

Paolo Bellini

The Myth of Eternal Youth and Post-modern Civilisation. Androgyny, Genders and Biopower

Abstract: The myth of eternal youth, in connection with the symbolism of the androgyne, dates back to very ancient history and has been passing through the various stages of development of the Western culture and civilization since time immemorial. In particular, in Hesiod's myth of the golden age, there is a description of eternal youth that will leave a lasting impression in the imaginary of the Western civilization, spreading until modern and post-modern culture. Such an imaginary seems to guide the current pursuits of biomedical sciences and new technologies, through which, although in an unconscious manner, the modern and post-modern civilization seems to cultivate the ancient dream of the golden age, thanks to a novel relationship between knowledge and power.

Keywords: Eternal Youth; Androgyny; Genders; Biopower; Post-Modern Civilization.

PAOLO BELLINI

Università degli Studi dell'Insubria, Varese –
Como, Italia
paolo.bellini@uninsubria.it

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2022.42.08

Introduction¹

The myth of eternal youth, in connection with the symbolism of the androgyne, dates back to very ancient history and has been passing through the various stages of development of the Western culture and civilisation since time immemorial. Among its examples, there are ancient narratives concerning divinities such as Dionysus² or Eros³, prototypes as the *puer aeternus*⁴, as well as literary references like *Dorian Gray*⁵ or all the alchemical practices relating to the obtainment of the philosopher's stone⁶.

In particular, in Hesiod's myth of the golden age, there is a description of eternal youth that will leave a lasting impression in the imaginary of the Western civilisation, spreading until modern and post-modern culture.

First of all [110] the deathless gods who dwell on Olympus made a golden race of mortal men who lived in the time of Cronos when he was reigning in heaven. And they lived like gods [115] without sorrow of heart, remote and free from

toil and grief: miserable age rested not on them; but with legs and arms never failing they made merry with feasting beyond the reach of all evils. When they died, it was as though they were overcome with sleep, and they had all good things; for the fruitful earth unforced bare them fruit abundantly and without stint. They dwelt in ease and peace upon their lands with many good things, [120] rich in flocks and loved by the blessed gods.⁷

As can easily be inferred by Hesiod's portrayal, the mythical golden age is characterised by the fact that the human beings that populate it do not know sickness, old age, suffering, toil or sorrow, namely all those evils that have always plagued our species. Those creatures live beyond historical times, in a primeval and mythical universe; and as a matter of fact, although mortal, they resemble more gods than men *stricto sensu*. They are, in fact, fundamentally supernatural beings who, unsurprisingly, after their disappearance in the belly of the Earth, will acquire the characteristics of «pure spirits dwelling on the earth, delivering from harm and guardians of mortal men»⁸.

But, despite the evocation of a mythical past and of beliefs that are completely extraneous to a modern scientific culture, such an imaginary seems to guide the current pursuits of biomedical sciences and new technologies, through which, although in an unconscious manner, the modern and post-modern civilisation seems to cultivate the ancient dream of the golden age, thanks to a novel relationship between knowledge and power⁹.

Biopower, Collective Imaginary and Eternal Youth

Since the 18th century, power has tended to organise society in a direction connected to what Foucault defined as a will *to rationalize problems posed to governmental practice by phenomena characteristic of a set of living beings forming a population: health, hygiene, birthrate, life expectancy, race*¹⁰. This change has meant a different approach from political power towards the people who are subject to it. Whereas in the past power limited itself to the imposition of a command dealing with the administration of justice, the exercise of the right of life and death, as well as the management and armed protection of available resources, during the modern age it is possible to witness the emergence of governmental practices tied to population control, in a health-related, organisational or disciplinary sense. In this way, every political system ceases to be a simple place where human relations can be managed in accordance with the ancient Greek model, in which a city represented the space within which people would cultivate harmony with superhuman divine powers, defending themselves from the wilderness and from external enemies (other populations)¹¹. In particular, since the birth of the modern State, and of all the political systems that derived from it, power has tended to actively manage the life and well-being of populations, taking care, in a direct and capillary manner, of the administration of every aspect of individual existence. This takes place through the control of scientific and technological knowledge and through the creation of a complex set of rules, laws and regulations implemented, on a social

level, by a network of institutions and agencies responsible for that purpose.

There is a clear *modus operandi*, which was brilliantly defined as biopower¹², understood, in its original core, as a relationship of command and obedience, which, expanding on the Hobbesian pattern for which a person always obeys in exchange for protection¹³, considers the latter as a general and total preservation of a person's lifestyle in a material and spiritual sense. Biopower manages human existence in its entirety, since it deals with every aspect of individual and social life, forging collective imaginary, shared values, ethical and moral rules, ideological convictions, spreading knowledge through educational institutions (schools and universities), taking care of living conditions from a material point of view (health, economic prosperity and satisfaction of primary needs). In that way, command and systemic subjugation are not experienced as an imposition or something to be tolerated because necessary for the maintenance of social peace and order, but are rather desired, sought after, cultivated and enthusiastically lived as essential to individual fulfilment and collective well-being. By contrast, their absence generates unhappiness, insecurity, exclusion, suffering and profound dissatisfaction.

However, such a political and social organisation, based on the exercise of biopower, inevitably casts a shadow where systemic problems have been able to hide for long and that globalisation suddenly brought to light. These are epochal issues, which could even compromise the very existence of the human species and which could be summarised as follows: 1. Environmental and ecological crisis (Climate change, reduction of biodiversity, land,

water and air pollution); 2. Massive production after WWII of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear devices, chemical and biological bombs); 3. Possibility of intervening on the human genome, modifying it.

In all these cases it is evident that these problems depend largely on the kind of socio-political use of scientific knowledge and technology that derives from it. As Wendell Berry explains pretty well, for example, industrial agriculture tends to significantly deplete the soil since it treats it in accordance with a *mining and extractive model*, draining it of its chemical and organic properties¹⁴. Therefore, it seems necessary to develop new agricultural models that take into account both what chemical and industrial technologies are available and the ecological and systemic consequences of a massive and indiscriminate use of them¹⁵. Another relevant aspect, which somehow completes the picture of planetary crises induced by biopower, concerns the consumer society and the stimulation of specific imaginaries capable of influencing purchasing behaviours and desires. The behaviours, in turn, determine – while being at the same time determined, in a circular logic – the use of the available industrial and technological power. A classic example of this phenomenon is the sudden spread of mobile phones, which were adopted with immediate enthusiasm thanks to a positive imaginary spread before they were mass marketed. At the same time, their availability on the market immediately created the conditions for them to be desired and bought by consumers. This pushed the major manufacturing companies to invest heavily in their technological improvement¹⁶, so that in a

very short period of time a simple, small portable phone became a fully-fledged smartphone.

Among the most widespread imaginaries, the myths of eternal youth and androgyny, which are deeply connected with the new technologies and their ever-increasing ability to colonise, penetrate, heal and transform the human body, currently emerge very clearly. Eternal youth, as evoked by Hesiod in his description of the ancient golden age, which was followed by a long literary tradition and a remarkable fortune within the Western culture, thanks to the alchemical imaginary and to the popularity of the Arthurian Cycle¹⁷, is now subject – following new logics and new imaginaries evoked by biopower – to a substantial transformation. In Hesiod's golden age, or in connection with the philosopher's stone and the Grail, eternal youth derives from supernatural, mystical and/or spiritual factors that are well above man in terms of power and perfection; by contrast, for the new technological imaginary eternal youth depends on a desacralised symbolism that proliferates on biomedical knowledge and on the management of natural processes like aging. In fact, whereas in some ways the new myth of eternal youth recoups typical traits of the Greek-Roman symbolism, in other ways it fully distances itself from it. As a matter of fact, a healthy preservation of body and mind, as well as the abundance of cosmetic products capable of concealing old age, derive both from the scientific advances in the pharmacological and biomedical fields, but also from a series of behaviours such as having healthy eating habits, constantly performing some physical activity, reducing stress-inducing factors, keeping up intellectual work, etc. This clearly shows

how the new myth of eternal youth widely depends on a series of empirical practices, scientific discoveries and behaviours capable of tightening its symbolic grip through the obtainment of tangible results. One of the most interesting traits of eternal youth (which should be more correctly called *youth until death*) concerns the fact that it became an authentic and universal wish that everyone, with no gender differences, pursues, in a more or less conscious way. In the pagan and Judeo-Christian traditions (and not only in those), however, the golden age where eternal youth is present is also related, as a primeval time, to androgyny, as a typical condition of the primeval human, who is always qualified as a double being, male and female at the same time¹⁸. For the new post-modern imaginary, however, as far as eternal youth is concerned, this androgyny seems to have turned into a sort of sexual neutralisation. As a matter of fact, since the XV century, the person¹⁹ has emerged as a fundamental concept for the construction of an individual identity that disregards sexual identity, since it refers to the self and to the conscience as theorised by Locke²⁰. Moreover, having been developed even more in the course of modernity, the person further qualifies in a neutral sense and in reference to an individual placed at the center of a system of cultural, social, political and juridical relations that determine his or her characteristics²¹. It is precisely this intrinsic neutrality that allows, therefore, to conceive a person with no regard for his or her individual characteristics, so that each self-aware subject (or potentially such), capable of managing (at least in a virtual way) a network of political-juridical relations that determine their rights and duties, can be and effectively is qualified as

a person. A person is, for the liberal culture, androgynous in the sense that, regardless of any sexual or gender characteristic, he or she always holds the same rights and duties and can freely shape his or her own individual identity. This attitude, typical of the post-modern Western civilization, currently characterises the dominant culture. In particular, as the protagonist of one of Jeanette Winterson's most recent novels shows, it is currently possible, with the available technological resources, to freely choose one's identity by placing oneself in an androgynous dimension, where one can be at the same time male and female, without having it affect political and social recognition of themselves as persons in the least²².

A Theory of Limit and Personal Freedom

After considering what has been said so far, a problem that spontaneously surfaces concerns, at this point, a reflection of ethical-political, as well as value-related, nature on the limits, if any, tied to the exercise of biopower and to the inevitable unfolding of technological power connected to it. For that purpose, in order to avoid the emergence of purely impracticable or unrealistic positions, constructed on abstract systems of values, but lacking a real subject capable of converting them into actual behaviours equipped with an effective empirical consistency, a careful analysis of the effectual reality and of the *status quo* is necessary. Sometimes, as a matter of fact, contemporary philosophical thinking can present a typical intellectual *hybris* (arrogance), showing indifference to the actual conditions of existence of those whom it addresses in ethical and political

terms, outlining a logic of "needing to be" that the subjects, who should be the actual architects of such a logic, find completely extraneous. Unfortunately, in doing so, however magnificent such intellectual creations, conceived in a secluded studio, may be, they inevitably appear to be condemned to irrelevance and anachronism.

Now, regarding the typical condition of the post-modern subject, of the human being that actually lies behind such a convenient definition, it is necessary to observe how it is influenced by something that goes beyond, and is more powerful, than the fear of (violent) death typical of the Hobbesian state of nature²³. As a matter of fact, the Western civilisation is permeated by a veritable phobia that concerns death in a very general sense, symbolically intended as being deprived of your lifestyle, of the good health of your body, or having a lack of access to mass consumer goods, social security, or to the immediate availability of every technological innovation. Being deprived of even one of these elements, connected with the psychological and physical wellbeing of each individual, is considered intolerable, a symbolic death that is difficult to handle. All this generates a state of permanent anxiety for one's future fate, which, in turn, triggers a continuous desire to preserve one's own body-person in which the fear-salvation dialectic that is typical of the post-modern culture is coagulated²⁴.

One of the most relevant phobias that seem to haunt the Western culture concerns the typical prerogatives of a person, where the wish to delay death as long as possible, keeping one's own body young and choosing its shape and gender, manifests itself vigorously.

However, such an attitude poses problems of ethical and moral nature on the limits that should be imposed on biopower and on the management of technological power. It is therefore necessary to consider this question also in terms of fair and unfair (ethics) and good and evil (morality), taking into account the fact that sometimes they do not coincide, since ethics has an objective and interpersonal value, while morality mainly concerns a subjective and individual dimension. For example, on the basis of personal and religious convictions, it is possible to consider divorce immoral, but the fact that it should be the people involved who freely choose what to do with their own marriage ethically permissible. On the contrary, it is possible to consider good in a moral sense to help others, but ethically correct and admissible to be disinterested in other people's existence, as often is the case in a mass individualistic society. Usually, a perfect overlap of ethics and morals produces tyrannical or totalitarian societies. In the first case (tyranny), the beliefs about good and evil of an individual or a group become the working paradigm for every ethical option (fair v. unfair), so that everyone must behave in accordance with the moral convictions of those in power, without being able to express dissent. In the second case (totalitarianism), by contrast, those who hold political power deduce or socially impose a system of objective values in which fair and unfair absorb within themselves the freedom of an individual conscience and become the cornerstone for the distinction between good and evil. In the latter case, everyone is led to never be able to freely and individually conceive a different moral position than the public ethics imposed by

the political power (in the sense that in an Orwellian-style totalitarian society there is the tendency, through the control of language, to eliminate the very same possibility of critically thinking about reality)²⁵.

Hence, in the case of management of new technologies by biopower, it is necessary to clearly identify the limits to be put on the potency expressed by scientific knowledge and technologies that derive from it, proceeding from the current state of affairs and from empirical evidence to determine the ethical and moral criteria.

On a historical and factual level, there are some trends on which it is necessary to focus attention before proceeding to an ethical and moral analysis. First, it bears taking into account that the technological perfecting and continuous improvement in every field of human activity, from artificial intelligence to molecular biology, represents an irreversible destiny. The human species, as a matter of fact, has become fundamentally dependent on the technologies it has developed and which represent veritable extensions of their minds and their bodies²⁶. A withdrawal, a sudden disappearance of the current technologies, as well as a halt in their constant progress, would probably condemn billions of human beings to death and would generate a regressive cycle that would lead humanity to a new stone age²⁷. Second, the behaviours of the human beings that inhabit the planet lead to think that almost all of them are completely unprepared and have no desire to give up the benefits of techno-scientific progress. Finally, it is necessary to take into account that the colonisation of the human body with new technologies proceeds relentlessly, in the attempt to definitively hybridise human

beings and machines, allowing our species to evolve from *Homo sapiens* to *Cyborg*²⁸.

Turning now to ethical and moral criteria consistent with the *status quo* that we have briefly described, it bears observing that the liberal ideology, since its dawn, has represented one of the most effective forms of power containment. It has historically achieved, with respect to any other ideology, the best results in relation to the protection of the person-individual. It therefore seems appropriate to use, even in this case, the same methodology, adapting it to the changed historical and cultural conditions of post-modern civilisation. What seems necessary to limit is, indeed, the biopower and its ability to socially utilise the techno-scientific knowledge on which post-modern society is based.

An effective theory of the limit, from this point of view, taking into account the probable mutation to which the human species will be subject by hybridising itself with the machines (something that has already happened, by the way, on a psychological, mental and cognitive level), can only concern the foundational core of the person, which regards, as previously mentioned, the presence of self-awareness and relational capacity. Now, both of these elements can be qualified through the concept of self-aware life²⁹, intended as an essential trait of the person, devoid of metaphysical connotations, either empirical or material, as well as moral and spiritual. Thus, every living being, virtually or potentially capable of acquiring a self-aware self and of entering a complex system of social relations, can be qualified through the concept of self-aware life. Therefore, a theory of the limit of biopower and technological manipulative potency will be effective

in the near future only if it starts from such a conception. More specifically, the consistent application of such a principle identifies as ethically acceptable every act that does not harm the person, both on an individual and on a systemic level. Consequently, it appears, for example, ethically correct the search for individual wellbeing, eternal youth, androgyny and any other manipulation of the body only if it does not irreparably damage self-awareness and the network of life from which it derives its own origins. On the other hand, from this perspective, uncontrolled pollution, unlimited exploitation of natural resources, the creation of beings lacking superior cognitive abilities³⁰, the systematic depletion of territories through excessively-invasive methods of intensive agriculture³¹ and the frenetic growth of the world population, can all be considered ethically unfitting because they either offend the dignity of the person as a self-aware life or are a threat to life itself in a broader sense. This obviously does not mean that it is ethically unfitting, for example, the supply of energy that derives from the extraction of hydrocarbons; the intention is rather to direct the globalised civilisation towards a progressive reduction of their use, increasing renewable sources as much as possible. In general, the suggested ethical perspective aims to express a principle capable of generating a satisfactory balance between the typical needs of technological development, individual freedom, systemic instances of survival and evolution of the human species and protection of the rights of the person. As far as morals are concerned, on the other hand, we are in the presence of subjective choices which, if they do not limit or offend other people's rights, are always

acceptable and cannot be considered unfitting on a social level. These include the most varied lifestyles such as vegetarianism or a meat-based diet, the search for greater physical prowess, the desire for a hybrid body shaped by the machines or the individual rejection of new technologies, and so on. Ultimately, all that pertains to a purely subjective universe has a moral value and cannot be consequently considered ethically and socially unfitting. An individual, in such areas, as long as he or she does not harm anyone and does not limit others' freedom, should always have an absolute right to freedom of choice on the bases of their personal convictions³².

Conclusion

Post-modern societies act on a symbolic level that is extraordinary complex, from which narratives, myths and utopias that determine lifestyles, values and behaviours of

their members arise. Within this symbolic context, it is necessary to outline, in relation to the dominant behaviours and imaginary, the ethical principles that are necessary for a peaceful and harmonious civil coexistence. This appears as a very difficult task, and can be carried out effectively only if the ethical coordinates used as reference are developed coherently with the dominant social practices and imaginary. Otherwise, any system of values, however fascinating, elegant and well thought-out, is condemned to be either a mere mental experiment devoid of actual efficacy or a simple homage to human hypocrisy; or, in a worst-case scenario, the picklock for a disturbing cultural totalitarianism where it is common «[...] to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, [...] That was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed »³³.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nicola Abbagnano, *Dizionario di filosofia*, Milano: Tea, 1993
- Paolo Bellini, *L'immaginario politico del Salvatore. Biopotere, sapere e ordine sociale*, Milano-Udine, Mimesis 2012.
- Paolo Bellini, *Cyberfilosofia del potere. Immaginari, ideologie e conflitti della civiltà tecnologica*, Milano – Udine, Mimesis 2007.
- Paolo Bellini, *Pour une éthique de la technique*, in *Repenser la nature. Dialogue philosophique Europe, Asie Amérique*, sous la direction de J. P. Pierron e M. H. Parizeau, Canada, Presse de l'Université Laval 2012.
- Wendell Berry, *Bringing it to the table: on farmer and food*, Berkeley: Counterpoint: Distributed by Publishers Group West 2009.
- Antimo Cesaro, *The Concept of Person Between the Christian Tradition and Post-Modern Society*, in *Philosophy and Public Issues*, Vol. 6, No. 3 2016.
- Jean Chevalier, Alain Gheerbrant, *A Dictionary of Symbols*, trans. by John Buchanan Brown, New York, Penguin Books 1996.
- Derrick de Kerckhove, *Brainframes. Technology, mind and business*, Utrecht, BSO/ORIGIN 1991.
- Derrick de Kerckhove, *The architecture of intelligence*, Basel, Boston, Birkhäuser 2001.
- Dictionnaire de philosophie politique*, sous la direction de P. Raynaud et S. Rials, Paris, P. U. F. 1996.
- Mircea Eliade, *The Forge and the Crucible*, trans. by Stephen Corrin, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978.

- Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*, trans. by Graham Burchell, New York: Palgrave MacMillan 2008, p. 317.
- Yuval N. Harari, *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*, New York, NY, Harper, an imprint of HarperCollins Publishers 2017.
- Michael Hardt Antonio Negri, *Empire*, Cambridge, Massachusetts – London, England, Harvard University Press 2000
- Hesiod, *Works and Days*, trans. by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1914.
- Aldous Huxley, *Brave new world*, New York, Modern Library 1956.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, London: Andrew Crooke 1651.
- Karoly Kerényi, *The Gods of the Greeks*, trans. by Norman Cameron, London, New York, Thames, and Hudson 1951.
- John Locke, *An essay concerning human understanding*, The Pennsylvania State University, 1999.
- Jean Markale, *Le Graal*, Paris, Retz, 1982.
- Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding media: the extensions of man*, London, Sphere Books, 1967.
- George Orwell, 1984, Global Grey e-books, 2019.
- John Stuart Mill, *On liberty/Sulla libertà*, Milano: Bompiani, 2010.
- Max Tegmark, *Life 3.0 : being human in the age of artificial intelligence*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2017.
- Jeanette Winterson, *Frankissstein: a love story*, New York : Grove Press 2019.
- Paul Virilio, *La vitesse de libération : essai*, Paris, Galilée, 1995.
- Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890).
- Elemire Zolla, *Le meraviglie della natura. Introduzione all'alchimia*, Venezia, Marsilio 1991.

NOTES

1. An Italian version of this article appeared on *Mondi. Movimenti simbolici e sociali dell'uomo*, 3/2020.
2. Cf. Karl Kerényi, *The Gods of the Greeks*, trans. by Norman Cameron, London, New York: Thames, and Hudson, 1951.
3. *Ibidem*.
4. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, IV, 18.
5. Cf. Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890).
6. Cf. Jean Chevalier, Alain Gheerbrant, *Rebis, Androgynous* in *A Dictionary of Symbols*, trans. by John Buchanan Brown, New York, Penguin Books, 1996 and Mircea Eliade, *The Forge and the Crucible*, trans. by Stephen Corrin, Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1978.
7. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, trans. by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914, 110-125.
8. *Ibidem*.
9. Cf. P. Bellini, *L'immaginario politico del Salvatore. Biopotere, sapere e ordine sociale*, Milano-Udine: Mimesis, 2012.
10. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*, trans. by Graham Burchell, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008, p. 317.
11. Cf. Plato, *Protagoras*, 320c -322d e *Cité* in *Dictionnaire de philosophie politique*, sous la direction de P. Raynaud et S. Rials, Paris : P. U. F., 1996.
12. «Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it. Power can achieve an effective command over the entire life of the population only when it becomes an integral, vital function that every individual embraces and reactivates of his or her own accord. [...] The highest function of this power is to invest life through and through, and its primary task is to administer life. Biopower thus refers to a situation in which what is directly at stake in power is the production and reproduction of life itself. [...] In the passage from disciplinary society

- to the society of control, a new paradigm of power is realized which is defined by the technologies that recognize society as the realm of biopower. [...] By contrast, when power becomes entirely biopolitical, the whole social body is comprised by power's machine and developed in its virtuality. This relationship is open, qualitative, and affective. Society, subsumed within a power that reaches down to the ganglia of the social structure and its processes of development, reacts like a single body. Power is thus expressed as a control that extends throughout the depths of the consciousnesses and bodies of the population—and at the same time across the entirety of social relations» (Michael Hardt – Antonio Negri, *Empire*, Cambridge, Massachusetts – London, England: Harvard University Press, 2000, pp. 23-24).
13. «The obligation of subjects to the sovereign is understood to last as long, and no longer, than the power lasteth by which he is able to protect them. For the right men have by nature to protect themselves, when none else can protect them, can by no covenant be relinquished. [...] The end of obedience is protection» (Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, London: Andrew Crooke 1651, p. 136). *Obedientiae finis est protectio* (T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Londini: Malmesburiensi ed. 1841, p.168).
 14. See Wendell Berry, *Bringing it to the table: on farmer and food*, Berkeley : Counterpoint : Distributed by Publishers Group West, 2009.
 15. *Ibidem*.
 16. Cf. Paolo Bellini, *Cyberfilosofia del potere. Immaginari, ideologie e conflitti della civiltà tecnologica*, Milano - Udine : Mimesis, 2007, pp. 66-67.
 17. Cf. Jean Markale, *Le Graal*, Paris : Retz, 1982 and Elemire Zolla, *Le meraviglie della natura. Introduzione all'alchimia*, Venezia : Marsilio, 1991.
 18. Cf. Jean Chevalier, Alain Gheerbrant, *Rebis, Androgynous* in *A Dictionary of Symbol*, and Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of Human Androgyny* in *Patterns in comparative religion*, trans. by Rosemary Sheed, Lincoln : University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
 19. Cfr. A. Cesaro, *The Concept of Person Between the Christian Tradition and Post-Modern Society*, in *Philosophy and Public Issues*, Vol. 6, No. 3 2016, pp. 95-114.
 20. «... to find wherein personal identity consists, we must consider what person stands for;—which, I think, is a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing, in different times and places; which it does only by that consciousness which is inseparable from thinking, and, as it seems to me, essential to it: it being impossible for any one to perceive without perceiving that he does perceive. When we see, hear, smell, taste, feel, meditate, or will anything, we know that we do so. Thus it is always as to our present sensations and perceptions: and by this every one is to himself that which he calls self: it not being considered, in this case, whether the same self be continued in the same or diverse substances. For, since consciousness always accompanies thinking, and it is that which makes every one to be what he calls self, and thereby distinguishes himself from all other thinking things, in this alone consists personal identity, i.e. the sameness of a rational being: and as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person;...» (J. Locke, *An essay concerning human understanding*, The Pennsylvania State University, 1999, pp. 318-319).
 21. Cf. N. Abbagnano, *Persona*, in *Dizionario di filosofia*, Milano: Tea, 1993.
 22. Cf. Jeanette Winterson, *Frankissstein : a love story*, New York : Grove Press, 2019.
 23. At the state of nature there is «continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short» (Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 78).
 24. Cf. Paolo Bellini, *Cyberfilosofia del potere. Immaginari, ideologie e conflitti della civiltà tecnologica*, Milano – Udine: Mimesis, 2007, pp. 27 -49, and *Immaginario politico del Salvatore. Biopotere, sapere e ordine sociale*, Milano – Udine: Mimesis, 2012, pp. 86-97.
 25. «The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for worldview and mental habits proper to devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible » (George Orwell, 1984, Global Grey e-books 2019, p. 272).
 26. Cf. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding media: the extensions of man*, London, Sphere Books, 1967; Derrick de Kerckhove, *Brainframes. Technology, mind and business*, Utrecht : BSO/ORIGIN, 1991, and *The architecture of intelligence*, Basel ; Boston : Birkhäuser, 2001.

27. Cf. Max Tegmark, *Life 3.0 : being human in the age of artificial intelligence*, New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 2017, and Yuval N. Harari, *Homo Deus : A Brief History of Tomorrow*, New York, NY : Harper, an imprint of HarperCollins Publishers, 2017.
28. Cf. *Ibidem*, Paolo Bellini, *Il cyborg. Una nuova mitopia tecnologica*, Pedagogika.it, Anno XIV Numero 4, 2010 and Paul Virilio, *La vitesse de libération : essai*, Paris : Galilée, 1995.
29. Cfr. Paolo Bellini, *Pour une éthique de la technique*, in *Repenser la nature. Dialogue philosophique Europe, Asie Amérique*, sous la direction de J. P. Pierron e M. H. Parizeau, Canada : Presse de l'Université Laval, 2012.
30. Cf. Aldous Huxley, *Brave new world*, New York : Modern Library, 1956.
31. Cf. Wendell Berry, *Bringing it to the table: on farmer and food*.
32. «...the sole end for which mankind are warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. ... The only part of the conduct of any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute» (John Stuart Mill, *On liberty/Sulla libertà*, Milano: Bompiani 2010, p. 54).
33. George Orwell, 1984, p. 31.