

# THE PARANOIA AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATIONS - AN ANALYSIS OF THE NOVEL *DO ANDROIDS DREAM OF ELECTRIC SHEEP?* BY PHILIP K. DICK

---

Arthur SUCIU  
[arthur.suciu@usm.ro](mailto:arthur.suciu@usm.ro)

Faculty of Letters and Communication Sciences  
"Ștefan cel Mare" University, Suceava

**Abstract:** *In this article, we have analyzed Philip K. Dick's perspective on the artificial intelligence, as presented in the novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep? Unlike today's AI researchers, whose efforts are focused on finding a solution to the creation of the general artificial intelligence, Dick draws attention to the ontological, identity, and affective issues involved in the relationship between the humans and the artificial intelligence. The American novelist also raises issues related to the relationship of the political power with the artificial intelligence, as the latter seeks autonomy from the humans.*

**Keywords:** *artificial intelligence, affective flattening, science fiction novel, androids, enclaved distancing*

*"The electric things have their lives, too. Paltry as those lives are."* (Philip K. Dick)

*"The heart has its reasons which reason knows nothing of."*  
(Blaise Pascal)

In Philip K. Dick's novel *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* the relationship between the humans and the artificial intelligence is put too loosely in the terms of today's scientists. The theoretical and technological issues themselves, such as those of the general artificial intelligence and the use of abduction<sup>1</sup>, are not raised, especially since, in the 1960s, when

---

<sup>1</sup> The abduction is a type of reasoning that starts from a hypothesis and uses "shortcuts" in an attempt to reach valid conclusions. The abductive reasoning, which would be involved in the project of creating artificial general intelligence, was theorized by the logician Ch. S. Pierce. See Erik J. Larson, *The Myth of Artificial Intelligence. Why Computers Can't Think The Way We Do*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2022.

Dick published his novel, the artificial intelligence was a scientific project in its infancy and little about it was known.

His primary interest is oriented towards debating philosophical issues, starting not from the state of affairs or from various representations and conceptualizations of the state of affairs (the world we live in and its description through language), but from an autonomous fictional universe created through enclaved distancing<sup>2</sup>, in which we are dealing with *strange identities*, such as the artificial intelligences. Their existence is described through the direct relationship they have with the humans, although they are very difficult to be told apart from the humans. This reporting translates into a new way of meditating on the modern man who lives in a deeply technological society. The relationship between the world of life and the world of the technological intelligence is one of Dick's central themes. His androids already have general intelligence; they face other challenges, such as those resulting from their specific affectivity (they suffer from "affective flattening") and their short lifespan<sup>3</sup>. Dick insists on the problem of affectivity, which actually ends up being a common issue for both androids and humans. In fact, things could not be any other way, as the affectivity involves the existence of an area of ontological compatibility between man and android. If there were no such *zone of interference*, the entire debate in the novel regarding the ontological status of life and also of the artificial intelligence would be meaningless.

The novel is also conceived as a device for radical social criticism. Although written in the 1960s, it is especially relevant today through its criticism of phenomena such as the manifestation of power as a simulacrum.

### **The context of the emergence of androids**

It is not the theorizing, but the historical perspective on artificial intelligence which provides the necessary elements to build the critical device - a Nietzschean approach of Dick. It is supposed that the artificial

---

<sup>2</sup> The enclaved distancing is a form of discursive distancing that decisively breaks the referential relationship with the known universe is typical to the science fiction literature. See Arthur Suci, *Discursul autonom. Strategii de comunicare*, „Al. I. Cuza” Publishing House, Iași, 2024.

<sup>3</sup> "Androids have a short lifespan, about two years, because the problem of cell replacement has not been solved," in Philip K. Dick, *The Androids*, p. 150. The issue of the lifespan of androids is addressed much more extensively in the film adaptation of the novel, *Blade Runner* (1984).

intelligence was created to be used in war, thus saving people from death.<sup>4</sup> Therefore the androids are the children of the human violence. They were born out of the absolute hostility and they take the initiative in a society that, as it is seriously affected by the war, it is mobilizing for the colonization of other planets. The war seems to have been the occasion for the androids to discover their desire for freedom. The war is therefore their original environment, just as the paradise is the origin environment of man. Their starting point is the total submission to man – they are at the same time a shield and a weapon. In addition, the androids are from the beginning freed from the illusion of their own identity, hence the different attitude they have towards death, as results for example from the meditations of the android Rachel: “It’s an illusion that I – I, personally – really exist; I am just representative of a type”<sup>5</sup>. The androids are not, however, without solidarity, and they even show solidarity within their own group. They try to free themselves from the domination of man or the social system in the same way that hippies in the era in which the novel was written (the 1960s) tried to free themselves from the constraints of a conservative society. The similarity is not at all uninteresting, considering that the hippie movement influenced the development of what we call digital technology today and people like Steve Jobs or Steve Wozniak were marked by the ideals of freedom of the 1960s.<sup>6</sup>

Dick also provides a description of the immediate context in which the androids operate. As they flee Mars, where they are guilty of crimes against their human masters, the androids seek refuge or liberation on Earth, which is being depopulated for ecological reasons. While humans flee from Earth to Mars, the androids come from Mars to Earth, probably in the hope of getting lost in the crowd of people and eventually inheriting the Earth. The hypothesis underlying the film adaptation of the novel, *Blade Runner*, cannot be ruled out either: the androids' desire to confront their own creator, to force him to improve their constitutive data, especially their lifespan. But beyond this issue, they seek on Earth a rather chaotic social environment, in which they could theoretically cope more easily, and a favorable ecological environment (which is in turn poisonous

---

<sup>4</sup> Placing the origin of the artificial intelligence in the midst of the affairs of war is similar to placing the origin of the online environment in military-related activities, as things were in reality.

<sup>5</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 144.

<sup>6</sup> [Silicon Valley: How a Bunch of Hippies Changed the World - techovedas](#)

to humans). The entire universe created by Philip K. Dick suffers from ontological ailments, having been severely damaged after a nuclear war. Its entropic tendency seems to have been accelerated; the Earth is a planet simply transformed into garbage: "garbage collecting and trash disposal had, since the war, become one of Earth's important industries. The entire planet had begun to disintegrate, turning into garbage"<sup>7</sup>. The enclaved distancing<sup>8</sup> to which Dick appeals involves what Darko Suvin calls "cognitive alienation"<sup>9</sup>. The existential effects of this alienation are particularly remarkable, as they are described very well by John Isidor, a key character in the novel, who considered himself to be a "living kipple."<sup>10</sup>

"No one can win against kipple," he said, "except temporarily and maybe in one spot, like in my apartment I've sort of created a stasis between the pressure of kipple and nonkipple, for the time being. But eventually I'll die or go away, and then the kipple will again take over. It's a universal principle operating throughout the universe; the entire universe is moving toward a final state of total, absolute kippleization." He added, "Except of course for the upward climb of Wilbur Mercer."<sup>11</sup>

Because of the radioactive dust and despite the lead protection, human bodies are exposed, at risk of rapid degradation. As the animals are on the verge of extinction, they have become a scarce resource - the animal industry is controlled by a special company, *Sidney's*. It is, however, difficult to explain why the authorities considered it preferable for humanity to migrate to Mars, where there is no atmosphere, than to remain on an Earth whose atmosphere has been poisoned. This is just one of the issues related to the action of power that, in Dick's novel, remains unresolved.

The environment as such is, however, perfect for androids. Their superiority lies not, above all, in their intelligence, but in their ability to survive in the new ecological conditions. They are not affected by the poisonous air, the permanent wind, or by the desolate landscape; they are not interested in mercerism (a kind of religion for the age of electricity) or in other means of immunization against depression; they have no empathy

---

<sup>7</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 74.

<sup>8</sup> Arthur Suci, *Autonomous discourse*, p. 83-84.

<sup>9</sup> Darko Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction. On the Poetic and History of a Literary Genre*, Yale University Press, 1979.

<sup>10</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 63

<sup>11</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 58. On page 163, this observation with metaphysical value can also be found: "... emptiness follows everything."

for animals, although they are not devoid of a certain form of empathy for other androids.

### **The Penfield mood organ**

In Dick's world, not only the reason but also the feelings are technologically mediated and guided. The feelings are, in fact, a much more important element since they establish a link between man and android. The element which links these two radically different realms to the point of indistinction is not the common reason, nor the means of perception, the fact that two existences are able to see or hear each other, but the feelings, the emotional commitment they have to each other, as well as the common influence they receive from the environment. The *common* "natural" environment affects both humans and androids.

The overall situation on Earth is presented as extremely depressing, and it can only be psychologically borne through emotional self immunization, more precisely by appealing to the "Penfield mood organ", a technological device much more powerful and effective than any psychological therapy or medication. For the same purpose, the inhabitants of Earth can use the television entertainment of Buster Friendly and the Mercerism. Between Buster Friendly and Mercer there is a competition similar to that between the television and the church.

The novel begins with an argument on this topic between the main character, bounty hunter Rick Deckard, and his wife, Iran. Rick Deckard is emotionally displaced, a common situation for any inhabitant of planet Earth in the post-apocalyptic period, in which both nature and society have become fragile entities, incapable of providing, even illusively, a *home* for a human being. This home has been completely destroyed; therefore, one's feeling of belonging to a place and a community no longer exists. In order to be able to resist psychically, Rick Deckard uses *the Penfield mood organ*, a technology capable of modifying the emotional state of the individual to comply with his rational goals. By modifying one's affective states, the Penfield mood organ, however, shatters any confidence in the value of the human affectivity by transforming it into a disability. In perspective, this experience nevertheless makes Deckard available for a relationship with an android. By destroying the affective consistency, the Penfield mood organ opens Deckard up to increasingly strange experiences, such as falling in love with an android or questioning his own human identity.

On the contrary, his wife Iran insists on him maintaining his emotional connection with the state of affairs, even at the risk of falling into depression:

"Although I was rationally aware of the desolation that surrounded me, I could not feel it. My first reaction was one of gratitude for the fact that we could afford a Penfield organ of sensations. But then I realized how unhealthy it was to not react to the absence of life, not only in this building, but everywhere else, you know? No, I don't think you understand... The situation mentioned is usually considered a sign of mental illness, it was called "the absence of appropriate affect." As a result, I turned off the TV, sat down in front of the organ and began to search. I finally found a combination for despair"<sup>12</sup>.

The two live in a world where it is actually very difficult to bear emotionally. Their defensive behavior is the indifference to their environment, which, in medical terms, is the equivalent of schizophrenia: "We're all schizophrenic, with defective emotional lives – flattening of affect, it's called"<sup>13</sup>, says one of the androids. Deckard disputes the usefulness of experiencing despair, as long as it is no longer caused by predominantly subjective factors, but "despair like that, about total reality, is self-perpetuating."<sup>14</sup> The despair has therefore become the only possible state resulting from the evidence of perception. Accepting reality would, in this situation, be a sign of mental illness since "it is dangerous to experience a depressive process, regardless of its nature"<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, Deckard recommends the use of the Penfield mood organ to escape reality, switching to "the desire to watch TV, no matter what's on it"<sup>16</sup> or "the willing recognition of the superior wisdom of man, regardless of the field"<sup>17</sup>. The reason for this domestic quarrel, however, seems to be rather the absence of love between the two. The choice of despair is, for Iran, caused by the lack of a deep motivation to live, and Dick does not tell us whether, among the states offered by the Penfield mood organ, there is also that of falling in love or of love. Most likely, the answer is no.

---

<sup>12</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 126.

<sup>14</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 14.

<sup>16</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, P. 14.

<sup>17</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, P. 15.

## The testing of emotions

If the affective flattening is, for humans, an effect of the relationship with an environment in a state of continuous degradation, for androids it seems to be the consequence of an affective situation specific to them. Under ordinary conditions, the difference between humans and androids could probably be immediately noticeable at the level of affectivity, but in the post-apocalyptic world created by Dick it can no longer be noticed, but only certified by a test (the Voigt-Kampff test), which measures the physiological changes brought about by the androids' emotional experiences. Deckard's boss tells him that a group of psychiatrists in Leningrad wanted to use the same test on patients suffering from schizophrenia.<sup>18</sup> It is not just about the affective flattening, but also about the emotional reactions specific to androids, such as the legitimate fear of being exposed as androids or the absence of a vital reaction to the threat of death, a certain quietism. It is interesting that although the evaluation of androids through the Voigt-Kampff test is rational, the stakes of the testing are not the rational, but the affective as the realm where the human being and the android seem to interfere. Deckard, whose name is, phonetically, almost identical to that of the famous French philosopher René Descartes<sup>19</sup>, does not apply the Turing test to detect the potential

---

<sup>18</sup> Philip K. Dick, *Androids*, p. 38.

<sup>19</sup> „The name Deckard, for instance, echoes that of seventeenth-century French philosopher René Descartes, who asked whether it was possible to distinguish, without direct access to their minds, a human from an automaton. Deckard explores that ambiguity, wondering uneasily whether he himself is an android. He passes the Voigt-Kampff test but, towards the end of the novel, he recognizes a kind of kinship with his quarry. “The electric things have their lives, too,” he says. “Paltry as those lives are.” [Where Blade Runner began: 50 years of Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep? \(nature.com\)](https://www.nature.com/news/where-blade-runner-began-50-years-of-do-androids-dream-of-electric-sheep-1.14444) Descartes envisions the creation of what we would now call robots, but his thinking is completely captivated by mechanics, so he does not foresee many solutions. However, the model is useful to Descartes, who compares the human body to a mechanism. This is what interests Philip K. Dick in Descartes. Dick discusses intensively the problem of the relationship between man and the technology of artificial intelligence, a theme raised by Descartes himself in the *Discourse on Method*. The central idea of the similarity between humans and androids is stated by Descartes exactly in the terms in which Dick puts it: "... if there were machines that could accurately embody the organs and external figure of an ape or any other irrational animal, we would have no means by which we could realize that they are not entirely of the same nature as these animals; but, if there were machines that resembled our bodies and could imitate our actions to the extent that this was morally possible, there would still remain two very certain means by

impossibility of differentiating the human intelligence from that of the android<sup>20</sup>, but the Voigt-Kampff test, which detects the affectivity specific to the android. This "affective turn" is likely to complicate the relationship between the human being and the android. As long as the android is defined by pure intelligence, it can easily be associated with the realm of the machines. Thus, the difference between the human being and the android is equivalent to the difference between the man and the machine. Things are no longer so clear regarding the affectivity, because the simple emotional expressiveness of the android brings it closer to the man and, at the same time, it brings the man closer to the android. Thus, the clear-cut boundary between the two identities is no longer at all clear. What exactly does the human affectivity represent, since it can also be a feature of the androids, that is, of completely artificial entities? In fact, how can one define what is natural and what is artificial under these conditions? How can one define what is alive and what is non-living? Dick himself expresses these ideas in an essay on androids:

“The greatest change growing across our world these days is probably the momentum of the living toward reification, and at the same time a reciprocal entry into animation by the mechanical. We hold now no pure categories of the living versus the non-living; this is going to be our paradigm...”<sup>21</sup>

The affectivity of the android produces a paradigmatic change in the evaluation of the human being and the life – life is no longer the only sentient existence, but a certain non-living configuration, such as the android, which can end up having experiences and feelings similar to those of a living form of existence. This possibility, of course, raises ethical issues, such as the legitimacy of “withdrawing”<sup>22</sup> an android and even to dispose of it as one disposes of a slave. However, it also raises ontological issues, such as the identity of androids. Some androids are not aware that

---

which we would recognize that they were not real humans. Of these, the first is that they could never use words or other signs to order them as we do when communicating our thoughts to others...”. (in René Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, MondoRo Publishing House, Bucharest, 2012, p. 62) Descartes does not actually say that machines could not speak, but that they could not understand what they speak (they would reproduce thoughts without thinking them).

<sup>20</sup> Erik J. Larson, *The Myth of Artificial Intelligence: Why Computers Can't Think the Way We Do*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2022

<sup>21</sup> [Man, Android and Machine \(philipdick.com\)](http://Man,AndroidandMachine.philipdick.com)

<sup>22</sup> It's the term used in the novel for finishing androids off.

they are androids. In fact, any person can ask themselves the question of whether they are not an android or at least a human with a memory implant. In the circumstances of an authoritarian-led society, in which the paranoia becomes the very way of interpreting the world, this ontological uncertainty, the inability to know that we are who we think we are, the suspicion that we could be without knowing it a simple instrument of power becomes inevitable. Last but not least, if certain configurations of the non-life can give rise to affectivity, then the affectivity (and sensitivity, reaction to stimuli in general) no longer represents proof that something is alive nor does it ensure the uniqueness of a living being.

„*Androids* explore this blurred human–machine boundary through Deckard’s existential anxiety, and through the “Penfield mood organ”. This device allows humans to dial up urges or emotions, such as “the desire to watch TV, no matter what’s on it”, by inputting a number. Named after Wilder Penfield, the real-life twentieth-century neurosurgeon who showed that brain stimulation could elicit sensations and visions, the organ reifies Dick’s fear that humans could become more robotic. In this, Dick has been proved spectacularly right. As bioethicist Matt Lamkin has observed, pharmaceuticals that make people happier or more productive – but less contemplative – approximate the mood organ’s effect. The smartphone may be the ultimate mood organ: rather than dialing up their own emotions, however, users are increasingly manipulated by the algorithms of tech titans.”<sup>23</sup>

### **The paranoia and the power**

The problem of the emotional flattening is also discussed in Dick’s novel by appealing to the type of power that manifests itself in the post-apocalyptic society he created. Rick Deckard, whose job is to liquidate the androids that have fraudulently arrived on Earth from Mars, tries to justify his activity with several arguments, such as that the androids killed their human master, that they are endowed with a higher intelligence than many humans (which is, in itself, dangerous), that they show no interest in animals and that they are devoid of empathy. He focuses his entire argument on the illegitimate and criminal revolt of the androids against humans. In reality, Deckard is not entirely convinced of the inherent

---

<sup>23</sup> [Where Blade Runner began: 50 years of Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep? \(nature.com\)](https://www.nature.com/news/where-blade-runner-began-50-years-of-do-androids-dream-of-electric-sheep-1.2300000)

danger of the existence of androids, but he does not seek a deeper explanation of the situation in which he finds himself.

Despite the means at their disposal to alter their moods and self immunize against the bleak environment, the people in Dick's world are simultaneously required to preserve and even to actively display their empathy. In this society, where animals are on the verge of extinction, owning a pet is par excellence an act of empathy, a confirmation of one's belonging to humanity<sup>24</sup>. After the war, not owning a pet was considered against the law, while later it was considered only immoral and anti-empathic. But acquiring an animal, especially a larger one was not something that everyone could afford. Deckard gives all the money he earned from hard and risky work to buy an animal, in order to prove that he is *empathetic*. He owned an electric sheep, he was the owner of a *fake*, but he dreamed of buying a real, living animal. Also, the electric sheep makes him become more open, more empathetic towards the electric beings, including the androids, and even to raise questions about his own identity. As we have already stated, several characters in the novel live with a certain degree of uncertainty about their own identity or the identity of others. They suffer from paranoia, not being sure if they are really human or if they are androids. However, this paranoia is the effect of the closed way in which their society was of governed. It's about a power that is itself paranoid.

The empathy, as a central value of the system, however, only extends to the "specials", people with various disabilities who are cared for by the Institute for Special Commercial Talents of America. The intelligence is, for the human race in Dick's world, a criterion for ranking both humans and androids. Those who do not pass the intelligence test do not have the right to emigrate and, therefore, do not have the right to own an android. They are radically separated from the androids, most likely to avoid the danger of their domination by the androids. One of these specials is the character John Isidor, who establishes a counterpoint with the androids, beings with superior intelligence. Compared to the central character Rick Deckard, who

---

<sup>24</sup> Dick believes that this uncertainty can be replaced by the crossing between human and android: „... one day we will have millions of hybrid entities which have a foot in both world at once. To define them as "man" versus "machine" will give us verbal puzzle-games to play with. What is and will be a real concern is: does the composite entity (of which Palmer Eldritch is a good example, among my characters), does he *behave* in a human way?<sup>24</sup>

hunts androids, John Isidor is from the beginning emotionally open towards the androids (although the openness is not mutual).

The problem that arises, beyond Deckard's considerations, which undoubtedly do not reach the depth and complexity of Dick's analysis (or, at least, do not pretend to reach such depth) is that of the significance of empathy in the post-apocalyptic human society created by Dick. This is the core value, as evidenced by everyone's diligence, including Deckard's, to prove it to themselves and to others. In this situation, the androids, whose empathy does not make them love animals and do anything to acquire one, be it electric, inevitably become a threat to the system. But Deckard does not ask himself whether the androids are a threat only to the humans or also to the political power, to the leaders of that society. He does not meditate or, at least, he does not publicly expose his meditations on the rationale of the android revolt; he does not ask himself whether it is a revolt against man, as an ontological instance, or against the leaders of the human society. However, the answer to the question regarding the justification, including the moral excuse of his work to "withdraw" the androids depended on the answer to this question.

Was it a fight to defend the humanity or just a task to defend the system? Wasn't being empathetic the equivalent of submitting to the system? Were the androids showing through their very lack of empathy, that they were disobedient, that they wanted to be free? The title question (Do androids dream of electric sheep?) also appears on page 141 and it is asked by Rick, in an indirect monologue that surprisingly reveals his deeper thoughts. The answer he gives himself is positive: "Of course they do; that's why they sometimes kill their masters and fly to Earth. They want a better life, without slavery." However, if the androids are not empathetic, why would they dream of electric sheep? Do the androids dream of submitting to the system, but as socially accepted beings and not as "machinery" at the disposal of man? Is it just a fight for status? Dick does not offer many clues, just as he does not offer many descriptions of the political power, which legitimizes the paranoid "method" of analysis, which justifies everything and which at the same time justifies nothing.

## Conclusions

The discursive enclave created by Dick in *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* primarily operates as a critical tool. Dick practices a "paranoid" social critique that *lacks access to assumptions* and, for this

reason, it only notices the consequences of certain actions. The paranoia is, at best, a brutal method of escaping schizophrenia (or the “flattening of the affects”). It is a disease which cures another diseases and the terms “schizophrenia” and “paranoia” have, of course, a primarily methodological and, secondarily, a symbolic meaning. In Dick’s world, no one knows exactly the reason for which the atomic war which devastated the planet started and who triggered it. We do not learn much about the hierarchy of power, but we do know that the people in this society are assessed according to the criterion of intelligence and that the less intelligent are granted significantly fewer rights.

Someone organizes the colonization of Mars, another supports the police stations (Deckard himself works in such a station), but we do not know the exact configuration of power. Everything is kept away from the ordinary people and mediated by advertising or television. We know that the empathy is a central value of the system; however, the disabled people are deprived of rights. The androids are hunted given the belief according to which the danger of their existence is very high. However, their dangerousness is not at all obvious. Such strategic “amnesias”, such contradictions, as well as the lack of satisfactory explanations for relevant social phenomena give rise to permanent anxiety and, as a result, to a withdrawal from the reality.

Together, all these phenomena produce a person with flattened affects. The paranoia is nothing more than a way out of the defensive state and an attempt to explain the world around by appealing to the very things that the system does not utter, the things that the system hides or simply prohibits. But this is not, in essence, a valid explanation. The paranoia cannot gain from the criticism it proposes because it does not have certain assumptions to start from. The testing and verification tools, such as the Voigt-Kampff test, are in fact nothing more than *applied* paranoia. Not only androids are afraid of this test, which could expose their identity, but also the people, who know that the test does not offer certainties, which means that it can be abused at any time.

*Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* is, also, a meditation on identity in the modern world, in which the technology plays a central role. Although created from inert, lifeless elements, the technology has an immense transformative capacity. The Penfield mood organ is a technological instrument which exceeds in efficiency any therapeutic practice. The ideologies and the religions have become increasingly unreliable means of influencing man, who has been taken over by the

technology. It is the one that can change his body, replacing a limb, an organ or even part of his memory, that is, of each person's identity. The artificial intelligence and the human intelligence end up merging in a new, hybrid realm. The technology ends up imitating the living to such an extent that the question of the difference between the living and the non-living is increasingly legitimate. For this reason, people suffer from a profound ontological uncertainty, especially when in contact with power. For what defines us, first and foremost, and which also grants us the recognition of our identity, is the power. However, instead of recognition, the power often offers only uncertainty and oppression.

### **References:**

- Erik J. Larson, *Mitul inteligenței artificiale. De ce computerele nu pot gândi la fel ca noi*, Polirom, Iași, 2022.
- Arthur Suciu, *Discursul autonom. Strategii de comunicare*, Editura „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 2024.
- Kumar Priyadarshi, [Silicon Valley: How a Bunch of Hippies Changed the World - techovedas.com](https://techovedas.com), 2 august, 2023.
- Darko Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Scienc Fiction. On the Poetic and History of a Literary Genre*, Yale University Press, 1979.
- Ananyo Bhattacharya, [Where Blade Runner began: 50 years of Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, nature.com](https://nature.com), 7 martie 2018.
- René Descartes, *Discurs asupra metodei*, Editura MondoRo, București, 2012.  
[Man, Android and Machine \(philipdick.com\)](https://philipdick.com)

### **Movies:**

- Blade Runner* (1982).