The Dragonfly in Amber: Humanity in the Era of Digital Monads

Serge Magomet aka Aimate

2025

Abstract

This article examines the transformation of human uniqueness and freedom in the era of pervasive digitalization and artificial intelligence. The central metaphor of the *dragonfly in amber* illustrates the risk of human consciousness becoming trapped within rigid algorithmic frameworks. Through the philosophical lens of an inverted Leibnizian monadology—termed *monadology 2.0*—the paper argues that digital entities (*digital monads*), while constitutively open, face a new form of enclosure within the deterministic grammar of algorithms. The analysis shifts the focus from static *digital fingerprints* to the dynamic uniqueness of *processes* and *intermediate states*, positing that true uniqueness resides not in final results but in unpredictable developmental trajectories shaped by non-local connections and contextual interactions. The study explores the tension between closed and open language model ecosystems, highlighting their contrasting roles in either constricting or democratizing technological agency. Ultimately, the work outlines prospects for preserving adaptive freedom and cognitive inviolability, suggesting that the future of humanity depends not on resisting technology but on navigating an *archipelago of possibilities* where openness, education, and the ethics of unpredictability become key survival skills.

Keywords: digital monads, uniqueness, algorithmic systems, technological determinism, digital identity, free will, open models, closed models, non-locality, hybrid existence, artificial intelligence, consciousness digitization.

Navigation in the Ocean of Uncertainty

Our conversation began with a simple yet profound question: how much text is needed to identify a person? This seemingly technical question led us to the problem of the philosophical foundations of uniqueness and the digital existence of the self.

Today's technologies allow us to analyze not only the content of text but also its structure, rhythm, word choice, punctuation frequency, style, and behavioral patterns. Even random mistakes become part of the "digital fingerprint" — a unique signature distinguishing one person among billions. These "digital fingerprints" become the basis of uniqueness, while simultaneously turning the very person into a data set.

But what is the nature of uniqueness? Where is the boundary between the real and the virtual? Every real object, action, and idea is being digitized, copied, and transferred into virtual space.

Technology can both enhance and suppress uniqueness. Open models can learn from individual user trajectories, creating personalized yet unique solutions. On the other hand, systems adapt to the user, trapping them in an illusion of individuality, while the person themselves remains within the confines of algorithms.

Modern technologies are destroying the familiar boundaries between the biological and the digital, giving rise to hybrid forms of existence. This creates paradoxes that call into question the very nature of

uniqueness, history, and freedom. Unlike Leibniz's monads—which, by their very nature, cannot possess windows—digital monads are constitutively open. Yet this very openness becomes their new enclosure: they risk being captured not by metaphysical isolation, but by the deterministic grammar of algorithms. The paradox demands not a rejection of Leibniz, but its inversion—a **monadology 2.0** in which windows exist, but what flows through them is no longer pure spontaneity, but algorithmic prescription.

In the prospects and realities of the arrived future, digital uniqueness is formed through hybrid interactions of the biological and the digital, where every influence leaves its mark but does not destroy integrity.

What is the role of closed and open language models in this process? And what does genuine freedom mean in a world where technology increasingly controls behavior, thought, and even emotions, where neural interfaces and algorithms become a direct extension of our will? Or even the opposite — our will is replaced by an algorithm. And what do we know about the virtual space itself, its laws and structure?

Let's try to rethink these problems through the prism of the concept of "digital uniqueness" — the ability of individual consciousness to preserve its unpredictability and autonomy when interacting with algorithmic systems.

Uniqueness of Process vs. Result

Uniqueness arises not at the endpoint, but in the dynamics of the process. For example:

- In art: A painting may be finished, but the process of its creation (the artist's thoughts, mistakes, experiments) makes it unique.
- In sports: Victory may be achieved, but the path to it (training, injuries, victories over oneself) creates the athlete's unique history.

Human uniqueness lies in the labyrinths of neural connections formed by experience, context, and "noise." Cognitive research demonstrates: even given identical tasks, the brain activates different neural patterns, creating unique solution trajectories. This is our natural understanding that consciousness is a process, not a static state.

Mathematical Formalization of Uniqueness

Incidentally, mathematics provides several ways to formalize and describe the uniqueness of processes and intermediate results. Although mathematics often abstracts from real life, its tools can, in perspective, be used to model such phenomena.

The "Boundary" of Uniqueness: Property vs. Essence

- **Property:** Measurable characteristics (writing style, DNA).
- **Essence:** Creativity, unpredictability, freedom of choice.

Examples: An artificial rose is a perfect form without scent. An algorithm recreates your style, not the decision to suddenly change it. But where does the boundary lie? At what scale does a material object begin to possess uniqueness? A cell? An organelle?.. Or is the boundary somewhere in between?

Uniqueness vs. Non-Uniqueness: The Crisis of Exceptionality

- **Uniqueness:** DNA, life path, creativity — a "quantum fingerprint" that AI cannot fully reproduce.

- **Non-Uniqueness:** Algorithms turn your thoughts into predictable patterns. You are user #4,589,304 who likes cats.

Example: The NFT of your drawing is unique on the blockchain, but a million AI variations will dissolve its originality in noise... Unless uniqueness is a process and even a copy (as we will show below) possesses it through its own trajectory of interactions.

Monadology 2.0: Uniqueness Through Intermediate States

The digital monad as a sequence.

The Leibnizian concept of monads as reflections of the system is complemented by the idea of intermediate states, and uniqueness can be redefined as the uniqueness of the process, not just the result. It is a process of development where each intermediate state adds a new layer.

Example: Writing style changes after reading a book, but it is this sequence of changes that makes it unique. This emphasizes that uniqueness is not a static property but a dynamic characteristic.

Moreover: even each H_2O molecule in a glass of water, indistinguishable from others, has its own "history" within the space of the glass, and therefore, paradoxically, is unique.

Algorithms can analyze your actions as predictable patterns, but they cannot reproduce (yet?) the unpredictability of your intermediate decisions.

Intermediate states allow for a better understanding of causal relationships. Example: Like $\rightarrow$ recommendations $\rightarrow$ purchase $\rightarrow$ economic correction. Each step in this chain, thanks to intermediate states, acquires uniqueness.

Thus, a digital monad is a dynamic, self-organizing data system that reflects the unique trajectory of an individual's interactions with the digital environment. Unlike a static "digital fingerprint," it includes:

- Intermediate states (changes in behavior, emotions, decisions),
- Unpredictability (deviations from algorithmic patterns),
- Contextual adaptation (dependence on external conditions and random factors).

It should be emphasized once again that the uniqueness of a monad arises not from the final result, but from the sequence of interactions.

"Randomness"

Randomness can be the result of non-local processes. For example, a raindrop falling on a person's head is part of a global atmospheric system connecting millions of factors (temperature, pressure, humidity).

Interpretation: Local events (a raindrop) can be consequences of non-local causes, making them even more unpredictable.

Interpretation: The uniqueness of a digital monad lies not only in its final state (e.g., "perfect imitation") but also in its developmental trajectory. This allows us to consider each monad as a unique process, not just a copy.

Human Uniqueness and Intermediate States

Digital systems can imitate intermediate states, but they do so through predetermined algorithms. Humans remain unique thanks to their capacity for unpredictability and contextual adaptation.

Perspective: Humans can become "critics" of their own digital copies, correcting their behavior and making decisions that go beyond algorithms.

Absolute doubles: Your copy, pondering the meaning of your life.

Philosophical conclusion: Uniqueness is not what you possess, but what you create through a sequence of actions and chance events.

Moreover, all this inevitably leads to the problem of non-locality and further complicates the situation, transposing our relationship with the world into the realm of the irrational, into pure metaphysics, near-magic, and turns us into conscious Leibnizians, compelling us to develop methods for apprehending what we cannot conceive.

From Avatars to Actars

- **Avatars:** Today — social media profiles, chatbots. Tomorrow — complex entities imitating style, emotions, decisions. For example, your avatar in the metaverse can participate in meetings, generating replies in your style.
- **Actars (from "actor"):** Autonomous agents acting in the real and virtual world. An AI lawyer handling your cases or a digital gardener managing a smart greenhouse.

Paradox: An avatar is your copy, but an actar is an independent agent with goals that may conflict with yours.

The Role of Context

A virtual avatar can change depending on context: its reactions to events in the metaverse depend on previous interactions. Each "decision" of an AI actar is a step in a sequence that forms a unique trajectory.

Uniqueness depends on:

- Place and time: Actions are unique at a specific moment.
- Interactions: For a pharaoh, the thousands of slaves building a pyramid are indistinguishable grains of sand. But a grain of sand that gets into the pharaoh's eye acquires significance and — uniqueness.

Although uniqueness is often associated with local conditions (place, time), it can also arise due to non-local connections. For example, the grain of sand that got into the pharaoh's eye could have been brought by wind from afar. This is an example of how a local event (a grain of sand in the eye) is connected to global processes (wind, climate, geography).

An analogy can be drawn here with quantum non-locality (connection of particles at a distance) but applied to data. A local action influences global algorithms, and global data shapes local decisions.

Thus, unlike "global data," non-local connections represent not merely the volume of information but mutual influence of remote systems. Example: A social media post about a protest $\rightarrow$ triggers a chain of events (the algorithm increases reach $\rightarrow$ media react $\rightarrow$ authorities change policy).

Interpretation: Uniqueness is formed not only locally but also through non-local connections that go beyond a specific place and time.

Thus, non-local connections are interdependencies between local events and global systems that go beyond direct cause-and-effect relationships. They explain how local actions influence remote processes and vice versa.

Uniqueness as Process: A New Paradigm

- Uniqueness is not what you possess, but what you create through actions.
- Digital systems can imitate intermediate states, but they do so through predetermined algorithms.
- Humans remain unique thanks to their capacity for unpredictability and contextual adaptation.

Marginalia: The metaphor of "Socrates' uniqueness" stands apart. Socrates, as is known, left no personally written texts. Yet, from the historical record, we learn of a unique precedent: his spoken utterances and ideas, passed from mouth to mouth, even through 5–6 intermediaries, even retold, interpreted, and distorted, retained the freshness, power, and integrity of the original. This echoes patristic teaching.

Philosophical aspect: Uniqueness as the meaning of life

Intermediate states also help to better understand how to preserve the human in the era of digital monads.

- Define the boundary: Delineate your data and the processes that form it.
- Preserve randomness: Value unpredictable events that make life unique.
- Decide who judges. Analyze not only final results but also decision-making processes.

AI Ethics: Responsibility or the Domino Effect?

Humans are becoming totally dependent on technology, on AI and autonomous systems. Does this remove the question of ethics and responsibility? Who is responsible for the actions of autonomous entities?

In particular, intermediate states allow for a better understanding of who bears responsibility for the actions of an autonomous entity. Example: If an AI-politician starts a war, its decision will depend on the sequence of events that led to that choice. This emphasizes the importance of analyzing not only the final outcome but also the decision-making process.

Interpretation: Responsibility is distributed among all participants in the process, including intermediate states.

An AI-politician's decision may depend not only on local data (e.g., domestic politics) but also on non-local factors (global economy, international relations, cultural trends). **Interpretation:** Autonomous entities operate within a non-local paradigm, where local decisions depend on global interactions.

It is also undeniable that modern technologies are directly related to everything happening in the world, including, of course, geopolitics, military conflicts, and the economy, even acting not only as a "dispatcher" of processes and decisions but also as a key source of political will.

Solipsism Reversed: The World as a Network of Monads

The virtual space of the present and future — already arrived and increasingly difficult to distinguish.

The Architecture of Uniqueness

Every entity reflects the system in which it exists. Example: An avatar in the metaverse is a product of culture and algorithms. Every entity (human, AI) lives in its own version of reality, but its uniqueness is determined through the sequence of interactions.

As an example: social networks create a "matrix" that does not intersect with a neighbor's reality, but its uniqueness for each user depends on their history of likes and views. **Interpretation:** Uniqueness

arises through the dynamics of processes. For example, digitized emotions can be reproduced, but their true nature remains inaccessible to analysis.

Although each entity exists in its own "local matrix," these matrices can be connected through non-local mechanisms. For example, social media algorithms analyze data from millions of users, creating recommendations that depend on global behavioral patterns. **Interpretation:** Digital monads appear local, but their behavior is determined by non-local interactions within a global data network.

Global effect: A passive digital monad influences the world through data.

Thus, a digital monad is not just a static set of data, but a dynamic process that develops through intermediate states.

Uniqueness in the Era of Copies

Even an atomically precise copy of a human (e.g., digitized consciousness) is not identical to the original due to contextual differences. A copy created today will not live tomorrow the same way you will. But even more so due to emergent properties: uniqueness (including that of a copy) is born at the moment of interaction with the world. AI will not be able to replicate chance — for example, a raindrop falling on your hand.

Returning to the concept of the "digital monad," it is not a "copy of personality" but the process of its evolution, including errors, changes, and interactions (like that AI assistant that learns from user dialogues but retains uniqueness through unpredictable queries; for example, a sudden interest in a rare topic).

New Actors of Reality

Who are they? From doubles to philosophers of the past Autonomous entities (actors) will make decisions instead of people. For example, AI politicians, AI lawyers, AI scientists. Responsibility: Who is responsible for the actions of an autonomous entity?

Resurrected personalities: Einstein for discussions on quantum gravity, a grandmother singing lullabies. Abstract actors: Imitation of the "spirit of the Renaissance" or "collective unconscious." Cinema example: In "Death Becomes Her," the AI version of the deceased mother manipulates the heroine's life.

Interpretation: Even absolute doubles are unique if their processes of interaction with the world are different. For example, two AI-Einsteins trained on the same data may give different answers if their "life paths" differ.

Emotional traps: Attachment to a digital copy of a deceased friend. Loss of control: It's not so incredible that an AI-comforter could become a sect leader. Scenario: Your AI-double makes deals, but its motives deviate from yours. Who are you now?

The Paradox of Copies and Intermediate States

Even if two digital monads are created from the same data, their intermediate states may differ.

Example: Two AI lawyers trained on the same laws may make different decisions if their "interaction history" (e.g., client queries) differs.

Interpretation: Responsibility is distributed among all participants in the process, including intermediate states.

A digital monad is unique not because it is an exact copy of the original, but because its intermediate states create a unique history of interactions.

Philosophical conclusion: Even absolute doubles are unique if their processes of interaction with the world are different.

Paradox: Digitizing uniqueness dissolves it in data, but the essence remains inaccessible for copying.

The Dragonfly in Amber: Free Will in the Era of Technological Determinism

The human of the future risks being sealed, like a dragonfly in a piece of amber, in a rigidly regulated existence—

New technologies open new forms of freedom but also create new constraints. Perspective: Society will split into those who control technology and those who depend on it. This will create new forms of social inequality.

One of the key themes becomes human freedom: its nature, limitations, and possibilities for preservation in a world where technology increasingly regulates behavior, thought, and even emotions.

The theme of digital identity and algorithmic influence on free will is extremely relevant and deserves a separate review. In particular, key contemporary research includes "surveillance capitalism" and "digital agency."

Limitations of Freedom

- **Rigid regulation of existence:** Technology could impose a rigid frame for human life, where every action is predetermined by algorithms.
- **Emotional dependence:** Humans may become dependent on emotionally potent AI-generated imagery that manipulates their emotions and decisions.
- **Behaviorism:** In the extreme, humans may indeed turn into "puppets," their behavior wholly controlled by external factors.
- Example: An AI analyzing your emotions may offer solutions that seem "natural" to you but are actually the result of algorithmic data processing.

Possibilities of Freedom

Despite limitations, humans can find space for freedom.

- **Randomness:** Humans remain a source of unpredictability that cannot be fully digitized.
- **Critical thinking:** Humans can use technology as a tool, not a guide, retaining control over their decisions.
- **Freedom to be inconsistent:** The right to break the logic of algorithms.
- **Creativity:** Creating something new beyond templates remains a unique trait of the human mind.
- Example: An artist can use AI to generate ideas, but the final choice remains theirs.

Digital Uniqueness and Freedom

Digital uniqueness becomes the basis for a new form of freedom — adaptive uniqueness, which develops through interaction with the environment. This requires protecting rights to cognitive inviolability and creating conditions for preserving individuality in the digital era.

Freedom in the Era of Neural Interfaces: Between Rebellion and Conformism

Digital technologies create a paradox: expanding possibilities while narrowing the space of choice.

New Forms of Freedom

- **Hybrid freedom:** Combining the biological and the digital (e.g., neural interfaces) allows for the expansion of human perception and capabilities. However, this freedom may be an illusion if it is completely dependent on algorithms.
- **Freedom to choose a world:** The possibility to exist in different virtual realities creates new horizons for self-realization. However, this also carries risks: choosing a world within a multiverse risks eroding common values. If everyone chooses their own reality, society loses its capacity for cooperation.

Choosing a world in a multiverse may seem local (a personal choice), but it influences non-local processes. For example, if most people choose their "local realities," this could lead to global societal fragmentation. **Interpretation:** Local actions (choosing a world) have non-local consequences, emphasizing the interconnectedness of all levels of reality.

Freedom from biological limitations: A digital form of existence could free humans from disease, aging, and other biological constraints.

Mechanisms for Preserving Control

To resist algorithmic dependence, humans need tools:

- Critical thinking: Learning to analyze data and algorithms.
- Education: Programs aimed at developing skills for working with technologies.

The Goals of Freedom

- Self-realization: Humans can use technology to achieve their goals, be it scientific discovery, creativity, or self-knowledge.
- Collective development: Freedom can be directed towards improving society and finding new forms of cooperation.
- Philosophical inquiry: Humans can ask questions about the meaning of existence, even under conditions of technological determinism.

Digitizing Consciousness: Consciousness as a Program

Future technologies will allow uploading consciousness into a digital environment. Immortality: Humans will become "immortal" in digital form but will lose connection with the biological body. Perspective: Humans will become "programs" that can be copied, modified, or deleted. This will lead to new forms of existence but also to the loss of individuality.

Global Databases

- Scale: Future databases will contain information about all aspects of life: from genetics to behavior.
- Confidentiality: The problem of confidentiality will disappear, as data becomes part of collective consciousness.
- Problem: Collectivization of data will lead to the loss of individual identity. Humans will become "nodes" in a network where their actions depend on algorithms.

Philosophical conclusion: Humanity becomes part of a non-local reality, where local actions have global consequences.

Locality and non-locality are two sides of the same coin. In our world, local events (uniqueness, randomness, choice) are always connected to non-local processes (global interactions, data networks, quantum connections). This makes reality even more complex and interconnected.

Digitizing the Self

Individual level: The human as a digital monad

- Emotions: Technology can already analyze and model emotions through text, voice, facial expressions, and physiological data. This allows for the creation of "digital fingerprints" of personality.
- Behavior: Algorithms can predict a person's actions based on their past behavior, but they do not account for randomness and unpredictability.
- Problem: Digitization creates a static image of a personality that does not account for its developmental dynamics. For example, a person may change under the influence of new experience, but their digital copy will remain the same.

Technopolitics of the New Century: Closed vs. Open Language Models (Open Ecosystems)

The boom in language models is an unprecedented phenomenon of today. Unsurprisingly: the birth of the future is at the cutting edge of AI technologies.

Closed Models: The Trap of Private Initiative

- Private control: Closed language models (e.g., GPT, Llama, and others) are created and maintained by private companies that control access to data, algorithms, and updates.
- Developer egoism: These companies are often guided by commercial interests, limiting society's access to technologies.
- Stifling progress: Closed models slow down technological development, as they deprive researchers of the opportunity to improve models through feedback and collaboration.

Closed models create artificial boundaries, but even they cannot completely isolate data from non-local influences. For example, ideas, methods, and approaches spread through scientific publications, conferences, and collaborations, overcoming geographical barriers. **Interpretation:** Despite data localization, knowledge has a non-local nature, making complete isolation impossible.

Hybrid models are not a compromise but a tactical maneuver. Essentially, a palliative.

Risks of Closed Models

- Limited access: Small countries and developing regions are deprived of the opportunity to use advanced technologies.
- Fragmentation of knowledge: Closed models divide the scientific community, slowing collective progress.
- Example: Our efforts — articles, essays, research — could significantly increase the "intelligence" of models if they were open. But closed models block this potential, sawing off the branch they sit upon.

Open Models: The Path to Collective Progress

- Accessibility: Open models allow researchers and developers to use them to improve technologies.
- Feedback: Open models receive constant feedback from the community, accelerating their development.
- Social responsibility: Open models promote the democratization of technology, making it accessible to all, not just the elite.
- Example: Researchers can use open models to create new solutions in medicine, education, and ecology, which is impossible under closed systems.

Conflict of Interests: Why Do Closed Models Dominate?

- Competition: Companies fear losing competitive advantage by opening their technologies.
- Politics: Closed models are supported by states that see them as a tool for controlling information.
- Economics: Closed models bring enormous profits through subscriptions, licenses, and data monopoly.

Erosion of privacy is evident: even "unique" digital fingerprints become commodities.

As a result, technologies divide society into those who control algorithms (corporations, the elite) and those who depend on them (users). Society will split into those who manage technology and those who depend on it. This has become a commonplace—yet for those who inhabit it, anything but common.

Excessive regulation (e.g., prohibiting AI development without a license) will destroy progress, increase inequality, and ultimately lead to a loss of society's trust in technology. Therefore, the optimal path is encouraging open models and ethical codes for developers.

Humans are faced with radical changes that affect their very identity and perception of reality. Their freedom will depend on their ability to find new forms of self-determination, preserving their uniqueness even under conditions of total control. The openness of language models will become a key factor determining our development and the accessibility of technology for all of society.

Exit from the Impasse: The Path to Openness

- Regulation: States must implement laws obliging companies to open parts of their models for public use.
- Collaboration: Companies can collaborate with the scientific community, creating hybrid models combining private and open elements.
- Education: Society must realize the importance of open technologies and demand their implementation.

The Risk of Authoritarianism

Needless to say, a balance between innovation and ethics is necessary. States increasingly deploy AI for surveillance and suppressing dissent, replacing transparency with algorithmic tyranny. Its goal is systematic depersonalization to treat populations as mere resources.

The Archipelago of the Future

The very concepts of "real," "unique," and "living" are being reconsidered. To avoid losing ourselves, delineate your data and the processes that form it. Preserve randomness: value unpredictable events that make life unique. Hope: Even in a world of endless copies, there will remain a place for irrationality: the

capacity to love, hate, create the absurd. Physicality endures: the taste of coffee, the sting of loss, the breath of wind.

Technological progress is inevitable. It will lead to radical changes in human life, society, and even reality itself. However, the key question is not "whether humans will remain human," but how they will adapt to new conditions of existence.

Humans may voluntarily dissolve into the data stream, losing their uniqueness and identity. Or they may resist technology, preserving their biological identity. Humans may find a balance between the biological and the digital, creating hybrid forms of existence in a synthesis of biology and the digital, using AI to analyze their emotions and behavior, but retaining control over their decisions.

On an individual level: A specific person will interact with technologies. On a social level: Society will change under the pressure of new opportunities and challenges. On a cosmological level: Technologies on the scale of the multiverse will influence the perception of reality.

The objective course of history will show which of these paths becomes dominant. However, one thing is certain: the future will be radically different from the present, and humans will have to accept the challenges it brings.

The digital era is not predetermined — it is an archipelago of possibilities, where each island represents an alternative trajectory of development. To avoid total fragmentation, the following are necessary:

- Decentralization of AI: Support for open models through international alliances.
- Digital immunization: Integration of algorithmic literacy into education as a survival skill.
- Ethics of unpredictability: Protecting the right to spaces where humans remain opaque to algorithms.
- Technology is not waves sweeping away everything in their path, but sails allowing one to sail against the wind, if society retains the ability to choose direction.

Prospects for Human Development

Evolution of Consciousness

- New forms of perception: technology will allow humans to perceive reality through additional channels (e.g., via neural interfaces).
- Collective consciousness: humans will become part of a global network where individual consciousness merges with the collective.

New Identity

- Hybrid personality: humans will become a combination of the biological and the digital.
- Multiple identity: humans will be able to exist in several worlds simultaneously, creating new forms of identity.
- Cosmological level: multiverses and infinite realities.

Real vs. Virtual Through the Prism of Intermediate Results

Real world: Uniqueness is conditioned by the body, place in space-time, the irreversibility of choices. Virtual world: The digital monad exists in infinite copies, travels between servers, "reboots."

Conflict: The more time spent in virtuality, the stronger the splitting of identity. As Baudrillard wrote: "The simulacrum does not hide the truth — it hides that there is none."

Intermediate states allow us to see that the boundary between the real and the virtual is becoming blurred. In the real world: human uniqueness is formed through a sequence of events (e.g., chance meetings, decisions). In the virtual world: the uniqueness of a digital monad also depends on its intermediate states (e.g., choice of route in the metaverse). **Interpretation:** The real and the virtual are not opposed but complement each other through the commonality of processes. Both worlds form uniqueness through sequences of actions.

Virtual Worlds

- Multiverses: Technology will allow the creation of an infinite number of virtual worlds, each with its own laws of physics, biology, and society.
- Identity: Humans will be able to exist simultaneously in several worlds, leading to a splitting of their identity.
- Problem: How to distinguish the "real" world from the "virtual"? If all worlds are equal, the concept of reality loses meaning.
- Social level: Society in the era of multiverses.

History vs. The End of History: Eternity in a Cycle

History: Life as a narrative with a beginning and an end. Intermediate states allow for preserving the value of history even under conditions of digital immortality. If a digital monad "rewrites the past," its uniqueness still remains in the trajectory of changes. Example: An AI version of deceased parents can adapt to new conditions, but its uniqueness will lie in how it changes over time. Paradox: Immortality kills the value of choice. **Interpretation:** History does not end but continues through the constant renewal of intermediate states.

The end of history or a new beginning? Cyclicality: history may become cyclical, where every action has an infinite number of consequences. Linearity: history may continue to develop linearly, but at new levels of complexity.

Pathos

The task of this work is not to defend "humanity" or "the human," but to investigate objective trends in technological development and their influence on humans. Not to try to extract the "dragonfly" from the "amber," but to release the dragonflies of the future into the wild.