthropocentric conceptions of justice toward more relational, technological, and ecological understandings of political responsibility.

The analysis also suggests that these conceptual developments possess broader implications for governance under conditions of accelerating technological change. Questions concerning algorithmic accountability, equitable access to emerging technologies, technological sovereignty, and ecological responsibility are likely to become increasingly important components of future discussions on justice. However, the present study approaches these issues as conceptual implications derived from theoretical analysis rather than as direct policy prescriptions.

Finally, the study recognizes several limitations that also provide directions for future research. First, the present study is conceptual and interpretive in nature and therefore does not seek to empirically evaluate posthumanist approaches within specific institutional, national, or policy contexts. Second, although the analysis integrates perspectives from political philosophy, posthumanism, science and technology studies (STS), and bioethics, it does not examine how these conceptual insights operate across different socio-political, cultural, or technological settings. Consequently, future research should investigate the empirical applicability of the proposed analytical framework through comparative case studies, policy analysis, and interdisciplinary empirical research. Particular attention may be devoted to artificial intelligence governance, digital inequality, environmental justice, post-conflict reconstruction, and cross-national comparisons of technological governance. Such research would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how emerging technological transformations continue to reshape the normative foundations of equality and justice in the twenty-first century.

References

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128

Bellacasa, M. P. de la. (2017). *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816696260.001.0001

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Duke University Press.

Berlin, I. (1969). *Two concepts of liberty*. In *Four essays on liberty* (pp. 118–172). Oxford University Press.

Bostrom, N. (2003). Human genetic enhancements: A transhumanist perspective. *Journal of Value Inquiry, 37*(4), 493–506.

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge*. Polity Press.

Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). *Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12255.001.0001

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350059511

Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.

Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT Press.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373780

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.

Hughes, J. (2004). *Citizen Cyborg: Why Democratic Societies Must Respond to the Redesigned Human of the Future*. Westview Press.

Jasanoff, S. (2016). *The ethics of invention: Technology and the human future*. W. W. Norton.

Kant, I. (1991). *An answer to the question: What is enlightenment?* In H. S. Reiss (Ed.), *Kant: Political writings* (2nd ed., H. B. Nisbet, Trans., pp. 54–60). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1784)

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*. Viking.

Latour, B. (2004). *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy* (C. Porter, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture, 15*, 11-40. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-15-1-11

Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global Inequality*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjghwk4

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism. New York University Press.https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt9w5

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*.Broadway Books.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Stiegler, B. (2018). *The neganthropocene*. Open Humanities Press.

Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. Harvard University Press.

Wolfe, C. (2010). *What is posthumanism?* University of Minnesota Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Author Bio

Dobrodum Olga Victorivna is Doctor of Philosophical Sciences (DSc) and Professor in the Department of Journalism and Advertising, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine. Her research interests include political philosophy, posthumanism, new humanism, artificial intelligence, digital ethics, technological governance, and the transformation of justice systems in the digital era. Her current research examines the philosophical, ethical, and political implications of emerging technologies for human dignity, social equality, democratic governance, and the future of humanistic values.

Declaration of Interest

The author declares no competing interests

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were generated or analyzed during this study. The analysis is based exclusively on existing literature and publicly available sources cited in the manuscript.

Use of Generative AI

During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used an AI-assisted language tool for language refinement and structural editing. All substantive arguments, interpretations, analyses, and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author.