

## *THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ISELF*

**Bogdan Popoveniuc**  
**Assoc. Prof., PhD, "Ștefan cel Mare" University of Suceava**

*Abstract: The tremendous developments of digital and intelligent technologies changed dramatically the world we living in and the way we think and act. The technological settings forced human cognition to adapt itself to its own creation. This is an undergoing process therefore most of its consequences are unpredictable at this moment. Nonetheless, some changes are already noticeable. Among these we are witnessing to the nurture of a real and most tangible global and collective IBrain together with a very flexible and flowing ISelf. It is analyzed the problem of self-identity and the future of moral perspective in relation with the collective artificial (un)consciousness.*

*Keywords: ISelf, Collective Brain/Mind; Hyperreality, Technology, Moral;*

Even a short relatively period of accessing digital ITechnologies, as Google-search usage, is reported to be accompanied with the activation of a specific new brain area unrelated with the regular books reading.<sup>1</sup> Only a single hour per day of using Internet readily produce changes in a way the brain processes information. But the digital-natives are exposed more than half of day to digital stimulation and the number of computer mediated social interaction is exponentially increasing. Living in a digitally mediated reality affects our cognitive skills, sharpening certain cognitive skills and atrophying other. In some aspects communication technologies make us smarter, but in other aspects they seems to make us dumber and only makes us think we are smarter. If the ICTs (Information and Communications Technology) improved or negatively affects our knowledge and understanding abilities is more a question of anthropology than standardized measurement. The human mind has evolved to make just the minimum that improves the adaptation of its host. Because people are a social species and have evolved in the context of collaboration, whenever possible, the skills have been outsourced. Consequently, most of our knowledge today is outspread in things and people around us. And since the ICTs make possible the instantaneous communication and access to huge world databases of knowledge at distance we feel almost omniscient. But, „because we confuse the knowledge in our heads with the knowledge we have access to, we are largely unaware of how little we understand. We live with the belief that we understand more than we do.”<sup>2</sup>

In this general framework of permanent access to collective knowledge one crucial aspect is represented by self-knowledge. What definitely the technological progress will make, and with growing importance in the future, will be to assist and influence our knowledge and self-understanding very deeply. One’s self-knowledge is “something that grows significantly with time and experience and as something that can always be transformed by new information.” And now we are “confronting a mass of new information about the brain and its activities, and we face the prospect of a great deal more.”<sup>3</sup> And this new information changes the ways we think

---

1 Gary Small, Gigi Vorgan, *IBrain: Surviving the Technological Alteration of the Modern Mind*, Harper Collins, 2009, pp. 14-16.

2 Steven Sloman, Philip Fernbach, *The Knowledge Illusion: Why We Never Think Alone*, Penguin, 2017, p. 129.

3 Paul Churchland, *The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul: A Philosophical Journey into the Brain*, MIT Press, 1996, p. 322.

about ourselves, the character of human cognitive and social interaction. The future people will have more opportunities to develop a more self-reflexive unbiased attitude, a stance required for multi-cultural openness and mutual understanding in a very diverse global world. But to have the opportunity is not equal to make use of it. Most of the people from developed world have the opportunity for a healthy, less stressful and meaningful life, but a small part of them does it. Why is that so? Why if the people have more opportunities than ever to self-discover, self-development and personal growth we observe an opposite process of individuals who seems to lost the sense or their personal identity, other than the fashioned and up-to-dated one? Why people don't move from the driving force of low level needs of physical comfort and social recognition fulfillment to the pursuit of aesthetic and cognitive superior needs, self-actualization and self-transcendence?<sup>4</sup> As Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Žižek stated "there is nothing more miserable today, than those people who organize their life in order to enjoy themselves."<sup>5</sup>

A significant part of the answer lays, not in the problem of individual knowledge, but the issue of self-understanding, in the sense of the personal identity.

### **The problem of identity**

Nowadays the reality is permanently folded and mediated by a virtual reality. Its main features are the *simulation* of reality - in medicine, entertainment, and education and training; the *interaction* between our virtual personalities - in television mediated communications, or virtual universities; *artificiality* of the entire space inhabited by humans; the sensory *immersion* in virtual environment made possible by different VR devices which sometimes, in turn, connects to the real world up to the *full body immersion*; the *telepresence* in distant places which brings human effective and in real-time to another real-world location as it the surgeon inside the patient's body, the speleologist in deep down physically inaccessible caves, or the oceanographer at the bottom of Mariana Trench (as opposed to telepresence instituted by imaginary worlds of art, mathematics, and entertainment); and, of course, the *networked (post-symbolic) communications* where people can assert and create virtual objects and activities and share imaginary things and events without using words or real-world references.<sup>6</sup>

The omnipresence of digital interconnection augments the postmodern phenomenon of hyperreality, where the social reality re-creates or simulates reality from models up to the point where the consciousness is incapable to distinguish the real from a simulation of reality. This kind of reality is basically generated from ideas and the division between reality and imaginary disappears. In this ubiquitous "cybernetic game" the simulacra reality<sup>7</sup> becomes "too much reality" - with nothing hidden or unknown, "more than reality" plain and clear with no flaws or imperfection, like special effects and "para-reality". In that extra-reality which covers or replaces the real the digital self is underpinned by a "fragmented, disjointed, and discontinuous mode of experience."<sup>8</sup> The personal identity is no longer something distinct from what we are doing, performing or representing when we are offline, in physical interactions outside the virtual world. Our identity marks as our past achievements and present attitudes are always available for other and me. This ubiquity of virtual reality exerts a continuous influence on our self-identity and moulds it accordingly, as powerful as use to be in the past the interactions in daily life. "In

---

4 Abraham Maslow, *The farther reaches of human nature*, New York: Viking, 1971.

5 Slavoj Žižek "Slavoj Žižek: The Reality of the Virtual" (2006), documentary movie directed by Ben Wright.

6 Michael Heim, *The Metaphysics of Virtual Reality*, Chap. *The Essence of VR*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993: 109-128.

7 Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra & Simulation. The Precession of Simulacra*, University of Michigan Press, 1994.

8 Douglas Kellner, *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and the Post-modern*, Routledge, 2003, p. 233.

that context, we are always online, and our identities are «always on.» Identity and its online representations therefore not something we switch off, move away from, or otherwise demarcate from the everyday practices of selfhood.”<sup>9</sup> The representational aspect of my online self, more powerful than in real life, affects my own understanding of who am I.

The constant physical interactions with other people support people in unitary experience of the self. Living multifaceted in virtual reality dismantle and provides a sense of split personality. The self is not a standalone substance, but a project,<sup>10</sup> a rhizomatic form constituted by various types of discourses which feed the focal self-narrative. In modernity, the chief material constitution of me-self<sup>11</sup> - the internalized attitudes of the others, the equivalent of psychoanalytical Super-Ego - was language, while the online discourse is mainly imagistic. The text and rational discourse have lost its dominant position in modern culture, which spreads through mass-mediated communication such as television, film, music, music video, and online interactions. Online socialization is irresistible because it set the scene for the free fantasy and illusion of star-like life. “I have followers and people are watching my performance, I can play any role I want.” Moreover, the entire world is revolving around the I-Self: “I express myself, “I hear, but not listen the others,” because I can’t conceive the Other-I. The “selfie” phenomenon, which would be considered narcissistic fifty years ago, became normal. Nonetheless the ability to empathize is declining. The life on the screen implies a very passive perspective from out-side in, while reading books forces the imagination to live the inner life of the characters depicted by the author. The digital native watches in a passive stance the movies and diverse presentations. The reality is “pre-sent-ed” to them, a universal, ready-made, monochrome, and generally agreed way of perceiving and receiving messages. They need images for thinking. The movies, games and social-networks interactions become similar. I interact with virtual characters that become undistinguishable and interchangeable.

In the real life, the alter-ego(s) functions as a solution for alleviating frustration from daily life and, being mostly a reactive construct of personality, it is less controllable and prone to extreme and deviant deeds. In the context of virtual reality, the notion of self-identity is extremely challenged. It has a truly psychoanalytic effect because it released that part of personality which is repressed in real life for the sake of preserving the oneness of IPersonal identity. The life in real social world obligates to the censorship of those parts of our personality which don’t fit with our “character”. In virtual reality the dynamic interactions between our digital “persona” and the virtual others enacts the psychoanalytical encounter of the ISelf being, virtually constructed and under deep scrutiny, with the “real” Self. “The essence of this self is not unitary, nor are its parts stable entities. It is easy to cycle through its aspects and these are themselves changing though constant communication with each other.”<sup>12</sup> The virtual infinite dynamic of these aspects of the new ISelf leads to a multiple drafts structure of Me-Self. It is not based anymore on a stable, continuous and well-structured system of beliefs and experiences, but by a dynamic, fluid succession of different “explanations” of the lived events, which are continuous affected by subsequent events. As consequence, the conscious state is a relentless re-interpretation of these “explanations” of lived events affecting what we believe we believed. The brain has, at a given time, multiple “explanations/interpretations/understandings” at his disposal and chooses on the criteria of most suitable at that moment. “The Multiple Drafts model makes

---

9 Cover Rob, *Digital Identities: Creating and Communicating the Online Self*, Academic Press, 2015, p. x.

10 Foucault Michel, *Technologies of the Self*, University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

11 George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

12 Sherry Turkle, *Life on the Screen*, Simon and Schuster, 2011, p. 261.

«writing it down» in memory criterial for consciousness; that is what it is for the «given» to be «taken» — to be taken one way rather than another. There is no reality of conscious experience independent of the effects of various vehicles of content on subsequent action (and hence, of course, on memory).»<sup>13</sup>

This still controversial view on consciousness in general is very suitable to describe the tendency in Self-identity structure of present digital generations. In the virtual world, the individual has a multiple version of self-identity, can choose among them more freely than in physical world and has more liberty to express them. Some are optimistic about this new non-unitary sense of ISelf. “A more fluid sense of self allows a greater capacity for acknowledge diversity. It makes it easier to accept the array of our (and other’s) inconsistent personae.”<sup>14</sup> The acknowledgement of the own multiplicity and limitations should make someone to be more tolerant for accepting incompleteness and differences of the many in ourselves and others. Unfortunately, it seems that the negative consequences are more readily enabled than possible positive outcomes. The life in multicultural settings and crowded diversity makes people rather to become passive-tolerant and prone to develop a civilized indifference instead of openness and acceptance for the difference or for active involvement in common issues. “Our current sense of self is no more sustainable than our current use of energy or technology.”<sup>15</sup> But what could be the cause for this situation?

### **The psychoanalysis of ISelf**

The multilayered anthropic reality - physical-sensorial, social-relational and cognitive-informational - requires and is represented by different modes or levels of consciousness impossible to be deducted one from the other.<sup>16</sup> The human being tri-unitary constitution<sup>17</sup> involves a ternary aspect of the Self: the physical-driven Self, social-driven-Self and informational-driven Self. The growth of digital influence on our lives implies massive changes in our social and informational Self(s). The shift from face-to-face interaction to technological mediated interactions in concert with the shift from linguistic discourse to image-based and digital created culture deeply affects our very sense of Self.

In digital settings, the ISelf becomes interactional and relational as ever, but these formative relationships are also more insubstantial, shallow and artificial. The meaningful social interactions decrease and the face-to-face individual interaction lessen their formative power. The ISelf is in the most part other-directed. The early exposure to media and digital socializing practices hinders the formation of a strong Super-Ego, a personal moral guardian required for an inner-directed personality. “What is common to all other-directeds is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual – either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through mass-media. This source is of course «internalized» in the sense that dependence on it for guidance in life is implanted early.”<sup>18</sup> As a result, the classical psychic structure revealed by psychoanalysis is gradually changed in the sense that the Individual Super-Ego of inner-directed generations is increasingly replaced by the collective Super-ego of collective IBrain. Subsequently, the neurotic process of alienating qualities specific for inner-directed people - the transference of good and bad qualities that

---

13 Daniel C. Dennett, *Consciousness Explained*, Little, Brown & Co., 1991, p. 132.

14 Sherry Turkle, *Life on the Screen*, Simon and Schuster, 2011, p. 261-262.

15 Derrick Jensen, *Endgame*, Volume 1, Seven Stories Press, 2006, Premise 18, p. xii.

16 Basarab Nicolescu, *Ce este realitatea? (What is reality?)*; Junimea Publishing House, București, 2009.

17 Bogdan Popoveniuc, *Curs de Antropologie Filosofică (Philosophical Anthropology Course)*, “Ștefan cel Mare” University of Suceava Publishing house, 2008.

18 David Riesman; Nathan Glazer; Reuel Denney, *The lonely crowd*, Yale University Press, 1950, p. 22.

individual feels he can't express, from the self onto others<sup>19</sup> - is changing in a countertransference process and the self becomes self-contradictory (in time). This happens because the pressure exerted by individual Super-Ego, that hinder inner-directed individuals to manifest some of its good or bad qualities, is replaced by the resistance of collective Super-Ego, in which the individuals already projected his own despises (qualities he doesn't want to express) and loves (qualities he wish he could). As consequences, the interiorized model to which the individual strives is already contradictory and shifting (fashioned). Given the situation it is difficult for the digital native to find at least a sort of quasi-consistent a pattern for linking these identities. We have the possibility to be "too many" in the same time and with a sequential endurance and that makes us to be "no one". When you are too many, you are no one.

### **Technological colonization**

It seems that the present state of humanity looks dare. The technological system makes us more powerful than ever. We have capacity to make things which in the past were reserved only for the gods. "To the ancients, unleashing a storm, healing the sick, leveling a city, or foretelling the future would have been ample demonstrations of divinity. Now, having seen equivalent powers in Metaman, we might inquire how the «miracles» were performed rather than falling to our knees. Flight, television, a corneal transplant that restores sight, even high explosives would have once been considered godlike. Now we take them for granted. Knowing more, seeing more, having greater powers than any who have gone before, we – through Metaman – have in a sense become as gods. And yet we are «gods» only in the limited terms of early humans, because Metaman's emergence is giving us an awareness of the true enormity and power of the universe (...) We can now contemplate the prospect of one day moving beyond the «natural» conditions of hunger, disease, and perhaps even death itself."<sup>20</sup>

The man-made reality has transformed, in time, in a veritable Meta-reality that partially replaced the natural world. It directs and design humanity's will, as solely the laws of nature did in the past, to its own ends through technological development, market forces, political regulations, and cultural progress. The Metaman humanity is becoming a new self-programming system, both artificial and natural, that gradually escapes control, gains (relative) autonomy over its own existence and evolution by multifaceted and various cybernetic collective mechanisms as national and international rules and regulation on food, water or reproduction, systems of resources' exploitation, production, distribution of good and ideas and so on. This new neutral superior entity, subliminally replaces the previous conceptions in Gods. As consequence, the past strong moral function of religious beliefs in super-entities vanishes. But without such a belief a rational individual conduct is uncontrollable and become easily noxious for the collective harmony. Nor it can be different as long as a rational perspective limited to life-span length could not support sound arguments for an unselfish and open attitude to the masses.

### **The problem of moral**

The past conception on Gog is not sufficient at this stage of technological development anymore because it can't sustain the individual sense of common responsibility for our world. If I believe in the existence of a God which watches over the Earth, I am tend to entrust in its infinite wisdom and let the world to perish because I don't feel responsible for it. I only should have a proper behavior and the rest of the job will be done by that deity. Of course, I can have a

---

19 Snell Putney and Gail J. Putney, *Adjusted American: Normal Neuroses in the Individual and Society*, 1964.

20 Gregory Stock, *Metaman; The Merging of Humans and Machines into a Global Superorganism*, Doubleday Canada, Limited, 1993, p. 244-45.

pessimistic religious vision where the God let the world to perish, because it its sinful inhabitants doesn't deserve salvation. But the feeling of appurtenance to a superior entity, something greater than my mundane level of living, remains mandatory for promoting collective responsibility, but not in this form. Such belief is the necessary prerequisite for attaining a collective state of self-transcendence and constructive self-actualization reachable now only for a few. The political ideologies are also less efficient because they don't enforce the feeling of individual responsibility for the sake of collective. The failure of communism, the most humanitarian and egalitarian doctrine in theory, is a decisive argument.

The problem rests in the divergence between our moral drives inoculated by our biological nature and moral insights resulted from our cultural nature of superior beings nurtured in self-created technological settings. Our limited moral abilities were nurtured by hundreds thousands years of living in small communities, struggling for surviving as beings less endowed with suited anatomical features and natural skills for living in wilderness. As a result, we naturally developed a *casual individualistic defensive moral* which prone us to protect ourselves against loses; *with a small-size space-time scope*, i.e. limited to a small circle of family, friends and similar individuals and on short-timed application; and which is *triggered only by our direct deeds and causal individual outcomes*.<sup>21</sup> This primitive moral is no longer fitted for a species living in an over-technologized world. And it could not be changed by will through bio-enhancement, because this will means only to increase the existential risks that it supposed to prevent.<sup>22</sup> The technological progress brought unforeseen existential risks, just because the technological evolution is only partially predictable, and using a technological solution for preventing a structural imbalance for technological destruction is like putting the wolf to guard the sheep. "Problems cannot be solved with the same mindset that created them."<sup>23</sup> And it is insane to bet on winning the "technological gambit"<sup>24</sup> – that capacity of ICTs to bring benefits and restore the damages and negative outcomes of technological growth activity will develop before techno-humanity reaches the point of irreversible return to ecosystem balance – because of the unpredictability of technological progress.<sup>25</sup> We can't solve the problems brought by technology using sheer technology.

In order to save ourselves from the spell of technological sleep we have to change our mentality and develop a rational belief in the transcendent, but not supernatural, being that comprise all of us. And the idea of Collective IBrain is a self-enforcing concept with positive outcome.<sup>26</sup> *It is probable the only ideology able to help humanity to survive*. Only if someone believes he is a part of the collective being of IBrain, the modern version of animism, could feel and think as he is in reality: fully responsible for the sake of the entire world. Such a conviction, if is to be educated from a tender age, could overcome the vestigial natural moral inherited from our ancestors. All three moral shortages mentioned above are solved by the proper ICollective mentality. At this moment, our individualistic small scale view on moral and existential responsibility prevents us to adopt a proactive stance for seeking benefits, instead of protecting

---

21 Ingmar Persson, Julian Savulescu, *Unfit for the Future: The Need for Moral Enhancement*, OUP, Oxford, 2012.

22 Bogdan Popoveniuc, "Bio-ameliorareamorală,"(*Moral Bio-enhancement*) in Teodor N. Țârdea (ed.), *Strategia supraviețuirii din perspective bioeticii, filosofiei și medicinei*, Culegere de articole științifice cu participare internațională, vol. 22, CEP Medicina, Chișinău, 2016, pp. 31-35. (ISBN978-9975-82-023-3).

23 Albert Einstein.

24 Luciano Floridi, *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*, OUP Oxford, 2014.

25 Huesemann Michael, Huesemann Joyce, *Techno-Fix: Why Technology Won't Save Us Or the Environment*, New Society Publishers, 2011

26 Bogdan Popoveniuc, *Filosofia Singularității. Creierul global, o etică a gândirii fără om (The Philosophy of Singularity. The Global Brain, an Ethic of Thinking without Human)*, Eikon, București, 2016.

for loses, not even for ourselves as individuals. We prefer to protect ourselves against loses and not to struggle for improving our own condition let alone the collective enhancement. An individual with a strong ICollective belief is living (with) the conviction that his actions for the sake of collective being are redound on the improving of his individual condition. As consequences, the individual is encouraged to act in the benefit of impalpable humanity for increasing his own well-being. Likewise, the belief in the reality of IBrain is accompanied by the feeling of sameness with all humans and responsibility for the fate of the entire human species. It extends the capacity, or at least the effort, for empathy with all people, in the absence of which multicultural perspective, open-mind, solidarity are only empty words. The felt relationship with a collective IBrain, the feeling of appurtenance to something bigger, that “living” entity to which the individual owes its existence, expand the temporal scale of moral judgment in both directions. It rises the sense of responsibility for preserving its historical heritage, which has become now his own identity, and for the distant future of his species and following generations. I am thinking sometimes, that in our present delicate global situation, the humans desperately needs to find about extraterrestrial existence of life. Of course, the “realist” writers and movie directors usually envision this encounter through the same glasses of our primitive moral, depicting this advance civilization as alien, “stranger” which have to be mistrusted, offensive, and dangerous. But I also reasonable presume that this image is less probable. A sufficient advanced civilization able to master the technology for exploring the immensity of cosmic space should also poses a high level of superior positive or constructive moral sense, if it was able to survive to its own technological evolution, a threshold that humanity is not able to pass at this moment.<sup>27</sup> On its social dimension, our present civilization is structured on the stark hierarchy of those in power (brute and military forced in the past, by financial fortunes a technological superiority nowadays), and can be never sustainable. The justices, moral and civilized rules for human conduct are based almost entirely on economic incentives. The economic drives determine the social decisions on the basis if these decisions increase the assets, the power, and the right to increase and reassure the power and possessions of the decision-makers and those they serve at the expenses of those bellow.<sup>28</sup> Even the technological progress is driven and controlled by economic principles and this hinders the possibility of an earthly beneficial outcome. “Technological society, during the past half-century, has demonstrably not achieved the benefits it advertised for itself. Peace, security, public and planetary health, sanity, happiness, fulfillment are arguably less close at hand than they ever were in the past.”<sup>29</sup> The technological religion of science disappointed its expectations. The belief in Collective IBrain could successfully overthrow the present hidden cultural reality of entirely economic incentive of human action. In such perspective the exploitation of those bellow and the abuse of natural world could not be justifiable any longer.

And for the third problem of causal responsibility enforcing the conviction of collective IBrain reality is also vital. The sense of responsibility was already dramatically diminished by the life in over-crowded communities where the effect of diffusion of responsibility is at home.<sup>30</sup>

---

27 Here I could be listed the countless arguments brought by those who envisage the technological apocalypse and existential risks of future technological advancement. See, for example, Nick Bostrom, Milan M. Cirkovic (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks*, OUP Oxford, 2011.

28 Derrick Jensen, *Endgame*, Volume 1, Seven Stories Press, 2006.

29 Jerry Mander, *In the Absence of the Sacred. The Failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, 1991, p. 190.

30 See the “bystander effect” or “Genovese syndrome”, named after the case of 28-year-old American woman Kitty Genovese who was raped and stabbed to death outside her apartment building on March 13, 1964, and no one from the 37 or 38 witnesses who saw or heard the attack did not call the police.

The existence in the second life of digital world threatens this sense of responsibility up to its total disappearance. “In the physical embodied world, we have no choice but to assume responsibility for our body actions. (...) The possibilities inherent in virtuality, on the other hand, may provide some people with the excuse for irresponsibility.”<sup>31</sup> Of course, the virtual reality could enhance and enable expression of concealed sides of people personality and improve their creativity and personal development, but this is sustainable only if the dark side of the digital social-interactions is dominated by meaningful personal responsibility. Digital technologies decreased the sense of moral, or at least civic, responsibility from real world by enhancing the illusion of worth civic (passive) participation in social-networks.

### **From transactional to relational moral**

We witness to the nurture of a new ISelf or at least the increasing prevalence of other-related part of the Self within the personal identity. The belief in IBrain, as a metaphor or sheer reality, is not other thing than recognizing our relational way of living and this is a fact. We are relational beings living in a tight interconnectedness with all others. We have to assume that situation or pretend (!) to ignore it. The first stance means to be actively engaged, to ground our decision from a collective perspective, being altruist, kind and open. Being relational means living in relation to others in recognition of the essential interconnectedness with them. It means that in our interactions with others to be engaged, centered, grounded, clear, generous, humble and kind. Behind this attitude is not only the fact to meet the expectations of the others, as in traditional communities, but much more than meets the eye. As long as the loose individual Super-Ego is replaced by Collective Super-Ego the moral stance shifts from to *live according to* the moral principles, to *live the* moral principles.

The relational stance on life is opposed to transactional way of living. In the former case the emphasis falls on the results of these relations, in the latter on the relation(s) itself. The dreadful state of the modern world was due to this transactional approach to life. The ecological disaster is the result of industrial transactional relation with the nature: we want to get maximum for ourselves from natural resources. The world wealth imbalance between those small parts who have too much for living and those larger parts who suffer from hunger and poverty is due to market transactional approach of economic and political relations. It is time to understand that the human mind is a manifestation of (formative) relationships and, as consequence, the collective IMind should exist, no matter if we can't conceive it or not. The organism exists even the independent cells can't perceive it and is unaware of its existence. The individuality of the modern Self is like a body-cell that started to live by itself within the organism. But when the cells begin to multiply indefinitely and stimulate their own growth by abnormal metabolic pathways; evading the immune system; resist to programmed cell death and inhibitory signals that might otherwise stop their growth; invade local tissue and spread all over the space they change in malignant tumor.<sup>32</sup> The modern individual ISelf proliferates uncontrollable and chaotic in the resourceful economic and technological environment. It has the means for overstimulating the growth of its needs and many abnormal modes to satisfy them; it puts all the knowledge into the service of its own comfort and spreads its counterproductive triviality indefinite; withstands to the signals that hints its wrongness and hides its social futility from the others. It has no sense of its appurtenance to the wholeness of collective living reality that makes

---

31 Sherry Turkle, *Life on the Screen*, Simon and Schuster, 2011, p. 254.

32 See Douglas Hanahan; Robert A. Weinberg, „The hallmarks of cancer”. *Cell* 100 (1) (January 7, 2000): 57-70 and D. Hanahan; R. A. Weinberg, „Hallmarks of Cancer: The Next Generation”. *Cell* 144 (5) (2011): 646-674.



it possible and nurtures it. Coincidence or not, but these features are the hallmarks of a (psycho-social) cancer.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Basarab Nicolescu, *Ce este realitatea? (What is reality?)* Junimea Publishing House, București, 2009.
2. Baudrillard Jean, *Simulacra & Simulation. The Precession of Simulacra*, University of Michigan Press, 1994.
3. Bloom Howard, *Creierul global. Evoluția inteligenței planetare de la Big Bang până în secolul al XXI-lea*, Editura Tehnica, 2008.
4. Bogdan Popoveniuc, *Filosofia Singularității. Creierul global, o etică a gândirii fără om (The Philosophy of Singularity. The Global Brain, an Ethic of Thinking without Human)*, București: Eikon, 2016
5. Bostrom Nick, Cirkovic Milan M. (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks*, OUP Oxford, 2011.
6. Churchland Paul, *The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul: A Philosophical Journey into the Brain*, MIT Press, 1996.
7. Cover Rob, *Digital Identities: Creating and Communicating the Online Self*, Academic Press, 2015.
8. Cover Rob, *Digital Identities: Creating and Communicating the Online Self*, Academic Press, 2015, p. x.
9. Dennett Daniel C., *Consciousness Explained*, Little, Brown & Co., 1991.
10. Foucault Michel, *Technologies of the Self*, University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.
11. Hanahan D.; Weinberg Robert A. „Hallmarks of Cancer: The Next Generation,” *Cell* 144 (5) (2011): 646-674.
12. Hanahan Douglas; Weinberg Robert A. „The hallmarks of cancer,” *Cell* 100 (1) (January 7, 2000): 57-70.
13. Heim Michael, *The Metaphysics of Virtual Reality*, Chap. *The Essence of VR*, New York: OUP, 1993: 109-128.
14. Huesemann Michael, Huesemann Joyce, *Techno-Fix: Why Technology Won't Save Us Or the Environment*, New Society Publishers, 2011.
15. Jensen Derrick, *Endgame*, Volume 1, Seven Stories Press, 2006, Premise 18.
16. Kellner Douglas, *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and the Post-modern*, Routledge, 2003, p. 233.
17. Lévy Pierre, *Collective Intelligence: Mankind's Emerging World in Cyberspace*, Plenum Trade, 1997.
18. Mander Jerry, *In the Absence of the Sacred. The Failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, 1991.
19. Maslow Abraham, *The farther reaches of human nature*, New York: Viking, 1971.
20. Mead George Herbert, *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
21. Persson Ingmar, Savulescu Julian, *Unfit for the Future: The Need for Moral Enhancement*, OUP, Oxford, 2012.
22. Popoveniuc Bogdan, “Bio-ameliorareamorală,” (Moral bio-enhancement) in Teodor N. Țârdea (ed.), *Strategia supraviețuirii din perspective bioeticii, filosofiei și medicinei*,

- Culegere de articole științifice cu participare internațională, vol. 22, CEP Medicina, Chișinău, 2016, pp. 31-35. (ISBN978-9975-82-023-3).
23. Putney Snell and Putney Gail J., *Adjusted American: Normal Neuroses in the Individual and Society*, 1964.
  24. Riesman David; Nathan Glazer; Reuel Denney, *The lonely crowd*, Yale University Press, 1950, p. 22.
  25. Sloman Steven, Fernbach Philip, *The Knowledge Illusion: Why We Never Think Alone*, Penguin, 2017.
  26. Small Gary Gigi Vorgan, *iBrain: Surviving the Technological Alteration of the Modern Mind*, Harper Collins, 2009.
  27. Small Gary, Vorgan Gigi, *iBrain: Surviving the Technological Alteration of the Modern Mind*, Harper Collins, 2009.
  28. Stock Gregory, *Metaman; The Merging of Humans and Machines into a Global Superorganism*, Doubleday Canada, Limited, 1993.
  29. The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul: A Philosophical Journey.
  30. Turkle Sherry, *Life on the Screen*, Simon and Schuster, 2011.
  31. Žižekin Slavoj, “Slavoj Zizek: The Reality of the Virtual” (2006), documentary movie directed by Ben Wright.