

**THE CONSTITUTION OF PERSONALITY AND IDENTITY
IN A PERSPECTIVE BASED ON PRACTICES OF THE SELF,
OLD AND NEW**

1. Die Grundverfassung

The conception of our meeting, as formulated by its initiator, Ms Stoeckl, states that the key element in the field of problems to be discussed is the so called Death of the Subject. Evidently, this famous epistemological event is in the focus of a whole rich web of facts and events, both noumenal and phenomenal. Thus each of us in his contribution should cut a certain path through this web, starting from this focus. We all know one such path developed and advocated within the postmodernist paradigm, the last big narration produced by European mind. It is a very straight and uncompromising path, leading one quickly from the death of the epistemological hero via a series of similar lethal events, such as the death of God, death of history, etc. – to the final death, that of Man, described as early as 1966 in the famous final of “Les mots et les choses” by Michel Foucault. Here we get clear and predominantly negative, deconstructive answers to all the questions of our meeting: questions about human subject and community, structures of identity and personality, and so on. All the set of answers is logically coherent and self-consistent, but it is not convincing for me. In contrast to the starting event, which is a very moment of truth, and not just a product of postmodernist ideology, further steps are of mixed nature, including a large proportion of ideological postulates.

What strategy do I choose then? I take for sure only one general characteristic of the situation we are in: radical changes and transformations of both the anthropological discourse and its protagonist, a human being and its modes of representation are taking place. In particular, classical anthropological discourse established by Aristotle, Descartes and Kant and standing on the concepts of subject, essence and substance, cannot be taken as universally valid anymore. However, being trained as a quantum theory specialist, I restrain cautiously myself from the interpretation given to these changes by postmodernist discourse as well as any other interpretation. Such restraining from interpretation is a methodological position, common to both quantum theory and Husserlian phenomenology, in which it is known as *Epoche*. Taking this position, I find that my strategy should consist of one principle only: being faithful to experiential ground, namely, the ground of my anthropological experience, which should be made as full as possible and considered as precisely as possible. In other words, I must set up my cognitive perspective as a phenomenological perspective and put anthropological reality as such in its focus.

Thus the next question is: What is anthropological experience, and how should it be grasped in my cognitive perspective? As we agreed, the experience of perception and apprehension of anthropological reality (which is anthropological experience *per definitionem*) should be represented at this stage in the most universal way, avoiding any reducing notions or postulates, especially those belonging to classical anthropological discourse. To obtain a sufficiently general mode of representation, I picked up the term “human manifestation”, treating it as the most universal and all-embracing concept, which is also very flexible and admitting most variegated particularizations. Human manifestations may be outer or inner, may belong to any level of human organization, somatic, psychic or intellectual, etc. Evidently, the representation of anthropological reality as a set of human manifestations is in no way connected with any of the three basic concepts of the classical discourse, or this discourse as a whole. It is not an essentialist representation, and

instead of static discourse of essences, it proceeds in a dynamical discourse, in the dimension of being-action. On the other side, a distinction should be made between human manifestations and *acts* (actions, deeds) of a human person. In its long history, polemical standing to speculative metaphysics produced many philosophies which tried to keep close to the ground of experience, and in the anthropological field it often brought them close to the discourse of human acts or activities: various forms of empiricism, behaviorism or Marxism could be mentioned here. But we find the discourse of acts too poor and superficial in order to deal with anthropological reality as we see it now. For different reasons, but we join fully the Heideggerian criticism, stating that the translation of the Greek *energeia* with the Latin *actus* resulted in a grave loss for philosophy. As for human manifestations, they include, besides full-fledged human acts, all the rich world of embryonic human expressions, or *germs of acts*, such as urges, designs, inner movements, which may as well never grow into acts. The notion of human manifestation is closer to that of energy rather than that of act. It must be stressed, however, that philosophy still has no concept of energy adequate to anthropological reality. The classical Greek concept by Aristotle and Plotinus has very little to do with this reality, and all Western thought, including even late Heidegger, did not elaborate any sound alternative to it. Byzantine thought was moving to such alternative when it developed theology of uncreated Divine energies in the 14th c. This theology had naturally to be complemented with theology of created, i.e. human energies, but this next step was never done, and the concept of created energy, as distinct of uncreated one, was not created. Nevertheless, we can say that anthropology of manifestations represents a human being as an energetic formation, in a broad sense; and this representation has some affinity to Buddhist anthropology , in which human being is conceived as formed by flowing dharmas.

Now, can the discourse of human manifestations serve as a sound base for a full-fledged nonclassical anthropological discourse? To answer this question, we must see, first of all, how can basic anthropological problem of man's constitution be solved here. The solution turns out to be instructive: we find that it corresponds to a certain universal paradigm, which is of prime anthropological importance, but was too rarely noticed and little studied so far. For the start, we single out a certain class of human manifestations, which plays a key role in the constitution of a human person. As a general principle, a phenomenon or an essent, *Seiende*, forms up its constitution and identity through its relation to its Other, that is characterized by a different set of fundamental predicates. In our case, we develop an anthropological discourse, which uses energetic representation realized in terms of human manifestations; so the constitution and identity of a human person will be implemented here by those manifestations, in which the relation to the Other is actualized. Obviously, what manifests itself in such manifestations is not just anthropological reality as such, but also the Other; so that fundamental predicates of the horizon of human existence, consciousness and experience are found changing in them. For these special manifestations we use the term *extreme human manifestations* (EHMs). The set of all EHMs taken together is of a special meaning and value. It includes all the phenomena or manifestations of double nature, whose properties are marked and influenced by both anthropological reality and its Other. Thus it forms a *sui generis* intermediate or bordering area between them, and hence we give to it the name of *Anthropological Border*.

We must find, how EHMs emerge, and how they implement their constitutive function. This task amounts to universal problem of describing constitution and identity of a human being in their inner mechanism, as events or dynamical facts; or, in other words, seeing constitution in the dimension of being-action, which consists of acts and germs of acts, as explained above. The first basic property of the constitution seen as an event is that it is a two-sided or relational event, in which both a phenomenon (to be constituted) and its Other take part. It implies that if we consider the constitution in the dimension of being-action, we find that it has the nature of *inter-action*. What kind of interaction is it, and how does it proceed? First of all, some contact between interacting sides should be achieved, and to make it possible, a human being should open itself out with its manifestations (energies, forces) towards the Other: that is, it should unclose or unlock itself to the

Other. With this *key event of unlocking*, a meeting of two different energies or forces can take place, and in this meeting, energies or forces of the Other exert their formative and constitutive role. As for EHM_s, they are exactly those manifestations, in which the unlocking takes place.

Thus anthropological unlocking appears as the dynamical paradigm of the constitution of a human being in the discourse representing anthropological reality in the dimension of being-action; in particular, in any anthropology of energies or forces or dharmas, as well as in our anthropology of manifestations. It is significant that this paradigm of human constitution, which corresponds clearly to nonclassical, nonessentialist and subjectless anthropology has already rich history. No less significant is that the most important contributions to this history are the most ancient and most recent one. The latter is due to Gilles Deleuze, who gives a very clear-cut reconstruction of the paradigm, states that it is the central paradigm in anthropology of Foucault and basically joins himself what he presents as Foucault's view of main actual realizations of the paradigm in European man's history. As for preceding philosophies, where the paradigm can be found, he points out only Nietzsche and Heidegger. I would add here that in Nietzsche's texts the unlocking appears only implicitly. Heidegger, on the contrary, assigns a prominent place to it in his analytic of *Dasein*, making it an existential called *Erschliessen* or *Erschlossenheit*; but, due to his characteristically neoclassical and semi-essentialist standing, he is reluctant to stress its nonessentialist nature and prefers instead to integrate it into classical tradition, tracing its roots as far as to Plato. Irrespective of the question whether such extended interpretation is well-founded, we must say that the main part in all the Western history of the paradigm before Heidegger and Deleuze belongs to Kierkegaard, though he is hardly ever mentioned in this connection. The problem of constitution of human being and its self-identity is always central for him. Its solution is presented in his work in several versions, all of which are based more or less explicitly on the unlocking paradigm. By Kierkegaard, the duty of each man is to attain or build up his genuine personality, genuine Self, and it is only through the unlocking that these basic anthropological desiderata can be constituted. Thus "the duty of everybody is to make oneself open", and the dichotomy *Openness – Closedness* is the basic opposition in his analytic of personality. What matters for us, the true unlocking is only the unlocking towards God; it means "establishing the relation to the force that sets my Self up", and so "Who has no God, has no Self" ("Krankheit zum Tode"). This Kierkegaardian conception has great affinity to the initial page in the European history of the unlocking, which is the Greek patristic doctrine of *synergy* or cooperation between Divine and human energies. It is directly evident that synergy in its dynamical core is nothing but the anthropological unlocking. This doctrine, which is equally the fruit of hesychast ascetic experience and Christology of the VIth Ecumenical Council (680), played a prominent part in the East-West theological polemics during many centuries; but now I can only refer to my book "The Phenomenology of Ascesis" (1998) for all this history. Briefly, the Western attitude to synergy evolved very slowly from the direct rejection (to which there were a few interesting exceptions, like St. Bernard of Clairvaux or Erasmus of Rotterdam) to hesitant and relative acceptance – until the radical change of all the context, when French poststructuralism of Foucault and Deleuze presented a completely secularized version of the unlocking paradigm, ignoring all its rich ascetic, theological and non-Western past, and never mentioning synergy.

Coming back to our version of the paradigm, we see that its specific distinctions are concentrated in the concepts of EHM_s and Anthropological Border. These additional elements make it possible to advance to complete characterization of all types of constitution of human personality and identity. According to the paradigm, for each actual realization of the Other there is a corresponding set of EHM_s, in which the unlocking of human being towards this particular representation of the Other takes place. Now, what are these representations?

Evidently, if a human being is conceived ontologically, as a certain kind or horizon of being, its Other is a different horizon of being, "Other Being". In this case, anthropological unlocking must be realized in such EHM_s, which are directed to actual ontological transcendence of human being. We notice that such manifestations do exist: namely, they are cultivated in so-called spiritual

practices, that is ancient schools of spiritual, mystical and ascetic experience, created in most of the world religions. Spiritual practices are analyzed in detail in my works; they all possess a specific ladder structure, so that each step in this ladder is a special configuration of all human energies, and all the series of the steps is strictly ordered and directed to Other Being as a meta-anthropological *telos*, whose energies are constitutive for all the process of the practice. – Thus we identified one particular area of the Anthropological Border and one particular type of the constitution of personality, which are generated by the realization of the Other as ontologically other, or Other Being. We call this area *Ontological topic* of the Anthropological Border. As we saw, it is closely connected with spiritual practices, which provide its experiential and phenomenological base. This connection reflects a more general fact: non-essentialist anthropology as such has a close connection with practices of the Self, that is anthropological strategies, in which a human being performs a deliberate, goal-positing and goal-directed self-transformation. In such strategies a man tries to watch and control the set of all his energies, at least *de facto* treating himself as an energetic formation. Thus this field of anthropological experience pushes one to nonclassical interpretation; and so the perspective based on practices of the Self is particularly favorable for developing nonclassical energetic anthropology. Historically, this perspective embraces mainly two fields: ancient spiritual practices and traditions and present-day anthropological practices of all sorts, expressing irresistible striving of modern man to any kind of extreme experience. The area of Classical Man is then a *sui generis* Middle Kingdom between the areas of the old and new nonclassical species.

Then we notice that there is also a different realization of the Other and hence a different topic of the Anthropological Border. Surely, the Other to the horizon of human experience and existence may be conceived not ontologically as well. A human person can identify the horizon of his/her existence with that of his/her consciousness and in this case the Other will be represented as the Unconscious. The latter is never considered to be a different mode of being; its otherness is not ontological, but ontical. As the ontical Other of the consciousness, and the horizon of human existence, the Unconscious generates a certain class of EHM_s, and certain type of personality and identity structures. The set of all such EHM_s we call the *Ontical topic* of the Anthropological Border. Manifestations induced by energies of the Unconscious are abundant, and thoroughly studied in psychoanalysis; they include complexes, psychoses, neuroses, manias, phobias, etc. We are interested, first of all, in general properties, which differ them from the other class of EHM_s, that corresponds to the Ontological topic. In the broadest terms, I would say that the most general difference between the two topics is the replacement of ontology by topology. As studies of spiritual practices show, strategies oriented to Other Being develop specific dynamics, which represents spontaneous generation of a strictly ordered sequence of dynamical structures, or “energetic forms”, different from usual stable states. Now, in manifestations induced by the Unconscious this ontological dynamics is replaced by topological one. It means that the presence of an energetic source in the same horizon of being, but beyond the horizon of experience acts as a topological anomaly, which makes geometry curvilinear. This is reflected, for example, in the fact that typical phenomena induced by the Unconscious are called “patterns” or “figures” (*figures of the Unconscious* is the term by Carl Yung), which points out to their topological nature. Rich philosophical base for disclosing and describing topological nature of phenomena is provided by Deleuze; but, on the other side, he is inclined to absolutize topological vision of reality and does not regard for the presence of phenomena with different nature, for which such vision is not adequate.

Such non-topological phenomena among EHM_s are not restricted to the Ontological topic. Though the fundamental relation *Man vs. the Other* has two representations only, corresponding to the ontological and ontical representations of the Other, there is one more topic of the Anthropological Border. This is so, because there is one (and only one) kind of EHM_s, in which their extremeness is not due to the presence of the Other. These EHM_s are phenomena of virtual anthropological reality. By definition, all virtual phenomena are not completely actualized, which means that they are under-actualized correlates of definite actual phenomena; adopting physical

term, one can say that any actual phenomenon is surrounded by the “virtual cloud” of all its possible under-actualizations. Any such under-actualization lacks some essential, constitutive properties of corresponding actual phenomenon. It means that in virtual anthropological phenomena fundamental predicates of anthropological reality start changing, and so these phenomena have to be ranked among EHMs. The set of all such phenomena is called the *Virtual topic* of the Anthropological Border.

The three topics that we have found exhaust the Anthropological Border. Indeed, the Border phenomena can be constituted either by the outer energy or, on the contrary, by the lack of energy necessary for the actualization; and the outer energy should belong to the Other, which can be realized as either ontological or ontical Other. These three situations correspond exactly to the areas of the ontological, ontical and virtual Border, and it is evident that there are no other parts, which the Border of Man might include.

2. The Repertory of Human Identities

This reconstruction of the Anthropological Border represents clearly an outline or starting ground of a nonclassical, non-essentialist and subjectless anthropological model, based on the paradigm of unlocking or, as we can call it by right, the paradigm of synergy. It is still very far from full-bodied energetic or synergetic anthropology, but it is already sufficient to answer all the questions about the constitution of personality and identity. At closer look, the topical structure of the Anthropological Border is nothing but the spectrum of all possible types of identity of a human being. It means that we are ready now to answer the central question of our meeting. So:

Who comes after the Subject?

The answer given by our model is highly pluralistic. There comes a motley company of human beings, extremely unlike each other. First, there are three principal types, corresponding to the three basic mechanisms of anthropological unlocking: *Ontological Man – Ontical Man – Virtual Man*; their model realizations are: *spiritual practices – patterns of the Unconscious – virtual practices*. Then there are three additional “hybrid types”: the three principal types of EHMs may combine with each other and hence the three topics of the Anthropological Border overlap, forming up three “hybrid topics”. These hybrid human types are especially characteristic for the present-day anthropological processes, but now we do not have enough time to discuss them. But as for the principal types, I think that each of them should be described, if only in a few words.

Ontological Man is constituted by the energy of Other Being, and so his identity is built up in the process of ascending the ladder of energetic forms, which is directed to Other Being as a meta-anthropological telos of the process. The identity constituted in this way may be called *participative identity*: it is acquired through participating in the energies of Other Being and Other Being appears as the supreme source and holder of all assets of identity, which alone possesses ideal identity or, better, the identity in the full sense, so that all identity structures realized in being-there by empiric humans should be considered as only partial and imperfect reflections of the true identity dwelling in Other Being.

Then we discover a great East-West ontological bifurcation. Other Being has two opposite realizations, resp., in the dynamical personalist and static impersonal paradigm. They correspond to Western and Far-Eastern types of worldview and, by the unlocking paradigm, they both represent generating principle for definite types of constitution of human personality and identity. In both cases there emerges what we called participative identity formed up in the ascent to the meta-anthropological telos. We have seen, however, that basic properties and structures of such identity are strictly determined by the telos; and hence the telos conceived as personal God or as impersonal Absolute (like Nirvana or Great Void, identical to neither Being nor Non-Being) generates different types of human constitution. In their pure forms, these types are realized in corresponding spiritual practices, like hesychasm in the Western personalism paradigm and Tibetan yoga or Taoism in the impersonal paradigm.

Now, what are these types? The formative role of the telos shows up strikingly in them. The impersonal telos is Absolute devoid of any dynamics and any structures. Thus steps of the ladder approaching it represent energetic forms of less and less complex organization. Anthropological energetic structures are gradually getting dismantled and dissolved, which process was called *haploysis*, or simplification, in neoplatonic mysticism, belonging also to the impersonal paradigm. The techniques used in this process included basically meditation and contemplation; and it was supposed that in the final, personal identity and self-consciousness disappear completely. As one of the Yoga-Sutras by Patanjali puts it, when approaching the telos, or *Samaddhi*, “self-consciousness is devoid of its own form and dissolved completely in the essence of the contemplated, where Being and Non-Being are indistinguishable” (Sutra III.3).

In the personalist paradigm the most articulated form of which is found in Christian dogmatics, Absolute is conceived as Saint Trinity of Divine Hypostases, Whose mode of being is personal being-communion. It is endowed with its own extratemporal dynamics of generation and procession, which can be characterized at best by the Byzantine notion of *perichoresis*, meaning literally “go round, making a full circle” and meaning theologically complete and perfect mutual exchange of being between the Hypostases. This exchange of being is then interpreted as love, connecting the Hypostases, and also as communication, or communion between Them. Emerging ontological identity of the three basic concepts: *perichoresis – love (seen as an ontological principle) – personal communion*, can be considered as a concise, but still, in a sense, complete characterization of the personalist paradigm for Other Being; or, if you wish, simply a definition of personality. At the same time, it presents clearly the definition of a certain type of self-identity, which can be called *Trinitarian self-identity*. As said above, it is perfect or absolute identity possessed exclusively by Other Being. As for empiric humans in the horizon of being-there, they actualize imperfect participative identity, which represents energetic participation in the Trinitarian identity. Contrary to the identity structures in the impersonal paradigm, in this case approaching the telos brings forth not dissolving, but steady growing-up of personal identity and intensity of self-consciousness.

Ontical Man. The ontological bifurcation divides the realm of Ontological Man into very different parts. But as strong as their distinctions are, distinctions between the different topics of the Anthropological Border are even more significant. Topological dynamics generates highly specific identity structures, and one can say that the reconstruction and correction of these structures is the main task of all the sophisticated psychoanalytical therapy. The fact that these structures are considered as needing therapy and correction tells us that they are on the border between normal and pathological phenomena. Indeed, the key characteristic of all the Ontical topic is *disconnected topography of the consciousness*. This disconnectedness generates a large array of variegated “subnormal phenomena”, disorders and dysfunctions on the lower levels of the consciousness, like blunders, failures, so-called Freudian slips, etc. Evidently, all these phenomena express deficiencies of self-identity, and such topological deficiencies and disorders should be considered as specific characteristics of the identity structures in the Ontical topic.

Virtual Man is still a newcomer, and his nature and properties are too little studied so far. Nevertheless, it is clear enough, which are principal distinctions of his identity structures. The key characteristic of all virtual phenomena is under-actualization: any such phenomenon is an under-actualized copy of some actual phenomenon, i.e. it nearly coincides with the latter, but is deprived of some of its basic predicates. This general characteristic applies to identity as well: one can say that *Virtual Man is provided with under-actualized identity*, i.e. his identity is incomplete, lacking some basic elements or structures of the full-fledged human identity. This privative characterization brings the virtual type of identity close to the ontical type, which was also characterized by the presence of some defects of identity. On the other side, it reminds us of identity structures in spiritual practices with the impersonal *telos*, where dissolving of identity takes place. Both parallels are correct, but in both cases it is important to notice some distinctions as well.

Approaching the impersonal telos in spiritual practices includes deliberate and self-controlled dissolving of identity, which was perfectly well-developed at the start. On the contrary, in virtual

practices self-identity is incomplete from the start, and is not subject to any control (abilities of self-control are among the most reduced and damaged ones in Virtual Man). As for patterns of the Unconscious, each kind of them represents a topological effect connected with a definite defect or damage of identity, so that these defects are not arbitrary at all, but can be systematized and grouped into certain types, related to corresponding patterns and serving as their symptoms. But in the under-actualized identity of Virtual Man, any element or structure of his identity might *a priori* be not actualized. Thus any arbitrary defects and deficiencies of identity are possible here; and it means, evidently, that in the Virtual topic destructive or destructurizing trends in the sphere of human identity take more radical character.

3. The Survey

In conclusion, it is worth making a few remarks, integrating presented ideas into the context of present-day philosophical and theological thought. Evidently, our model can be viewed as a modern development of ancient basic intuitions of Eastern Orthodox personalist worldview and, more concretely, hesychast practical anthropology. However, we see hesychasm in the phenomenological perspective, as a certain practice of the Self, and we read its message as basically agreeing with that of Edmund Husserl: the message calling one to (re)turn *Zur Sachen selbst*, and be faithful to the ground of experience. Being faithful to present-day anthropological experience in its entirety and its own nature excluded representing this experience in the form of a classical metaphysical or theological system or, say, system in the tradition of Russian religious philosophy. This experience clearly corresponded to some radically new, maximally plastic, changing and polyphonic image of Man, capable to choose drastically different scenarios of self-realization. And the vision guided by those ancient Orthodox and hesychast intuitions does not contradict such image. This vision was never absolutist and never corresponded to the Kantian religion of *Pflicht*, leaving a human the only way, that of obeying Moral Law and advancing to Supreme Good. “If you prefer to perish, there is nobody resisting you or forbidding this to you”, - tells a classical hesychast text.

Thus alternative scenarios were always admitted, and our model presents their reconstruction, basing on the key observation that the ancient paradigm of synergy, or anthropological unlocking, can be reassessed and extended to become universal dynamical paradigm of human constitution. We find that basic properties and predicates of the human mode of being imply that a human being is pluralistic on a more profound level than just having a variety of possible scenarios of self-realization. One can say that there exists a variety of human beings, having fundamentally different constitution of personality and identity. Ontological Man, implementing the paradigm of Christocentric theosis or Kalachakra Tantra is one of them, but he is not the only existing one. Topological Man, implementing patterns of the Unconscious, is one of them, but he is not the only existing one. And so on. All the repertory of these types or beings is embraced by the unifying concept of the Anthropological Border. This concept provides also the model with practical epistemological methods: for instance, we see that the study of any anthropological phenomenon must start with *anthropological localization*, establishing, to which topic of the Anthropological Border this phenomenon belongs.

The phenomenological precept of faithfulness to experience makes our model free from fetters of any ideology. Although it originates in my studies of hesychast practice, and is rooted deeply in paradigms of Orthodox and hesychast thinking, the body of ideas closest to it is found in anthropology by Gilles Deleuze. This anthropology is a straightforward application of the unlocking paradigm: by Deleuze, “les forces dans l’homme ne composent une forme qu’en entrant en rapport avec des forces du dehors”¹. As a result, a human being is represented as “la forme-Homme”, which gets its constitution in the interaction with outer forces, “des forces du dehors”. Thus it is an energetic and synergetic formation; and in Deleuze, like in our model, this formation is pluralistic: there are various realizations of outer forces, and when inner forces enter into contact and interacton

¹ G. Deleuze. Foucault. Paris, Ed. de Minuit, 1986. P.139.

with them, a new anthropological formation emerges. Close parallel to our model describing a variety of synergetic anthropological formations is obvious.

In all energetic-synergetic models of the type considered, one of the main problems is that of anthropological evolution: in any period of history we find some prevailing anthropological formations, and the problem of tracing down and explaining their successive change is important both theoretically and practically. Here we diverge from Deleuze; anthropological evolution is presented in both models in a very different way. Combining the ideas by Foucault and Nietzsche, and not going deep into history, Deleuze notices just three formations, which take over each other successively: “la forme-Dieu”, constituted by the “forces of the elevation to the infinite” (17th and 18 cc.), “la forme-Homme”, constituted by the “forces of the finiteness”, that are Life, Work and Language (19th c.), and finally “la forme-Surhomme”, which is only emerging so far and is supposed to be constituted by forces of the “finite-unlimited” (fini-illimité), which are present, e.g., in silicon chips, elements of the genetic code or agrammatical structures (des agrammaticaux) in modernist literature.

As for our model, it presents anthropological evolution – *au vol d'oiseau*, without regard to the hybrid topics – as the successive taking over from Ontological Man, through the intermediate phase of the “Borderless Man” (who ignores the relation to the Anthropological Border and corresponds roughly to the “form-God” in Deleuze), to Topological Man and finally to Virtual Man. Quite definite dynamics is found behind such evolution: it is dynamics of steady decreasing of the form-building or creative energy in a human being. Describing the Ontical and Virtual topics of the Anthropological Border, we intentionally displayed and stressed deficient character of their structures, and pointed out that this character intensifies with the transition from the Ontical topic to the Virtual one.

Clearly, Virtual Man is in no way Superman. As argued in my recent texts, the secondary and dependent nature of virtual reality implies that complete coming of the Virtual topic results in the scenario of euthanasia for Mankind. Thus the appraisals of anthropological situation and perspective in both nonclassical models differ noticeably, to say the least. The more intriguing is our future, to which the last choice belongs.