Homo Hecmateus and the Ontology of Post-Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Framework Beyond Homo Sapiens and Homo Noeticus

Orhan Oğuz Yilmaz *

Posted Date: 10 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

Keywords: posthumanism; responsibility; Homo Technologicus; ethics; surveillance capitalism; speculative philosophy; inner governance; digital responsibility; inner governance; philosophy of technology; Homo Hecmateus; technological ethics

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

Article

Homo Hecmateus and the Ontology of Post-Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Framework Beyond *Homo sapiens* and Homo Noeticus

Orhan Oğuz Yilmaz

Independent Researcher; orhanoguzyilmaz@hotmail.com

Abstract: This article introduces *Homo Hecmateus* as a philosophical archetype that confronts the ontological and ethical crises of the algorithmic age. In contrast to the figure of *Homo Technologicus*, who is shaped by optimization, external control, and surveillance capitalism, *Homo Hecmateus* embodies a model of inner governance rooted in ethical coherence, responsibility, and wisdom. Through a spiral model of transformation—knowledge, responsibility, experience, and wisdom—the article draws on thinkers such as Spinoza, Hans Jonas, and Donna Haraway to articulate a framework of post-human ethics. The paper also employs speculative fiction to allegorize the consequences of ethical failure through a Mars-based parable. In this fictional epilogue, a technologically advanced society collapses under the weight of its inner contradictions, only to begin again in subterranean exile—an arc that mirrors Walter Benjamin's image of history and Ursula K. Le Guin's fractured utopias. Ultimately, the study proposes that humanity's future does not hinge on its technological capacity, but on its ability to develop an archetype that unites cognition with conscience. *Homo Hecmateus* is thus offered not as a prophecy, but as a proposition: a possible path forward for an age confronting its own ethical obsolescence.

Keywords: posthumanism; responsibility; Homo Technologicus; ethics; surveillance capitalism; speculative philosophy; inner governance; digital responsibility; inner governance; philosophy of technology; Homo Hecmateus; technological ethics

I. Introduction: Beyond Intelligence, Towards Ethical Archetypes

Human history is not merely a biological evolution; it is also a process of mental and spiritual transformation. This evolutionary journey begins with the upright posture of the body, expands through knowledge, deepens through consciousness, and ultimately reaches completion through wisdom. Every era gives birth to its own human archetype; and every archetype builds a world that reflects its own truth[1].

The first form of human, Homo Erectus, was the first being to walk upright on Earth. No longer clinging to the ground with all four limbs, it rose onto two feet. This shift allowed it to gaze at the horizon, observe its surroundings, and sense a distinction between itself and nature. Yet it remained tied to the soil, to the hunt, to fire, and to shelter. Its consciousness was confined to its body—focused on survival, reproduction, and protection from danger. At this stage, humanity experienced its existence only in a biological sense. Over time, consciousness expanded, and Homo Sapiens emerged. Now, human beings could speak, think, name things, create mythologies, write, and build societies and institutions. They accessed knowledge, gathered data, and constructed systems. But as

[1] This corresponds to what Michel Foucault described as an *epistemological rupture*, where dominant forms of knowledge reorganize how reality is perceived and structured (Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 1966).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

knowledge grew, wisdom waned. Humanity, in knowing more, began to lose meaning — buried beneath the very structures it had created.[2]

As Homo Sapiens seeks to understand itself, it grows increasingly estranged from its own essence. For this species, truth begins with recognition—but often, it ends with the illusion of having known. In response to this knowledge-heavy yet spiritually diminished stage, a new human type begins to emerge: Homo Noeticus. This being turns toward intuition, awareness, and higher states of consciousness. They meditate, turn inward, and attempt to resonate with the cosmos. Their mental and spiritual capacities expand—but this ascent often remains an individual pursuit. As Homo Noeticus falls in love with their own inner light, they lose sight of the collective. The more they retreat into themselves, the more distant they become from others' suffering.[3] They shine like solitary stars—radiant, but without warmth.

Each of these human archetypes is the outcome of vast cultural and cognitive transformations, unfolding over thousands of years. The most enduring systems that shape humanity are not built of stone or fortified with steel. True power resides beyond physical boundaries—nested within invisible yet potent constructs embedded in thought. For centuries, humanity has been molded by abstract forms of domination, discursive, ritual, and ideological mechanisms. Ideas planted through faith, fear, and belonging havetrained individuals to internalize their own confinement.

These transformations in human archetypes are not isolated developments but resonate with broader philosophical insights—from Foucault's epistemic breaks to Wilber's integral stages and Harari's reflections on the future of cognition.

II. Homo Sapiens to Homo Hecmateus: An Evolution in Responsibility

By wisdom, we do not mean a mystical inner journey as depicted in ancient traditions, wherein the self seeks only its own essence. Thus, the system endures without overt coercion. Kings, priests, warriors, and merchants are merely visible actors. The real force lies with the architects of thought—those who design imagined structures and fabricate illusions so convincingly that they feel more real than material reality itself.

These figures are as elusive as the "invisible hand" described in Keynesian economics, and as omnipresent as "Big Brother" in Orwell's 1984. They do not occupy a central throne, nor do they bear any clearly identifiable form. And yet, their influence quietly lingers behind every decision, every act of consent. At this current threshold, the structures that merely change their shell while maintaining their core not only persist—but also impose upon the evolving human a newly engineered sense of "self." This aligns with Agamben's notion of a community not built on static identities but on shared potentiality—what he calls *a coming community* in which belonging precedes classification (Agamben, *The Coming Community*, 1993)[4]. Perhaps that is why, as I write these lines, a question echoes within me: are these thoughts truly mine, or merely reverberations of an unseen mind that compelled me to write? Am I the subject of my own consciousness, or merely the scribe of another's ideas?

When Prometheus, the bringer of light, stole fire from the gods, he did not simply gift humanity with warmth or illumination—he delivered a spark of awareness, a torch of will. At first glance, his act appears to be a symbol of defiance and liberation. But perhaps it was also a calculated move within the gods' larger design. For this stolen fire brought not only empowerment, but also

[2] As Harari notes in *Homo Deus*, the human pursuit of intelligence enhancement often precedes any ethical reflection on its consequences, risking a collapse of meaning beneath the weight of data accumulation (Harari, 2016).

[3] This trajectory echoes Ken Wilber's integral model, in which personal spiritual realization must be integrated with social, ecological, and cognitive dimensions to constitute a higher stage of consciousness (Wilber, *Integral Psychology*, 2000).

[4] Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community*, trans. Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

punishment. And in gaining a scapegoat, the gods found a way to transfer blame for all evils. Yet even if ensnared, Prometheus still acted with intention. He moved. Humanity, on the other hand, chose not to ignite its own flame, but to follow torches lit by others.

Lacking the courage to draw its own path, humanity thus defeated Prometheus a second time. The individual who relinquishes thought also loses foresight, forfeiting the ability to envision what is yet to come. This tendency echoes what Byung-Chul Han describes as the systemic exclusion of the Other, where algorithmic systems flatten difference and isolate the subject within a feedback loop of self-similarity (Han, *The Expulsion of the Other*, 2016)[5]. Others began thinking in their place. The mind dulled, then withered. Trapped within zones of comfort, humans came to mistake contentment for truth—falling victim to a well-crafted illusion. In this way, the Earth ceased to be a realm for thinkers, and instead became a prison built of invisible walls. The Tower of Etamenanki, the temple of the Babylon, once a structure raised skyward by human hands, now rises not in brick but in layers within the human mind—reduced to an object. What was once a tower of aspiration now serves as a cosmic timepiece, keeping rhythm not just for history, but for the unfolding of entire ages.

In the Age of Pisces, souls navigated through intuition, guided by prophets and sages, advancing under the light of sacred texts. Today, however, those hazy intuitions have been replaced by the cold rationality of the Age of Aquarius. The god of this era no longer requires prophets, for the reign of dogma has ended and the era of data has begun. Mystics who once heralded epochal transitions have given way to CEOs shaping the future from the temples of Silicon Valley. The holy book of this new age is not yet complete, but its verses are already being written transhumanism, universal basic income, post-cash economy…

Yet these texts are not written for humanity, but despite it. The walls are woven from code; the towers built from algorithms; their mortar mixed with invisible frequencies. These frequencies, like blood flowing through human veins, course through the arteries of the world—except now, they carry not blood, but data. Just like ancient temples, the new ones elevate even as they degrade. They sanctify data but surrender thought to automation. As the possibility of machine consciousness is debated, the authorship of the age's revelation—like the old revelations before it—remains unquestioned.

For those who question, finding a "doorway" to make a difference has become an inescapable necessity. Yet to find the right key that opens this door, one must first peel away the veils obscuring the architecture of the new age. Since the dawn of civilization, societies have been ruled through the metaphor of a god beyond human comprehension. In the Sumerian city-states, gods lived among the people; in Babylon, kings ruled in their name. Prophets and spiritual leaders called themselves shepherds, and society, without protest, accepted the role of the flock. This order, in various forms, endured through the end of the Age of Pisces. And yet, despite its manipulations, this process also brought undeniable achievements to humanity.

The technological comfort we enjoy today is the result of the desires of the modern human who, through transhumanism, artificial intelligence, and consciousness transfer projects, seeks immortality. These desires, when combined with the inertia of the masses, have become a kind of whip—driving civilization forward on their backs to the point it has now reached. Millennia of exploitation have allowed certain minds the time to think more deeply, leading to a cumulative body of knowledge. Though ethically questionable and structurally unjust, this process has ultimately left behind a legacy that may open new doors for humanity. Now, humanity stands at the threshold not only of a new era, but potentially of a new species.

Gods will no longer descend from the heavens; instead, they will upload their consciousness to orbiting satellites and descend to earth as "updates." When the body dies, the data will be downloaded again and uploaded into a pre-prepared new body. This possibility suggests not a utopia, but a fragile future always on the verge of becoming a dystopia. The mortal desire for eternal

[5] *Byung-Chul Han, The Expulsion of the Other: Society, Perception and Communication Today (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016).*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

life is no longer confined to mythology—it has become a tangible item in investment portfolios. If these ambitions are realized one by one, immortality will become accessible only to a select elite through mind uploading and body engineering. Those who can convert their minds into data and replicate themselves will, over time, gain an overwhelming advantage in knowledge, experience, and accumulated lifetimes.

Moreover, the masses have already begun residing in digital cities. Projects like Songdo in South Korea and Neom in Saudi Arabia are not just architectural or technological innovations; they are prototypes of a digital surveillance regime where every movement is tracked by sensors and every decision is shaped by algorithms. To reside in these cities is not just to live in a building—it is to surrender to a lifestyle where invisible algorithms make choices on your behalf.

Even before stepping into these digital cities physically, people have already mentally settled in: the new generation, spending most of their day on virtual platforms and socializing through avatars, has already become their inhabitants. A new human type has emerged—one who exists not in lived reality but on screens, whose existence is validated by online metrics. Systems like China's social credit score further emphasize the dystopian face of this transformation. The obedient citizen is no longer simply one who follows rules, but one whose behavior aligns with algorithmic ethics. Thus, the cities of this new era are becoming digital temples built of data, and humanity, in turn, is transforming into digital worshippers—simultaneously surveilled and devotional.

As can be seen, the human of the new age is no longer molded from clay, but from code. Digital dwellers now outnumber the archetypes of earlier humanity in terms of virtual population. Each platform to which they belong operates like a mega-corporation, setting its own laws, agendas, and moral frameworks under the guise of "community guidelines." The human is no longer the subject of the system, but an object shaped by algorithms and defined through data. Clicks, likes, comments, and purchasing habits form digital traces that generate cognitive maps. These maps scan everything from planetary movements and biological rhythms to personal interests and psychological profiles, dictating what content you should see and when.

Algorithms do not just manage data—they manage emotions. They decide not only what you see but how you feel when you see it. As Sherry Turkle warns, the rise of emotionally reactive interfaces paradoxically creates isolated selves—*alone together* in a space where intimacy is simulated but not lived (Turkle, *Alone Together*, 2011). Life is no longer a divine gift or a universal miracle; it has been reduced to a line item on a digital ledger. Sin is no longer a moral deviation but a glitch in the system; virtue is no longer about intention, but about metrics—likes, star ratings, and comment volume. In the digital world, virtue is limited to how the algorithm perceives you. Those who succeed become visible; those who fall behind are quietly discarded—like emails lost to a spam folder.

Reaching the masses today is nearly impossible, much unlike the days when revolutionaries would ignite crowds in public squares. The crowds of today prefer searching over understanding—yet what is to be searched is also determined by algorithms. Even the seeker no longer decides what they seek; for even desire is now shaped by data analytics and trend predictions. The invisible architects of the digital age shape not only the content, but also the intention behind seeking it.

Add to this comfort zone—where minds are sent off to drift in oblivion—a promise of "Universal Basic Income" (UBI), and humanity's passivity appears almost inevitable. What initially seems like a freedom offering quickly risks turning into a freedom illusion. After all, the last major transformation—the Industrial Revolution—showed us how even the so-called "free individual" could lose their autonomy. The turning of factory wheels did not only produce goods; it mechanized human will.

Therefore, the concept of universal income may become a new loyalty contract in the age of digital welfare. Signing that contract could resemble a kind of digital baptism, a rite of passage into algorithmic citizenship. Especially if the income is offered only through system-regulated platforms and programmable digital currencies (such as CBDCs), the individual ceases to be a decision-making subject and instead becomes a new model citizen, one who feeds the system with data. In such a world, citizenship would no longer rest on rights, but on obedience and algorithmic loyalty.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

The traceability of digital money may yield positive outcomes in areas such as tax evasion prevention or the suppression of illicit income. However, who will control this monitoring mechanism—and within what boundaries—remains unclear. If control is transferred to a unilateral authority, the issue becomes not only economic but also profoundly ethical. Cash is not merely a means of payment; it is the tangible embodiment of individual will, privacy, and intent. A face-to-face transaction, a small allowance given to a child, or a quietly offered donation can all take place without leaving a trace. Invisibility carries risks, but it also offers a space for freedom—not only for the wicked, but for the well-intentioned as well. A fully digitized monetary system may not only prevent abuse; it may also create a surveillance potential that reaches deep into the personal choices of ordinary individuals.

Today, technologies such as blockchain are often presented with promises of security and transparency. Yet the unseen architecture of these systems lays the groundwork for a new form of surveillance. Chains are no longer physical; they have become digital agents—recording users' behaviors, decisions, and long-term tendencies, crafting invisible profiles. These records, originally designed to verify transactions, may gradually evolve into instruments that shape and limit individual preferences. Decisions about which expenditures are deemed appropriate, or when and what can be purchased, may fall under the control of algorithms and system owners. When this occurs, technology no longer fosters freedom, it cultivates dependency.

Unless the system clearly defines when and how it will exercise its control, the sense of trust it offers to society becomes unstable. This erosion of trust affects not only economic realms but also the psychological integrity of individuals. In such a framework, hope is shaped by the system's promises of stability, while fear hides in the arbitrariness of its power. Just as ancient mythologies offered paradise and threatened hell, the digital age offers a wallet full of security alongside a deletable identity. If the promise of transparency turns into the right to intervene, freedom—like in the old myths—retreats quietly; fear prevails, and hope becomes dependent on the system's mercy.

With all these intricate puzzles on the table, identifying the early tremors of the great quake awaiting us requires a careful analysis of the consequences of past transformations. Before the Industrial Revolution, people were either directly enslaved or lived as "free individuals" constantly at risk of enslavement. But with the establishment of assembly lines, the system began to demand hundreds of thousands of bodies—to operate machines, build new cities, expand consumption, and increase the number of consumers. At that point, the concept of "freedom" was repackaged as a marketing strategy. Ideals like democracy, individual rights, and political representation were not ends in themselves; they were motivational tools designed to keep the wheels of the system turning. In truth, no one cared about the vote of a peasant or a worker. What mattered was their voluntary integration into the system.

As the demand for labor intensified in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, mechanisms were developed to encourage voluntary participation. In this context, the ideals of freedom and democracy initially sprouted in intellectual circles but soon evolved into instruments of mass manipulation. The right to vote, offered to the public, was not a genuine avenue for influence but rather a mechanism to create the illusion of agency and participation.

The few who attempted to stand outside this system—those in the questioning minority—sought to respond by formulating theories, ideologies, and alternative structures. Yet even their aim was often less about transforming the masses and more about securing a place for themselves in the new order. Meanwhile, the majority of society, swept along by these ideas, unknowingly walked into another trap: freedom gradually became the chain itself. The individual was reshaped into a more efficient, more compliant, and more easily monitored cog in the machine. Over time, freedom became an unquestioned loyalty; the chains became one's new reality.

In the process we are now undergoing—nearly complete—the era of "freedom defined by the ability to escape" has come to an end. It has been replaced by a manufactured illusion of freedom, framed by obligations and responsibilities. The intent of this transformation can be understood through the functional role animals have historically played within systemic logic. During World

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

War I, millions of horses were used on the battlefield. By World War II, tanks and motorized vehicles rendered them obsolete. The horse was not banned or exiled; it simply became unnecessary. A similar fate has begun to apply to humans in the post-industrial world. Fordist production required mechanical labor to keep the lines moving.

Thus, a temporary value was assigned to the human being. But as competition intensified, the human ceased to be a resource and instead became a risk to be managed. On one hand, freedom was marketed; on the other, population growth was encouraged—because the system needed bodies to keep its wheels turning. Yet the Industrial Revolution was only a precursor tremor. Once the current transformation reaches its culmination, humans—much like the horses of an earlier era—may be quietly removed from the system. And this removal may happen so gradually that it remains unnoticed. The architects of the new age are constructing a system designed to keep the individual preoccupied: one in which the human no longer holds a central role but continues to feel as though they do.

To decipher the mental codes of these architects, one need only look at the film industry. In the cinematic portrayals of the American dream, there was once a glorification of large families, multi-child nuclear households, and dinner tables graced with prayers to Jesus. These scenes were not merely nostalgic imagery; they were visual propaganda aligned with the demographic structure the system needed at the time.

Today, however, the screen is populated by solitary individuals, minimalist living spaces, relationships without fixed identities, and unions driven by consumption rather than production. Modern media no longer promotes belonging but mobility, not continuity but momentary encounters. This aesthetic shift is, in fact, a reflection of a deeper transformation in the system's demographic priorities. A large population is no longer a benefit for production but a burden for administration. As automation, artificial intelligence, and digital logistics reduce the need for human labor to a minimum, reproduction is no longer an investment in the future—it has become a parameter to be managed. The next station on this trajectory is transhumanism, which seeks not only to enhance biology, but to merge it with technology.

Transhumanism is not a modern utopia that appeared overnight, but rather the continuation of a long and deliberate transformation. Beginning with eyeglasses, progressing through contact lenses, and refined by laser surgery, the chain of interventions has gradually redefined the human body. What started as applications aimed at improving quality of life have now evolved into a vision that seeks not just to extend life, but to convert the human being from a biological entity into a digitally engineered project. In this vision, the body is viewed as hardware, the mind as upgradable software, and the human as a potential to be processed through data. However, this transformation—despite its capabilities—carries the risk of eroding ethical orientation, privacy, inner meaning, and the freedom of personal will.

Moreover, this transformation is not confined to the evolution of technical instruments; it also compels a comprehensive shift in social structures, political authority, and ethical norms. Concepts such as transhumanism, universal basic income, artificial intelligence, and automation are neither definitive prescriptions for salvation nor simplistic tools of damnation. The real question lies in identifying the needs these concepts were created to address—and the fears through which they have been legitimized. On the surface, these transformations appear to be driven by the human desire for comfort and efficiency. Yet beneath that surface lies a deeper existential impulse: the fear of annihilation embedded in death itself. Equally important is the scrutiny of what hopes are embedded in these technologies, and which promises are unconsciously internalized as motivating myths. The desire for a longer, healthier, and more controllable life may appear irresistibly attractive—but if the process of transformation slips from humanity's own hands, it risks reducing the human into a passive figure. The fundamental question is this: Are we shaping the transformation by our own will—or have we become an algorithm within the transformation itself?

It seems this age, like all that preceded it, will also give rise to its own flood. Yet this time, the flood may not descend from the heavens but rather emerge from networks of data. In fact, evidence

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

suggests we are already submerged in such a deluge: the most celebrated rituals of this era are not thinking, not questioning, and glorifying dispossession. The current of this age flows not with water, but with numbers. If humanity fails to recognize its position and act accordingly, it will continue to be consumed by the tide of data. To survive this flood, we must abandon submission and idolatry in favor of thought, production, and the pursuit of wisdom.

Thus, Homo Hecmateus is not the product of genetic mutation or technological upgrade, but the result of an ethical reconstitution of human consciousness—an existential refusal to be reduced to mere systems logic. When this understanding is embraced as an ethical responsibility, the path will open from Homo Noeticus whose search remained personal, toward Homo Hecmateus who may become a founder of a new era.[6] Together, these critiques illuminate the shift from isolated introspection to communal responsibility, emphasizing that true human evolution requires not escape into the self, but ethical return to the Other.

Homo Hecmateus will not merely carry knowledge as a passive vessel; they will become an active and responsible guardian of meaning. They will not only master technology but will also question it, reshape it, and strive to align it with human dignity. Knowledge will not reside only in their mind but will manifest in how they live. For them, thought will not be a commodity to consume, but a field of action through which transformation unfolds. Their actions will not be guided by reason alone but will be measured on the scale of conscience.

The new human form will leave behind both the Homo Sapiens who lost himself in abstract concepts, and the Homo Noeticus who, in pursuit of individual ascension, neglected social bonds. Homo Hecmateus will strive to integrate wisdom with ethics, individuality with solidarity, and technology with humanity. His presence will not only interrogate the idea of a "digital future," but also challenge the very possibility of remaining human within that future. For what approaches is not a utopia of freedom, but a data regime in which those who no longer serve a function are quietly cast aside.

This new regime will tolerate the human only as long as he remains "useful"; stripped of passion, he will once again become the cheapest biological machine. And yet, existence runs far deeper than utility. Thus, at the threshold of a new era, what we encounter is not merely rupture—but a call for reconstruction. Homo Hecmateus is the one who hears that call: a consciousness form that seeks wisdom, transforms knowledge, and builds bridges between individual awareness and collective spirit. Even his silence carries meaning, for he understands the difference between the voice of knowledge and the resonance of wisdom.

Throughout the arc of historical existence, man has learned to walk, succeeded in speech, accessed knowledge, and deepened through emotion. Yet this evolutionary path cannot transcend cyclical repetition unless it culminates in the construction of meaning. Meaning is not attained through knowledge alone—it is realized by transforming knowledge into responsibility, responsibility into lived experience, and experience into a wisdom that can be shared with others. Being gains value through transformation. For it is not the one who merely thinks, but the one who transforms thought, who transcends time.

Homo Hecmateus embodies the possibility of that transformation: he is the herald of a wisdom age beyond the age of information. Man can only complete his own existence, and evolve into a new form of being, once he understands that truth is not only to be intuited, but to be felt and shared as a responsibility.

III. Wisdom vs. Efficiency: Critique of Transhumanist Idealism

In contemporary discourse, transhumanism is often celebrated as the natural next step in human evolution. It promises not only enhanced cognition, extended lifespans, and augmented physical

[6] This vision resonates with Giorgio Agamben's notion of a community grounded not in fixed identities but in shared potentiality—a "coming community" defined by openness and ethical coherence (Agamben, *The Coming Community*, 1993).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

capacity—but also a radical break from the limitations of the biological human. Yet beneath its futuristic appeal lies a troubling conflation: **the reduction of wisdom to efficiency, and of consciousness to computation.**

The transhumanist ideal envisions the human body as hardware, the brain as upgradeable software, and the self as a series of programmable functions. This metaphor, while rhetorically powerful, carries deep ontological consequences. If intelligence becomes merely a matter of processing speed and memory storage, then meaning is subordinated to metrics, and life is redefined by productivity.

But wisdom has never been about speed. Wisdom emerges through slowness—through reflection, restraint, and resonance. It is not about maximizing output but about **measuring value beyond output.** In contrast, the transhumanist narrative imagines progress as a linear path: more data, more control, less pain, longer life. The Homo Hecmateus model rejects this teleology. It asserts that not every prolongation is an advancement, and not every enhancement is an evolution.

The danger of transhumanism lies not in its technologies, but in its anthropology. It presumes that the human being is **a problem to be solved**, rather than **a mystery to be respected.** Nick Bostrom frames the human as an unfinished project, implicitly suggesting that moral and existential questions can be deferred until after cognitive enhancement is achieved (Bostrom, *Transhumanist Values*, 2005)[7]. It approaches human finitude not as the ground of meaning, but as an error to be corrected. In doing so, it echoes the ancient myth of hubris—the desire to transcend the gods not through transformation, but through domination.

In the logic of transhumanism, death is the final enemy, and immortality is the final goal. But if death is stripped of meaning, life becomes inert. Kurzweil's techno-optimism, while visionary, sidelines ethical agency in favor of cognitive maximization and life extension through digital transcendence (Kurzweil, *The Singularity Is Near*, 2005)[8]. **It is not mortality that devalues life, it is a life lived without orientation.**

Homo Hecmateus is not an opponent of technological development, but a guardian of ethical depth. Rather than asking what can be done, this archetype asks: **Should it be done?** Not every technological possibility deserves implementation, and not every problem needs an engineered solution.

The key distinction is this: **Transhumanism seeks optimization. Homo Hecmateus seeks orientation.** In the absence of wisdom, hyper-efficiency becomes tyranny. The world becomes calculable, but not comprehensible. The human becomes functional but not fulfilled. And in this hollow clarity, something essential is lost—not intelligence, but intimacy with meaning itself.

These visions of techno-augmentation, while captivating, risk ignoring the fundamental question: not whether we can digitize the human—but whether we should. As thinkers like Kurzweil and Bostrom celebrate exponential growth, critics like Turkle remind us that without emotional and ethical coherence, progress collapses into simulation[9].

IV. The Spiral of Meaning: Knowledge → Responsibility → Experience → Wisdom

Contemporary societies have increasingly equated knowledge with informational abundance. Education systems and digital infrastructures emphasize data acquisition, analytical proficiency, and speed of recall. Yet, during this epistemic acceleration, a fundamental dimension has been overlooked: the **transformation of knowledge into wisdom**. Homo Hecmateus introduces a

---

[7] Nick Bostrom, "Transhumanist Values," *Ethical Issues for the 21st Century*, ed. Frederick Adams (Oxford: Philosophical Documentation Center Press, 2005).

[8] Ray Kurzweil, *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology* (New York: Viking, 2005).

[9] *Sherry Turkle, Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other (New York: Basic Books, 2011).*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

philosophical correction by proposing that knowledge must not be treated as an end, but as the beginning of a deeper ethical and ontological process.

This process can be described as a four-stage spiral: **knowledge leads to responsibility; responsibility, when embodied, becomes lived experience; and experience, when reflected upon with ethical and existential depth, becomes wisdom**. These stages are not linear checkpoints, but recursive layers in a spiral formation—each pass through the cycle allows for greater integration, complexity, and maturity. This echoes Spinoza's third kind of knowledge—*scientia intuitiva*—in which true understanding arises not from accumulation, but from the ethical alignment of mind and reality (Spinoza, *Ethics*, 1677)[10]. In contrast to conventional models of development, the spiral framework allows for fallibility and non-linearity. Regression or repetition within the cycle is not interpreted as failure, but as part of a necessary refinement process.

Responsibility constitutes the hinge of this transformation. While knowledge can be passive, abstract, or even misused, responsibility requires an active ethical response. This concept resonates with Aristotle's notion of *phronesis*, or practical wisdom, which binds moral reasoning to situational discernment and right action (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VI)[11]. It binds the knower to the known, demanding not just comprehension but accountability. When this responsibility enters practice, it becomes experienced—subjective, embodied, and often imperfect. Through reflection and discernment, experience gives rise to wisdom: not merely knowing what is true, but understanding when, how, and why to act upon it in alignment with both human dignity and ecological coherence.

In the Homo Hecmateus model, wisdom is not externalized to institutions, traditions, or algorithmic systems. Instead, it is cultivated through inner governance: the individual's ongoing effort to align cognition, conscience, and conduct. This effort presupposes attentiveness, slowness, and depth—all qualities that are at odds with the hyper-efficiency demanded by digital culture. The spiral of meaning thus challenges not only how we learn, but how we exist: It frames evolution not as optimization, but as moral integration. Proposing that human evolution must move from accumulation to assimilation, from reaction to reflection, from knowledge to wisdom. Both Spinoza's ethical intuition and Aristotle's practical wisdom converge in the spiral model—not as fixed doctrines, but as lived processes through which being gains coherence and depth.

V. Homo Hecmateus vs. Homo Technologicus: Governance, Meaning, and Survival

The emergence of Homo Hecmateus as a philosophical archetype must be understood in contrast to a prevailing figure of the current technological age: **Homo Technologicus**. Whereas Homo Hecmateus embodies the ethical integration of knowledge, responsibility, and wisdom, Homo Technologicus is defined primarily by optimization, external control, and technocratic alignment. The contrast between these two archetypes is not merely semantic—it reflects a deeper divergence in how human agency, governance, and meaning are conceptualized in the algorithmic era.

In the figure of Homo Technologicus, subjectivity is increasingly shaped by automated systems, data-driven feedback loops, and predictive modeling. Agency becomes a derivative function of algorithmic affordances; choices are made within pre-designed parameters, often under the illusion of freedom. Governance, in this context, shifts from rule-based political deliberation to behavioral nudging through engineered systems. Surveillance capitalism and biometric tracking systems exemplify this transformation, wherein citizens are rendered legible and governable through digital traces, rather than through ethical deliberation or political representation. This dynamic is at the heart of what Shoshana Zuboff terms *surveillance capitalism*—a new economic logic that commodifies

[10] *Spinoza, B. (1677). Ethics, trans. Edwin Curley. Princeton University Press.*

[11] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VI.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

human behavior as data, transforming autonomy into algorithmically predicted compliance (Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, 2019)[12].

Homo Hecmateus, by contrast, is not governed from without but from within. The principle of **inner governance**—the alignment of cognition, conscience, and conduct—serves as a counter-model to external algorithmic control. This internal alignment presupposes not only self-awareness but also a relational ethical framework that holds the individual accountable to both society and the ecological whole. Governance, in this model, is not merely about rule enforcement or behavioral predictability; it is about ethical coherence across personal, collective, and planetary domains.

The divergence between these two models has profound implications for human survival. In the Homo Technologicus paradigm, survival is linked to system efficiency and functionality. The worth of the individual is contingent upon continued utility within the system. As artificial intelligence and automation increasingly displace human roles, those deemed inefficient risk becoming superfluous—analogous to how domesticated animals were rendered obsolete by industrial mechanization—useful once, dispensable later. In such a framework, the human being is not eliminated overtly, but gradually phased out through systemic irrelevance. As Ivan Illich warned, technological systems that surpass their convivial limits cease to serve the individual and begin to shape them, reducing the person from subject to systemic function (Illich, *Tools for Conviviality*, 1973)[13].

Homo Hecmateus, by contrast, does not derive value from function alone. Survival, in this model, is not just about continuity of the biological organism, but about the continuity of meaning, dignity, and moral depth. The existential question is no longer whether humanity can persist technologically, but whether it can remain recognizably human in ethical and philosophical terms. The ability to generate, preserve, and transmit meaning across generations—rather than mere data—becomes the defining criterion of survival.

In summary, the contrast between Homo Hecmateus and Homo Technologicus encapsulates two divergent trajectories of the human future. The former envisions a mode of being grounded in ethical discernment and inner responsibility; the latter, a system-compatible node optimized for survival but severed from ontological depth. The stakes of this divergence are not only political or technological—they are civilizational. The path that humanity chooses will determine whether it evolves into a more integrated form of being, or is reduced to a set of efficient functions within an increasingly impersonal and automated system. Together, Zuboff's critique of behavioral commodification and Illich's warning against technological overreach emphasize the urgent need for a new archetype—one that embodies inner governance rather than external optimization.

VI. Fictional Epilogue: Mars as a Symbol of Collapse and Renewal

The following allegorical narrative draws on speculative fiction to extrapolate the moral implications of humanity's failure to synthesize wisdom with knowledge, framing Mars not as a distant possibility, but as a reflective canvas for our ethical trajectory.

Yet if this archetype remains unrealized, if humanity continues to sever knowledge from wisdom then Homo Hecmateus will remain only a potential, never incarnated. In such a future, civilization will not ascend toward enlightenment but descend into entropy. While fictional, this hypothesis echoes structural patterns recognizable in historical cycles of civilizational failure. It has been tested once, on a distant world that humanity dared to call home again. What follows is not a myth, but a memory: the forgotten chronicle of a civilization that reached for utopia, only to fall once more into the spiral of division, desire, and domination. In this speculative allegory, that world is named Mars.

---

[12] Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019).

[13] Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

In a world already bearing the signs of dystopia, before the storm had even begun, a group of weary souls gathered. Their goal was not to save the corrupted world, nor to reform it by electing the "lesser evil" or the "good among the bad." Instead, they sought to leave it behind entirely. These individuals—burned out by a decaying order—chose exile over illusion. A council was convened, composed of ninety-nine sages from all professions, including fifty men. With unanimous agreement, they decided: Earth would be abandoned, and a new colony would be established on Mars. They had all they needed to realize this goal—not just artisans, engineers, and farmers, but people of wisdom and virtue as well.

One day, taking only the essential knowledge, the minimal technology required for survival, and their hopes, they departed from the Earth—a planet ruled by spiritual collapse and social decay. After years of preparation, they boarded the ship they had built and set off into the unknown. They made sure to take with them pairs of animals, seeds of fruits and vegetables, and all that was needed to begin again—this time, on Mars.

The thousand individuals selected with care by the ninety-nine sages left behind no farewells and no longing. All they abandoned was their greed, their desires, the dark shadows they had nurtured within themselves, and the endless conflicts they could no longer resolve. In an unprecedented act of collaboration, after a journey that lasted nearly eight months, they finally reached Mars. Their first mission was to build a livable zone. To do that, they had to construct a protective dome—since Mars' atmosphere was not only too thin to breathe but also saturated with lethal levels of radiation.

The surface pressure on Mars was less than one percent of Earth's, so creating a habitable interior meant not only generating breathable air, but also balancing atmospheric pressure and filtering radiation. Like ants in perfect coordination, they each fulfilled their roles without hesitation. The dome was completed in a short time. Inside, the necessary conditions of temperature, pressure, and air quality were established.

Next, they built an ecosystem within the dome—for the animals they had brought along, for the plants to take root, and for flowers to bloom. Since approximately 96% of the Martian atmosphere consists of carbon dioxide, they initially deployed a device called MOXIE, which converted CO_2 into breathable oxygen. But this was only a temporary solution. For long-term sustainability, photosynthetic microorganisms were placed in specially developed bioreactors and dispersed throughout the dome. These would gradually establish a self-sustaining oxygen cycle.

Water was sourced using a similar multi-phase strategy. At first, they generated water by reacting hydrogen with oxygen. However, the hydrogen they had brought with them was limited—and depletion was only a matter of time. Thus, in the second phase, humidity condensation systems were deployed to extract moisture from the Martian air, and ice mining operations were launched to tap into underground frozen reservoirs. This provided a sustainable source of both water and hydrogen.

Everything was progressing with near-perfection. There were no wars—nor even a need to declare peace. Greed had been forgotten; the shadows of the old world were long behind them. Time on Mars moved sluggishly, as if even its flow resisted being measured. Though ages were still counted by Earth standards, the lived experience felt almost twice as long. After all, a Martian year consisted of 669 Sols, and a single Sol was 39 minutes longer than an Earth day—equivalent to 687 Earth days in total.

Days turned into months, months into years, and finally the calendar marked Year 3, Sol 214—the 74th day of spring. It was the day of the Water Purification Festival. On that day, the colony's leader, Zinteh, addressed the people gathered in the central square beneath the dome:

"O noble, loyal, and courageous children of Mars... Three years ago, when we first set foot on this crimson soil, we did not merely break the chains of the past—we were wise enough to envision the utopia of the future. Today, as I look around, I see that all dualities have dissolved; soul and flesh have been reconciled, and two eyes now behold a single truth. We have constructed a system woven from collective reason, shared labor, and lived experience.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

We are no longer merely a people; we have become a coherence, a state of harmony. For peace cannot be defined simply by the absence of war. Peace is the untroubled rhythm of the heart, the silence of a mind at rest. This peace did not descend from above—it was something we raised together into the skies. Each morning, as we looked at one another with smiling eyes, we affirmed: 'If you exist, so do I.' Your suffering became mine; my burden rested on your shoulder. We understood each other without speaking, and we smiled without the need for formal greetings.

And so today, in this festival, we are purifying not only water but the sediment of the past. And let us not forget: if a day ever comes when we feel tempted to fight again, let us first look up—to the ceiling of this dome. For that ceiling reminds us that the sky is no longer something to be possessed, but a space we now inhabit—together."

Time did not flow, but passed silently, like water. The years slipped by one after another, and what had once been a solitary dome had gradually transformed into a network of interconnected settlements, large and small. The Martian calendar now marked Year 673, Sol 221. Despite carefully maintained population policies and rigorous resource management, the population had grown into the hundreds of thousands. For centuries, peace and balance were preserved under the leadership of the descendants of the original hundred sages. In time, that stability turned into an unspoken mythology—accepted without question, remembered without words. But one day, during a session convened to elect a new council leader, that ancient silence was broken for the first time.

A young man named T'Kharn, descended from Zinteh, rose in the assembly. His voice echoed under the dome like a resonance from ancestral tombs: "I carry the blood of Zinteh. This dome, this order, this peace… they are the legacy of my forefather's vision. I must lead this people."

As his words reverberated through the air, his eyes were not fixed on the light of the dome but wandered within the shadows of his own ambition.

The council was not unjustified in its caution; there were valid reasons why T'Kharn had been kept away from leadership for so long. Many had sensed that a darker force within him was slowly awakening. Yet T'Kharn was not alone. He had forged close ties with leaders from powerful mining cliques—men who gathered around him not for his vision, but for their own self-interest, feeding his ego with flattery and ambition. Though he was descended from a mind as brilliant as Zinteh's, T'Kharn himself lacked depth and foresight.

Meanwhile, the laborers working in the ice mines had grown increasingly resentful. They no longer wanted to live underground. They whispered among themselves, "Life on the surface is reserved for the privileged," and their anger toward the existing order began to intensify. But T'Kharn failed to comprehend the intent behind their unrest; he was not its architect—merely a man swept up by the wave. He became a tool in their plan: to seal the dome, take the council hostage, and seize control of the colony.

The plan was put into action. The dome was sealed, the system locked down... but it could not be reopened. The backup power units expired. Internal pressure dropped abruptly. Oxygen flow ceased. The bioreactors went silent. And the dome cracked. For the first time in Martian history, In a symbolic inversion, human collectivity collapses not due to external threats, but internal mistrust—echoing archetypes of civilizational entropy.

That day entered the records not merely as a technical failure, but as the Collapse of Unity and the Dissolution of Dualities. For across all minds echoed the same haunting whisper: "Perhaps unity was only the silence that comes just before the fracture."

Within a short time, tens of thousands lost their lives. Many died in silence, as the life-support units in their homes expired. Yet a small group of ninety-nine people managed to survive—almost miraculously—by taking refuge in the abandoned ice mines. Over the years, a primitive ecological structure had evolved in those underground shelters, shaped by the breath, condensation, and biological traces left behind by generations of workers. Though incapable of photosynthesis, fungal plant-like forms had developed a symbiotic relationship with chemosynthetic organisms, which began to separate carbon dioxide and generate oxygen—albeit in low concentrations. No one had

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

been aware of this transformation—until those fleeing death witnessed life sustained in the depths of the earth with their own eyes.

The children of the Broken Dome were, like the dome itself, fractured and scarred. The utopia that had once been envisioned in the first colony had quickly devolved into dystopia, forcing the Second Humanity to retreat from the surface into the subterranean world. This narrative[14] arc mirrors the tensions explored in Ursula K. Le Guin's speculative fiction, where utopian projects often unravel under the weight of their internal contradictions—giving rise to new myths born from collapse (Le Guin, *The Dispossessed*, 1974). There was no longer any functioning technology above ground, nor the knowledge to comprehend it. Over tens of thousands of years, time passed; memories were erased, languages fractured, and bloodlines intermingled. The human body slowly adapted to the conditions of the underground. Narrow tunnels thinned their frames; absence of light paled their skin; their eyes grew larger to see in the darkness, and their hands, shaped by the labor of digging, evolved into forms that nearly resembled claws.

They were no longer Homo sapiens. Over time, they had evolved into a new species known as Homo Subterraneus. How many cycles had passed was unknown. But one day, a curious child born in the depths of the underground slipped past his mother's watchful eyes and made his way to the surface. His appearance was far from anything resembling a human, yet when he lifted his head and looked up at the sky, what shone in his eyes was not fear—but an indescribable sense of wonder. For the surface was no longer dry, red, and hostile as it had once been. Mars had changed, shaped over the ages by both natural processes and ancient artificial interventions. The ecological chain set in motion by the microorganisms once left behind had slowly redefined the planet. The atmosphere remained thin but was no longer poisonous; the light remained pale but no longer burned. Mars was no longer an abandoned world—it had become an ancient homeland once again ready to embrace its own children.

Thus began the Second Humanity's journey back toward becoming human. They stood upright, measured time, searched for their own Atlantis, contemplated existence… and once again built a utopia. Mars had become, for them, a homeland, a mother, a father, and a god. The new order was founded upon only two sacred rules: "It was forbidden to cross the white peaks, and forbidden to laugh when the brightest star in the sky reached its brightest point."

These laws were carefully upheld, and the spirits of the ancestors were honored each year through ceremonial rites. Natural resources were never consumed beyond what was needed, and nothing was privately owned. In this way, a simple, quiet, and warless society took root—flowing once more through the veins of Mars.

But one day, the first blood was spilled—and the one who spilled it was cursed. He was not killed, but a mark was placed upon his forehead, and he was condemned to live the rest of his life among ruins. By then, the population had begun to grow uncontrollably, and the equitable distribution of resources had become increasingly difficult. Society fragmented—first into clans, then into lineages, and finally into isolated families. Within this fragmentation, the need for a new form of governance became inevitable. That was the day when black smoke began to rise beyond the white peaks—and in the mind of a prominent family leader, an ancient beast was stirred from its slumber: "Mars is angry with us… It warns us through its smoke. Mars demands something in return for what it has given: a human sacrifice."

And so the rituals began. Offerings made with fire and blood were once again dedicated to Mars. Over time, as some realized that stories could shape power, narrative machines were built, and myths became the foundation of the new social order. The second generation of humans on Mars fell—just as their distant ancestors once had on Earth—under the rule of those who controlled resources, stories, and sacred authority.

Thus, history repeated itself. Yet had humanity succeeded in taming the beast within—had it learned to temper knowledge with wisdom—it might have evolved not into Homo Subterraneus, but

[14] *Ursula K. Le Guin, The Dispossessed (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

into Homo Hecmateus. This vision resonates with Walter Benjamin's image of the *angel of history*, who sees progress not as a linear ascent but as a storm of wreckage—piling ruins upon ruins as he is blown into the future (Benjamin, *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, 1940) [15]. For degeneration is not only a physical process; it is also a moral and existential one. In this sense, if humanity fails to fuse knowledge with wisdom, it will continue to invent myths, believe in them, and be ruled through them. Like Le Guin's fractured utopias and Benjamin's storm-tossed angel, the Martian allegory reminds us that every collapse harbors the seed of a new myth—and that renewal begins not in escape, but in ethical reckoning.

VII. Conclusion: The Archetype as Proposition, Not Prophecy

The emergence of Homo Hecmateus, as elaborated throughout this essay, should not be interpreted as a deterministic prophecy or an evolutionary inevitability. Rather, it should be understood as a philosophical proposition—a possible configuration of human becoming in an age defined by algorithmic acceleration, cognitive dissonance, and moral fragmentation. This archetype does not claim historical certainty or scientific predictability; it asserts ethical urgency. This ethical urgency echoes Hans Jonas's imperative of responsibility, which demands that our power to shape the future be restrained by a duty to safeguard its very possibility (Jonas, *The Imperative of Responsibility*, 1979)[16].

Where Homo Sapiens stands for the knower and Homo Noeticus for the inner seeker, Homo Hecmateus represents the one who integrates knowledge and inwardness with responsibility, wisdom, and collective care. This figure is not predicated on technological mastery or biological enhancement, but on moral imagination and ontological coherence. In a world increasingly defined by external control, algorithmic governance, and behavioral engineering, Homo Hecmateus embodies an inward sovereignty—a self-governing subjectivity attuned to the weight of meaning, not merely to the logic of metrics.

This is not to suggest a naive return to a romantic past, nor a passive critique of emerging technologies. Rather, it is a call to critically reframe what it means to "advance." It is a challenge to distinguish between progress and propulsion, between optimization and orientation. This challenge resonates with Donna Haraway's call to "stay with the trouble"—to resist simplistic salvation narratives and remain ethically entangled with the complexities of our technological present (Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble*, 2016)[17]. Without this distinction, humanity risks confusing its speed with its direction, and its technical power with its ethical maturity.

As explored in the fictional allegory of the Martian colony, civilizations that neglect the integration of wisdom with structure tend to collapse—not merely because of material scarcity or political conflict, but due to the erosion of shared meaning. The parable serves not as a literal forecast, but as an epistemic mirror—reflecting back to us the consequences of a trajectory that severs intelligence from moral insight.

Thus, the archetype of Homo Hecmateus is best viewed as a **symbolic threshold**: a call to conscious evolution, rather than unconscious acceleration. Its realization depends not on technological invention but on philosophical intention. In this sense, the future is not something to be predicted—it is something to be **crafted** through the interplay of knowledge, responsibility, experience, and wisdom.

---

[15] Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1969).

[16] Hans Jonas, *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

[17] Donna J. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0819.v1

Homo Hecmateus may never emerge as a statistically dominant figure in demographic terms. But the emergence of even a small vanguard capable of embodying this archetype could shape the ethical, ecological, and existential contours of the coming era. Such individuals would not offer answers as much as they would reintroduce the art of asking the right questions. In an age drowning in information and starving for meaning, this alone would be revolutionary.

If there is one enduring lesson from both philosophy and history, it is this: the fate of humanity does not hinge on its tools, but on its truths. And in the face of accelerating crises—ecological, spiritual, technological—the question is not simply what humans can do, but what kind of beings they are willing to become.

Thus, Homo Hecmateus is not an answer to the age of machines—but a question addressed to the soul of humanity. As both Jonas and Haraway remind us, it is not enough to imagine a better future; we must become ethically responsive within the uncertainties of the present—crafting not predictions, but responsibilities.

References

1. Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*. Translated by Michael Hardt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
2. Benjamin, Walter. “Theses on the Philosophy of History.” In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, 253–264. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
3. Han, Byung-Chul. *The Expulsion of the Other: Society, Perception and Communication Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.
4. Harari, Yuval Noah. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. New York: Harper, 2016.
5. Haraway, Donna J. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.
6. Illich, Ivan. *Tools for Conviviality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
7. Jonas, Hans. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
8. Kurzweil, Ray. *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*. New York: Viking, 2005.
9. Le Guin, Ursula K. *The Dispossessed*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
10. Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics*. Translated by Edwin Curley. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985.
11. Wilber, Ken. *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Boston: Shambhala, 2000.
12. Yilmaz, Orhan Oğuz. *ETERNA: The Myth of All Ages, Draft to Digital, 2025.
13. Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2019.